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...any speaker is himself a respondent to a greater or lesser degree. He is not, after all, the first speaker, the one who disturbs the eternal silence of the universe.

(Bakhtin 1986: 69)
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

“Who controls the past, controls the future: who controls the present controls the past”
(Orwell 1949: 32)

1.1 The context and the aim of the research

Embracing Fairclough’s perspective that transformations in social life are led by discourse (2006a: 24-25), this study explores the specialized ‘realm’ of diplomacy as expressing the foreign policy of the British country. This research is especially an investigation of the communicative strategies used by the three foreign ministers (Cook, Straw and Beckett), during Blair’s government, to pursue their ideological design and to construct a positive image of their country’s policy by claiming unity.

The issues contemplated in their speeches, the only text-typology considered in this study, imply the construction of complex ideological and axiological discursive positions, which stem from a web of unavoidably superimposed emotional and moral evaluations, often interwoven with logical observations. This study takes up an interpersonal perspective on discourse outlining the ways speakers negotiate solidarity with their audience by ‘naturalizing’ a variety of ideological positions.

In a speech given on March 20th 2007, at a conference in London, the British Foreign Minister, Margaret Beckett, points out how diplomacy is undergoing a process of transformation and she also stresses the changing profile of the Foreign Commonwealth Office (henceforth FCO):
It has continued to adapt to new priorities and new ways of working that better fit the rapidly changing global environment. The global environment is now so complex, so interwoven and so fast-moving that now need a '360 degree diplomacy', with the freedom and flexibility to demonstrate initiative and to work with partners across different governments, across the broadest spectrum of British Society” [emphasis added]

This citation sets the context of this study which concerns a changing diplomatic scenario and reasons for these changes are due to a far more demanding environment as well as to a narrower distance between domestic and international setting (cf. Hocking 2007).

When dealing with international relations either political or military or business issues, governments communicate in a strategic way trying to build up a positive image of their nation, above all, trying to construct solidarity and consensus. Popular perception, or the way in which we notice and understand the image, values and motivations of a country, can create an enabling or disabling environment and, “perceptions of Western motivations as imperial or self-interested can damage the chances of success” (Leonard 2002: 49). All transactions - whether promoting ideologies and values or selling products - are a way to feed off the general representation of a nation, and strategic communication helps in that direction, increasing appreciation and influencing people's behaviour. Thus, the analysis of the organization of ideological contents is not a secondary aspect with respect to the political action, but on the contrary, communication is an integral part of the political action, it is action itself (cf. Marrone 2001: 222).

In the context of diplomacy, language choices, which carry significant communicative intent, are regularly made “to galvanize the audience to achieve a commonality of purpose” (Burhanudeen 2005: 37) through the enactment of specific linguistic mechanisms.
Looking at these mechanisms, the present work has two main areas of interest: linguistic and institutional. From the linguistic point of view my interest concerns those lexical and grammatical patterns which express the point of view of the speakers (Stubbs 1996: 20), namely their way of projecting the world, their way of persuading and positioning their audience to accept what they say.

For this reason, this research involves the study of identification of those discursive strategies through which people represent the world that is also a part of how they identify themselves (cf. Fairclough 2003), with particular reference to the discourse of ‘security’, seen as the top priority issue in the political agenda. Furthermore, another linguistic interest concerns the diachronic evolution of the keyword *security* across the ten years under investigation (1997-2007).

From the institutional point of view, as Partington (2003: 5) maintains, it is crucial to determine “how is discourse organised” to “appear factual, literal, objective, authoritative” (see also Stubbs 1996: 97).

### 1.2 Justifying the choice of foreign ministers’ speeches

Language is an essential component in the construction of individual and group identity and it finds its further “refinement as a medium of communication” in diplomacy (Abu Jaber 2001: 49) in which formalisation into fixed patterns aims to “oil the joints of relationships between people and nations” (ibid.). In outlining the reasons for the drastic changes in diplomacy, Rana (2001: 111) maintains that foreign ministry has overcome its former role due to the ever-increasing networking and also to the participation of non-state actors into the external relationships of each country. He uses the term 'democratisation' to sum up this process.

In the aftermath of the September 11th terrorist attacks, the UK
worked in the United Nations to implement more intensive action against terrorism. The enactment of the conflict and the drawing up of some strategies to counter such a global phenomenon require a significant degree of political and social consensus. It is here that foreign ministers come on the scene, namely when dealing with their task of explaining clearly the tactical choices made with respect to international issues, such as terrorism, human rights and climate change.

Foreign Ministers’ role is thus delicate in that they “are located at the interstice of a complex transformation in the external and domestic environment in world affairs”\(^1\) and, when illustrating their foreign policy strategies, they also aim to persuade people at home and abroad that they are working in a particular way for the good of the country. This means that in turn “consensus and knowledge require the deployment and manipulation of language” (Jackson 2005: 16). Moreover, in their attempt to legitimate their choices the ministers reflect the image of their country:

few would contest that the foreign policy of any country must necessarily, in some sense, be a reflection of its own sense of its identity. Foreign Secretaries and their advisers must have some motion of 'Britain' and 'Britishness' even if they are not very explicit about it. And historians have recently been stressing the fact that a country's image of itself is often confirmed by its image of 'the Other' - that Britain is emphatically different from France, Germany or the United States in particular\(^2\).

In the light of these remarks, diplomatic speeches were chosen as focus of the analysis because they are representative of the interplay between the foreign policy purposes and the discursive strategies personally employed to achieve those aims. In line with Miller’s viewpoint (2002: 121), these


\(^2\) from: 'Britishness and British Foreign Policy' (14/05/97) Event: 1997 FCO Annual Lecture Location: FCO London Speech Date: 14/05/97 Keith Robbins –website: [www.fco.gov.uk](http://www.fco.gov.uk) date of download 23.03.2007.
speeches constitute a site of ‘engagement’ which can be approached as sites of ‘substantive reasoning’ (Toulmin 1958) that are also seen as framing ‘ideological, culture-encoding concepts’ that aim to legitimate and preserve specific socio-political views and value systems (see Miller 2002: 222).

1.3 Research focus and outline of the study

The overall purpose of this study, namely providing insights into the distinctive linguistic features of the discourse of diplomacy from a phraseological perspective, can be sketched out in the following points:

1. to study the diachronic evolution of the concept of ‘security’ across the speeches delivered by the three foreign ministers of Blair’s government (1997-2007);
2. to determine and marshal the ways of meanings used to construe the ‘speaker orientation’ (Lemke 1992) with regard to the matter being debated, in particular with reference to the discourse of ‘security’. Put differently, the work will focus on the linguistic mechanisms used by speakers to ‘naturalise’ their value positions and in so doing construing a positive image of their country.
3. to see if the speakers manipulate the language introducing elements of subjectivity.

Following the aim of answering these questions, the present study entails an examination of areas of research such as evaluation/appraisal as the key to the study of the value system of a society. Moreover, differences among the three Foreign Ministers’ construction of the stance will be highlighted. At the level of logical meanings or meta-argumentative, I shall touch upon some aspects of the structure of persuasive reasoning.

After the outline of the literature background of this research in
Chapter Two, attention is turned to the data and the methodological choices in Chapter Three. Chapter Four introduces the new scenario of an ‘active’ diplomacy and reviews the definition of diplomacy according to the new trends. This chapter also starts the analysis of ‘security’ as a keyword and its associated words across the three ministers’ speeches. Chapter Five concentrates on the application of the Appraisal Theory, in particular the system of ‘Engagement’, in order to ‘denaturalise’ the speakers’ ideological positions. Chapter Six deals with the analysis of the most frequent cluster, I want to, compared with the same cluster having we as subject in order to highlight the reasons which determine the shifts from one perspective to the other. Chapter Seven presents conclusions and implications for further research.
2.1 From Evaluation...

Placed in the Bakhtinian (1981; 1986) tradition of ‘dialogism’, this study sees any text as both ideological and axiological (i.e. Halliday’s complementarity of ideational and interpersonal meaning) where the bonding of ‘sense’ and ‘emotion’ shapes discourse and moves the world (Lemke 1990). To put it another way: “ideologically speaking a text unfolds as rationality – a quest for ‘truth’; axiologically it unfolds rhetorically – an invitation to community” (Martin 2004: 327). According to this perspective every ‘voice’ constructs an evaluative position with respect to other voices.

Meanings are negotiated on different levels, through evaluative and argumentative formulations, multimodal choices and pragmatic expedients. Evaluative meanings are all ubiquitous in language, they are interwoven in the fabric of text and their examination is significant to identify ideology or values underlying a text (Hunston 1993; Hunston and Thompson 2000; Martin 2000; Biber & Finnegan 1989). Hunston (1993: 58) sees evaluation as “anything which indicates the writer’s attitude to the value of an entity in the text”. Given the nature of evaluations of being organized by norms and values in society, a strong connection between ideologies and evaluative beliefs such as attitudes may be postulated and, thus, a connection between ideologies and values is also posited (Van Dijk 1998: 10). Drawing on
Hofstede (2001: 5), values indicate the inclination to “prefer certain states of affairs over others” which deal with oppositional feelings such as good/bad, dangerous/safe, ugly/beautiful and so on and so forth. A relevant aspect is the distinction between the ‘desired’ (what people wish) and the ‘desirable’ (what people think they ought to desire) in that the former appertains to pragmatics the latter to ideology.

If studies on evaluation demonstrate that it is an individual phenomenon (Hoey 1983), it is also true that the value system entailed is institutional or social and may be expressed in ‘metaphoric non-personal terms’ (Hunston 1993: 58). In their thorough overview on evaluation, Hunston and Thompson review the plethora of terms expressing opinion, which go from ‘attitude’, ‘connotation’, appraisal to ‘modality’ and ‘stance’. They prefer to sort to ‘evaluation’ as an umbrella term which encompasses the two different perspectives of study they talk about: the ‘separating’ and the ‘combining’ approach. The former, represented by Halliday (1985), differentiates modality from attitudinal meaning which, on the contrary, converges into the latter mainly epitomized in Biber’s expression of ‘attitudinal stance’ (Biber and Finegan 1989). Set within the parameters of Halliday’s approach, Martin and White’s work takes ‘attitude’ as focal and moves beyond emotions so as to look at full-scale feelings through resources of ‘affect’, ‘judgement’ and ‘appreciation’.

Evaluation can be decoded in two ways, conceptually and linguistically (Hunston and Thompson 2000: 13). From a conceptual perspective, evaluation may be pointed to by some indicators such as comparison, subjectivity and social value. When somebody makes an evaluation a social or cultural activity is carried out and thus, this phenomenon consists essentially in anything that can be contrasted with what is accepted as the ‘norm’ or in a reaction to a situation or in entities
which contain judgements of value (ibid.). As Dressen observes (2003: 274), the core of evaluation “can be seen as a manifestation of the community’s normalising process”.

Linguistically speaking, evaluative identification can be based on lexis, grammar and text. This research will be based on lexico-grammar features, or rather on individual lexical items as they are embedded in stretches of text and on the value-laden nature of evaluation. Of the three functions of evaluation identified, expressing opinion, constructing relations and managing discourse, they all appertain to this research in that ministers’ use of evaluation preserves the system value of the British community and is also employed to organize discourse.

Further complicating the picture of evaluation is the research on ‘metadiscursivity’ (Hyland 1998; 2000; 2005) which provides a comprehensive and integrated way (stance and engagement) of how interaction is construed in academic genre looking at overt markers in discourse. ‘Metadiscourse’ is “the cover term for the self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactions in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a viewpoint and engage with readers as members of a particular community” (Hyland 2005: 46). Hence, this phenomenon is relevant to the construction of the relationship with the audience.

All these studies contribute to point out those elements in a sentence which, working in a complementary way, construct evaluation in a text and cannot be captured systematically. It is here that Martin’s appraisal comes into the picture by providing a framework which investigates also those resources which are hidden in language. This means that evaluation cannot be completely identified through “decontextualized examples” (Martin et al 2003), an issue already raised by Stubbs (1996: 21), who argued that texts “help to construct social reality. And textual analysis is a perspective from
which to observe society: it makes ideological structures tangible.”

Evaluation positionings play a crucial role in the discourse of diplomacy, since it is via them that a model of the social and moral order according to what is socially acceptable or not is organised (cf. White 2006: 38). Given the institutional character of the diplomatic discourse (Abu Jaber 2001) we might expect these attitudes to be expressed in a more impersonal way, couched in attitudinal lexis for instance, which lead the audience to accept the value system of the discourse community. It goes without saying that the less conspicuous evaluation is more manipulative the text will be.

2.1.1 The Appraisal Theory
Developed within the framework of Systemic Functional Grammar, the Appraisal Theory seems to be more germane to Biber’s concept of ‘stance’\footnote{Biber’s definition of stance is concerned with “the expression of attitudes, feelings, judgements, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message” (Biber and Finegan 1989: 93)} whereas its concept of ‘engagement’ shows similarities with that of ‘evidentiality’ in literature (Chafe & Nichols 1986). This model of study concentrates on what is traditionally known as ‘Mood’, ‘Modality’ and Attitudinal Lexis and is mainly concerned with those wordings by which speakers “negotiate and ‘naturalize’ subjective, and ultimately ideological, position” (Miller 2002: 120). For this purpose, the Appraisal framework explores how judgements on people, on facts, on others' utterances are expressed in texts and how they may be more indirectly implied, presupposed or assumed. Thus, the main reason for adopting this framework relies on its capacity to offer a comprehensive analysis of implicit as well as explicit speaker’s attitude. In other words, it helps to a better understanding of how micro-level linguistic choices contribute to the
construction of evaluative stance in discourse semantics. For instance, Coffin’s (2000) appraisal analysis in the genre of history has shown how the subjective nature of interpretation is largely obscured. In her analysis of the US President Bush’s speech to the UN dated September 12th 2002, Miller (2004) shows how the Engagement resources used in the text construct what she calls a ‘solo’ stance, adopted by the USA to gain consensus on the Iraqi war in the name of ‘legitimate defence’. Relying on this system of analysis, Bevitori (2007) has demonstrated how in a corpus of “parliamentary events”, gender is a variable, among the others, which affects the choice of patterns at the level of discourse.

The Appraisal model proposes three dimensions of evaluative meaning which, adopting Martin and White’s terminology (White 2003; 2005), are ‘Attitude’, ‘Engagement’ and ‘Graduation’. The sub-domains of ‘Attitude’ are ‘Affect’, involving emotional reaction, ‘Judgement’, referring to assessments of human behaviour, and ‘Appreciation’, which looks at resources for constructing assessments of artefacts, texts, natural objects in terms of how they are assigned value socially. The second dimension, ‘Engagement’, covers the resources which position the textual voice intersubjectively and, finally, ‘Graduation’ is concerned with all those resources for ‘up- or down-grading’ the intensity of the speaker's meanings. This category subsumes what are traditionally known as intensifiers, amplifiers and emphatics.

The core system –as we read in Miller (2007: 163) is Affect “with Judgement and Appreciation as its institutionalized versions, having been re-contextualized – Judgement with a practical view to controlling what people do and Appreciation, for discursively valuing what they achieve.” When the attitudinal positioning is explicit it is labelled 'attitudinal inscription', conversely, it is known as 'attitudinal token' and, in this case,
evaluation is construed through mechanisms of ‘association’ and ‘implication’. Martin (2000) points out that the expression of attitude is a truly interpersonal issue in that it does not simply relate to the speaker’s opinion about the world but to the aim of eliciting a reaction of solidarity (see Figure 2.1 for an overview of the Appraisal Model).

Each system redounds with systems in other parts of lexicogrammar and this leads to the distinction between 'inscribed appraisal', explicit instantiations of evaluation and 'invoked appraisal' which refers to all those mechanisms that 'provoke' attitude (Martin 2000: 142).

The final point worth highlighting is that appraisal works as an ongoing cumulative process so that the interpersonal structure of language reveals its prosodic nature. In Halliday’s terms (1979: 66-67):

The interpersonal component of meaning is the speaker’s ongoing intrusion into the speech situation … Interpersonal meanings cannot easily be expressed as configurations of discrete elements … this interpersonal meaning …is strung throughout the clause as a continuous motif or colouring …the effect is cumulative … we shall refer to this type of realisation as ‘prosodic’, since the meaning is distributed like a prosody throughout a continuous stretch of discourse.

Figure 2.1 – Overview of Appraisal (from Martin and White 2005: 38)
2.2 ...to Ideology

It is a truism that “language is not a clear window, but a refracting, structuring medium” (Fowler 1991: 11) and that categories are not objective but anything said or written about the external world is always subject to a process of interpretation, namely articulated from a position.

Although ideology has been differently and extensively defined, a common view seems to be that ideology has potentiality for creating different worldviews. Modern research has demonstrated two main tendencies of ideology: one considers it as a false representation of reality (Marxist tradition) and the other sees it as part of all thinking and acting (Van Dijk 2001; 2002). Within the Marxist framework, ideology as ‘false consciousness’ aims to guarantee the dominant power of the ruling classes through discursive strategies that fulfil a mystifying function in society (cf. Van Dijk 1998; Garzone/Sarangi 2007). This negative notion of ideology has been dominant in social sciences as traditionally opposed to scientific knowledge.

Neglecting this approach, this work will be placed in the tradition which privileges three main approaches (cf. Lassen 2007: viii): Van Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach (2000), Wodak’s emphasis on social structures and finally, Fairclough’s ‘social-constructionist view’ (1995; 2006a). Adopting Halliday’s theory, Fairclough, views language use as ‘social practice’ meaning that language is socially and historically situated and finds itself in a dialectical relationship with other aspects of the social.

The term discourse, which generally encompasses any form of language use in society, (Van Dijk 1997; Fairclough 1993) is a way of behaving which considers people as members of specific social groups. As Kress observes: “Discourses are systematically-organised sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution” (1985: 6-7). The
main concern is to investigate formally these ‘sets of statements’, starting from the assumption that language is a phenomenon through which society reflects itself. Discourse is crucial to all studies of human interaction in the political sphere because it “is socially constitutive as well as socially shaped” and “social transformations in contemporary social life are extensively ‘discourse-led’, in the sense that it is discourses which change first” (Fairclough 2006a: 27). Social changes, namely transformations (e.g. globalisation or in our case the new regime of international security) include change in social practices and, drawing on Jessop (2000), we can see these transformations on the dimension of ‘re-scaling’ that is the transformation of security between the local, national and global scales of social life.

In Fairclough's version of Critical Discourse Analysis, ideologies are analysed from the perspective of 'mediation as the movement of meaning' from one text or discourse to another (2006a: 22). They are seen as contributing to the constitution, reproduction of social relations of power and domination. This critical concept of ideology is included in a reformulated version of CDA as an approach which entails a particular view of interdisciplinary research. This approach, called ‘transdisciplinary’, assembles diverse disciplinary resources for particular research projects and it also aspires towards a dialogue between disciplines or frameworks.

Accepting the theory that ideologies are socially shaped, Van Dijk emphasizes their cognitive aspect, considering them as system of beliefs performing identifying tasks and representing the basic social characteristics of a group such as their objectives, values and norms. In other words:

ideologies are localized between societal structures and the structures of the minds of social members. They allow social actors to ‘translate’ their social properties (identity, goal, position, etc.) into the knowledge and beliefs that make up the concrete models of their everyday life experiences, that is the
mental representations of their actions and discourse. Indirectly (viz., through attitudes and knowledge), therefore, ideologies control how people plan and understand their social practices, and hence also the structures of text and talk (Van Dijk 2000: 21).

According to Van Dijk, some underlying syntactic, semantic or pragmatic discourse structures give birth to surface realisations and it may happen that some meanings do not encode ideology explicitly but these surface structures may reveal such hidden meanings (ibid.). Foucault’s influence is conspicuous here (Fowler 1991: 42), in that he maintained that ideas crystallize as to what is right or wrong, permitted or prohibited.

Subscribing to this theory of ideology, we need to attend to those features of discourse that signal opinions, perspectives, interests, evaluation. Furthermore, ideological representations are structured along the ‘us vs them’ dimension (Van Dijk 2002; 2007) by which a community presents itself in positive terms and ‘the other’ in negative terms. Lexicalization is the major domain of ideological expression and persuasion and thus, various labels may be employed to refer to the same person or groups or social issues according to the different discourse genres, social and cultural contexts.

In the corpus interrogated in this research, the foreign minister Jack Straw, for instance, positions the audience to take a negative view of terrorists via a covert instantiation of authorial viewpoint (Martin 2000) by sorting to the negative attitudinal ‘inscription’ extremist as in Extremist fanaticism is based on a denial of these values and of the humanity of others. As White has shown (2006: 44) the term ‘extremist’ has a stable negative meaning in that always associated “with allegations that groups or individuals have been involved in non-state sanctioned acts of political violence”.

Following Fairclough-Van Dijk-Wodak trend, but also Kress and
Hodge’s conjecture of being manipulated while informed (1979), all kinds of discourse are potentially ideologically un-neutral, even those which fit in the specialized communication and which are supposedly subjectively free or completely ‘referential’ (cf. Garzone/Sarangi 2007: 22-30). This point may be illustrated by looking at that bulk of research aimed to unmask the ways of encoding the speaker’s attitude towards the topic debated (Martin 2000) by investigating those language resources which instantiate evaluations, opinions and judgements in specialized communication such as corporate discourse (Pocini 2004) political discourse (Miller 2002) and legal field (Mazzi 2008). In particular, Mazzi’s study (2008: 379) has shown how Boudon’s concept of ideology as a “complex doctrinal system of representations based on scientific argumentation” has proved instrumental to demonstrate how judicial decisions are far from being impersonal and impartial.

Against this backdrop, this study gives insights into how ‘particularist ideologies’ and choices mapped to broader ideologies are worded in the language of diplomacy, which, more than any other fields of specialized communication, rests on the traditional claim to be objectively constructed.

2.3 The interplay of argumentation

The issues debated in the national and international fora are certainly controversial and multi-faceted in nature hence, they involve ideological positions (entailing emotional and moral evaluations) strictly interwoven with logical and legal considerations. The speaker’s voice tries to build consensus on the basis of a more or less dialogic orientation towards contrasting or shared positions.

The texts included in the corpus of diplomatic speeches under investigation can be considered argumentative in that they are created with
the ideological functionality of endorsing and promoting the natural particular systems of values and beliefs of the ‘discourse community’ they refer to. As Stati maintains (1997: 9), “we consider texts with prevalently persuasive and therefore rhetorical function to be argumentative”. A diplomatic speech aims to persuade the audience of a certain point of view and, therefore, it can be considered argumentative in that other voices are quoted to be endorsed or rejected.

According to van Eemeren and et al’s definition (1996: 5):

argumentation is a verbal and social activity of reason aiming at increasing (or decreasing) the acceptability of a controversial standpoint for the listener or reader, by putting forward a constellation of propositions intended to justify (or refute) the standpoint before a rational judge.

If this definition allows concentration on those discourses with an argumentative purpose, other approaches (Perelman, 1969; Ducrot, 1988) take into account the argumentative orientation and dimension utterances. Indeed, the argumentative force is a constitutive part of the meaning of an utterance, which for this reason is ‘orienting’. The perspective embraced in this research, in line with the Bakhtinian dialogic view, mirrors Plantin’s argumentative standpoint, in that any formulation aims to act upon the recipients so as to affect their way of thinking (1996: 18).

Rather than focusing on the structure of the arguments made in the diplomatic speeches, this research looks at arguments in the text which are relevant to construct the speaker’s ideological position with reference to other voices which are supported or contrasted.

For the purposes of this line of inquiry we will consider Toulmin’s terminology which includes: the ‘claim’ (a statement containing an opinion which needs support); the ‘data’ (constituting the backing for the claim); the
‘warrant’ (which links the claim and the grounds); the ‘backing’ (support for the warrant); the ‘modality’ (which considers the degree of certainty showed in offering the argument); finally, the ‘rebuttal’ comes out from exceptions to the initial claim. All the moves which guarantee the transition from the data or ‘premises’ to the arguer’s opinion are also known as topoi.

2.4 Looking at subjectivity

Subjectivization involves the structures and strategies that languages evolve in the linguistic realization of subjectivity. Research in this area of the language has been carried out by scholars working in different fields. As observed (Bühler 1934; Jakobson 1960; Mushin 2001), speakers do not just neutrally and mechanically describe states and affairs in the world sorting to objective and prefabricated linguistic formulations, but their personal identity sometimes crops up through a range of viewpoints. In his discussion of linguistic subjectivity, Benveniste (1971: 225) maintains that: “Language is marked so deeply by the expression of subjectivity that one might ask if it could still function and be called language if it were constructed otherwise”. He explains subjectivity in terms of the ability of speakers to view themselves as subjects and, in his view, the first personal pronoun is the grammatical category that contributes to this expressive capacity of speakers. Lyons goes beyond this and employs the term ‘subjectivity’ (1982: 102) to refer to the way in which “natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent’s expression of himself and of his own attitudes and beliefs”. Lyons’ interest was mainly focused on the examination of the degree of subjectivity by looking at modality, tense and aspect across languages. Looking at the role of the perspective of locutionary agents, their expression of affect, modality and at the effects of these phenomena
on the formal shape of discourse he demonstrates how central subjectivity is to human discourse.

The definition of subjectivity which concerns in particular this work is provided by Finnegan (1995: 1) who sees it in terms of the “expression of self and the representation of a speaker’s [...] perspective or point of view in discourse – what has been called a speaker’s imprint.”

2.5 The diplomatic language

Diplomatic communication is a social activity that aims to ensure information of foreign policy and speakers try to manage information and their country’s image in such a way as to give the best possible slant on the government’s representation whether it be to a home or foreign audience. For this reason, speakers need to organise their discourse into meaningful patterns for their audience and this implies familiarity with the conventional discursive practices of a ‘discourse community’. This notion, introduced by Swales (1990: 29), refers to “a group of people who share certain language-using practices. These practices can be seen as conventionalized in two ways: stylistic conventions regulate social interactions both within the group and in its dealing with outsiders”.

Strictly connected to the notion of diplomacy is that of national reputation or branding, namely the others’ opinion about one nation’s culture, policy and conduct, that is also part of a nation’s ‘soft power’ and diplomacy has a critical role in it. In marking the importance of a country’s branding, Simon Anholt, Author, Researcher and Independent Member of the FCO sets up a comparison with the business company’s image:

When I started writing about an idea I called ‘nation brand’ more than twelve years ago, my observation was a simple one: that the reputations of countries are analogous to the brand images of companies and products, and are equally critical to the progress and prosperity of those
countries because of their influence on the opinions and behaviours of each country’s ‘target audiences’: foreign investors, tourists, consumers, students, entrepreneurs, trading partners, the media, other governments, donors, multilateral agencies, and so on.²

In his work of setting the stage for diplomacy, Girardin (2001: 140) states that the three dimensions of language that are interpretation, persuasion and respect have some implications in diplomacy. Considering language as “prior to any diplomacy, shaping its world, setting the rules of the game”, interpretation is constantly at work in diplomacy. Based on the skill of convincing people to perceive things your way, diplomacy blends logic and science with the “gift of proper language packaging and presentation necessary to convince others” (Abu Jaber 2001: 53). This means that diplomacy cannot be separated from persuasion, which is overwhelmingly active during negotiations. The aim is to “weave discourse into fabrics than others perceive as true” (Harris 1991: 289). The last dimension, seen as ingrained in diplomacy, involves ethics namely the respect for the other which can be expressed in terms of a strong care for a sense of impartiality.

A survey of the literature on language of diplomacy suggests that research in this field has followed different directions, from the exploration of the impact of computer-based communication in diplomatic documents (Kurbaljia 2001) to the cross-cultural implications in the field of translation for negotiation purposes (Rana 2001). Closer to the aims of this research is the literature that looks at the plethora of language mechanisms and choices which make diplomatic language the property of a ‘discourse community’ (Swales 1990).

Whatever the object of study, or the choice of methodological

approach, a common thread characterizing the previous literature on the language of diplomacy (Cohen 1995; Hofstede 2004; Matos 2004) resides in its main essence that is the conducive manner “to the construction and sustenance of consensus and collaboration among nations” (Burhanudeen 2005: 36). According to this research, five main features typical of this type of discourse have been unanimously identified (ibid.):

(i) a positive emphasis on ‘what to say’;
(ii) a use of diplomatic language in terms of ‘peace-building, peace-making and peace-promoting force’;
(iii) avoidance of potentially aggressive and hostile language;
(iv) a cautious and strategic communication;
(v) a constructively expressed position of attitudes, beliefs and emotions.

If the last point constitutes the main focus of this dissertation, the ‘strategic communication’ is also taken into account above all when speaking of ambiguity as one the main resources in diplomatic communication.

Cohen (1981: 32-35) has described ‘courtesy’, ‘non-redundancy’ and ‘constructive ambiguity’ as devices, which feature prominently in the language of diplomacy. If courtesy is achieved through a set of formulaic expressions or ritualized phrases which enable diplomats to express unpleasant meanings tactfully, non-redundancy implies that “a diplomatic communication should say neither too much nor too little because every word, nuance of omission will be meticulously studied for any shade of meaning” (Cohen, 1981: 32). ‘Constructive ambiguity’ aims to avoid discontent by ensuring open alternatives or a margin for further interpretations with the purpose of facilitating conflict resolution.

By investigating rhetoric in diplomacy, Pehar (2001) focuses of the
role of analogies in diplomacy and points out how ‘historical analogies’ serve the function of marking diplomats and politicians’ positions to strengthen their arguments.

Due to the aim of investigating the multi-faceted word of ‘security’ in next chapter, a short survey of the tool of ambiguity is illustrated in the following sub-section.

2.5.1 Ambiguity in diplomatic discourse

Words are polysemic and semantic differences imply different interpretations of reality. In Pehar's words (2005: 155) ambiguity can be defined as:

a pattern of language which potentially carries a number of different meanings, and one is undecided as to which of the meanings is actually conveyed. But, this is not all. The concept of ambiguity is especially interesting because an ambiguous sentence, word, or a text, opens the possibility of different, and, more importantly, incompatible meanings.

Another definition (Berridge and James 2004) stress the function of this tool by giving the example of how ‘constructive ambiguity’ “might be employed not only to disguise an inability to resolve a question on which the parties remain far apart but to do so in a manner that enables each to claim that some concession on it has actually been obtained”4. These two definitions point out two different faces of the same coin: ambiguity exists in language because it is a product of human cognition but at the same time it is instrumental to buy room for manoeuvre. Language may be compared to a piece of clay that can be moulded into form, be this precise

---

3 Most of the considerations in this sub-section come from the insightful lessons of dr. Biljana during my course in “Language and Diplomacy” at the University of Malta (July –October 2008).

or merely suggestive. In other words, ambiguity is an asset and a design fault at the same time, inevitable and indispensable, depending on what language areas it involves and on the addresser’s intentions. Starting from the assumption that ambiguity cannot be compartmentalised, because it arises in a number of ways, two main macro categories can be distinguished: ‘narrow’ and ‘broad’ ambiguity. The former, known as ‘categorical’ arises when phenomena like homophony, polysemy and sentence structures are implicated. On the other hand, semantic vagueness, connotations, parataxis and implications are the sources of the ‘multivalent’ ambiguity, intended as giving rise to different interpretations due to multiple meanings. Since some of these elements are unavoidable, as homophony in speaking, a cline could be suggested starting from those inherent elements of language, which bring about inescapable ambiguity, to deliberate (mis)uses of words or sentences.

In the light of this difference, it might be added that ‘narrow ambiguity’ results in an unequivocal preference and is easier to be solved, whereas ‘broad ambiguity’ entangles us in connotations and implications and it is awkward to come to a consensus over. It goes without saying that context helps to disambiguate meaning. Communication is mainly an inferential process; therefore “Anyone involved in a communicative act will practically never be faced with a totally new phenomenon” (Taylor 1998: 75). This is because a word or sentences are not isolated entities, they exist as part of a text, namely they are linked to their environment.

As Edelman maintains (1988: 103 the phenomenon of ambiguity is pervasive in language, more particularly in diplomatic language, and it is mainly due to humanity accumulation of knowledge. To put it another way, when new terms enter the language new meanings are piled on older ones, which are, at first, ambiguous but then they abandon this ‘dressing’ only
through usage and consensus. A case in point is given by the word *security* in the Diplomatic corpus in that it sometimes becomes ambiguous due to its multifaceted aspect as it will shown in chapter four. Let us now turn to the description of the data and the methodology used in this research.
CHAPTER THREE

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Building up a corpus of diplomatic speeches

The research described in this analysis will be conducted on a corpus of 553,462 running words downloaded from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office website (henceforth FCO), where they were available for inspection. What I call Diplomatic Corpus (henceforth DiCo) includes one main genre type, namely speeches gathered over a period of ten years, from the beginning of Blair’s government, May 1997, to the end of it, June 2007, through the tenure of the three foreign ministers Robin Cook, Jack Straw and Margaret Beckett. I will refer to their speeches as sub-corpora or

---

1 Robin Cook (1946-2005) was born in Scotland where, after his studies in English Literature, started his career as a local councillor in 1971. In 1974 he became Member of Parliament and in 1997 he was appointed Foreign Secretary. Under Blair’s government he dropped previous commitments to unilateral disarmament and a Eurosceptic approach. In 2002 he was replaced as Foreign Minister and became Leader of the House, but resigned in 2003 as a sign of protest against the British policy in Iraq.

Jack Straw was born in 1946 and was educated at Leeds University. He was Deputy Leader in 1973 and worked as a barrister for two years. Elected to Parliament in 1979 he served the Opposition front bench until 1997 when he became Home Secretary. In 2001 he was appointed Foreign Secretary serving in the post until 2006. In 2007 he became Secretary of State for Justice after spending a year as Leader of the House of Commons. Today he is the Secretary of State for Justice and continues to be a major figure in the Labour government.

Margaret Jackson Beckett was born in 1943 into a working-class family. She qualified as a metallurgist at the University of Manchester. She started her political career in 1973 when she was selected as a Labour candidate for Lincoln but she did not win. In 1974 she became Member of Parliament and only in 1992 she was elected Deputy Leader of the Labour Party being the first woman to serve it under John Smith. After his death she remained leader until 1994 then, under Blair’s leadership, she had different roles: from Shadow Secretary of State for Health to the shadow President of the Board of Trade. After the General Elections in 2001 she held the position of Leader of the House of Commons then, replaced by Robin Cook, she was appointed Secretary of State for Environment until 2006 when she became Foreign Minister. She is one of the longest-serving Labour frontbenchers.
simply speeches. By virtue of their position, foreign ministers have all powers to represent their governments in the international fora as contemplated in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961.

The criteria behind the corpus are in line with the principles stated by Wynne (2005: 5), in that the contents were selected “without regard for the language they contain, but according to their communicative function in the community in which they arise”. Table 3.1 gives an overview of the corpus (for further details see Appendix One):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Secretary</th>
<th>Text-typology</th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Cook</td>
<td>58 speeches</td>
<td>140,583</td>
<td>May 1997-June 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Straw</td>
<td>144 speeches</td>
<td>308,570</td>
<td>June 2001-May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Beckett</td>
<td>46 speeches</td>
<td>104,309</td>
<td>May 2006-June 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Diplomatic Corpus. Total running words: 553,462

The speeches I shall be investigating are all part of official communicative settings. In other words, all the speeches were properly prepared for institutional and public purposes. It is important to point out here that transcriptions of speeches are not considered as representing real spoken discourse, because they are pre-written and, hence, some important features such as information about intonation, pauses and overlappings are omitted (Slembrouck 1992). The retrieval tools used in the research are WordSmith Tools (Scott 2007) and ConCgram (Greaves, in press) and the corpus is not annotated meaning that the analysis was entirely manual.
3.2 The contextual configuration of the diplomatic speeches

The tangible construct of the context of situation (Halliday 1985) allows us to understand what is going on in the text (field), the social relationships existing between people involved (tenor) and the way in which language is used and its medium of transmission (mode). If the field informs about the terminology used, the tenor alerts to the register employed and finally, the mode is important to distinguish between given and new information. As far as the British foreign ministers’ speeches are concerned, one of their task is to illustrate and explain the foreign policy strategic choices made at home and abroad about topics such as European integration, terrorism, human rights and the environment (field). This aim is pursued through the critical interrogation of a range of evidence and is revealed under the form of “a ritualized monologue” (tenor), “delivered orally and pre-written to be read” (mode) (Miller 2004b: 43).

In a similar line, adopting Hymes’ parameters (1971), we can trace the macro-context or context of communication of the texts under investigation. As far as the ‘setting’ is concerned the speeches are usually delivered in the various rooms of the Foreign Office, at the House of Commons (internal political communication) or at the Embassies abroad (inter-state political communication). The ‘time’ embraces the whole Blair’s government. The ‘channel’ is not really spontaneous but texts are readout. The ‘register’ is formal and sometimes highly rhetorical, except for some spontaneous remarks on some local events. The ‘topic’ deals with the main international issues which reflect the political and social themes of the ministers’ times. If Cook deals with the issue of the European integration, the question of the Euro introduction and, hence, the position of Britain in Europe, Jack Straw lived the delicate period of the terrorist attacks and the Iraqi war, therefore, most of his speeches concentrate on security issues,
counter-terrorism strategies and the future of Iraq. Finally, with her background as Minister of the Environment, Beckett concentrates mainly on the climate change issue and energy security. If it is true that these speeches are illustrated to a live audience, they are also addressed to the media to be reproduced and, eventually, being available on the web, they are addressed to the ‘posterity’ (Bayley 2008: 47).

3.3 Corpus-Assisted Discourse Analysis: a synergy between two approaches.

From a methodological point of view, this study is set in the recent tradition that combines corpus linguistics and discourse analysis (Koller and Mautner 2005; Miller 2007; Bayley 2008), in particular functional grammar, and starts with an essentially empirical approach in order to grasp what we are not expecting to find out or to survey the corpus “to gain a sense of the flavour of the data” (Silverman 1993: 163). Described as “theory-heavy”, the SFL has a different approach to the description of language from Corpus Linguistics (henceforth CL), which is seen as “theory-light”, namely free from any theoretical framework (Hunston and Thompson 2006: 2). As it has been stated (ibid.), SFL implies a set of system networks seen as mediation between the total system of language and the realisations of meanings, whereas CL “does not posit such a mediation, but regards the totality of language use (or in Hoey’s terms, the totality of the individual’s experience of language) as an entity in its own right, partially observable in a corpus” (ibid.). Despite this difference, both approaches share a common concern for the context starting from the language as a text or from the same assumptions insofar a text is seen as the main vehicle for the creation of the meaning (Tognini-Bonelli 2004). Furthermore, if the importance of context is highlighted in both
approaches what mainly distances them is the criterion of ‘frequency’, which only recently has been introduced in SFL (see Matthiessen 2006).

The interaction between these two approaches may provide the means to depict the way in which ideological discursive positions are construed globally across texts. As observed by Partington (2004: 12) “one of the fundamental questions of modern linguistics is the relationship between instance and system, between the typical and the exceptional, between signal and noise”. The assumption is that browsing through corpora can reveal collocational patterns that may work as pointers to larger discursive processes, of which instances of ideological value positions are usually part. Thus, stretches of discourse identified through the use of a concordancer constitute the background for a detailed qualitative diagnosis of the instantiation enacted through the texts, in this case with the help of the analytical framework of the Appraisal Theory (Martin 2000; Martin and White 2005), whose main aim is to better understand “the interplay of interpersonal meaning and social relations in the model of language and the social we were developing, especially in the area of solidarity (i.e. resources for empathy and affiliation)” (Martin, 2000: 148). Corpus study will reveal replicable preferred ways of speaking allowing qualitative analysis of larger units of language.

Furthermore, the work here is posited as axiomatic in that “any proposal of socio-institutional behavioural norms necessarily involves the contemporaneous enactment of value orientations; hence, attitudinal resources, and in particular appraisal systems [...] are considered to be the basic analytical tools” (Miller 2006: 250). There is an increasing number of contributions (Hunston and Thompson 2006; Miller 2007) attesting the problems encountered in investigating sets of events jointly rather than individually, in that both context and co-text are important and “it is
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posited that patterns of ways of saying do ‘count’, and so may usefully be counted’ Miller (2007: 160).

In this research the cotext of the word ‘security’ is first analysed in order to look at its collocates and study its evolution across the three ministers; this study is assumed as being preliminary to the study of the same word in its wider context, which starts by looking at the repeated associations of words which function as indicators of ideologies.

3.4 The phraseological approach

Over the last 20 years there has been an increasing interest in phraseology in English language description and significant results have been shown. In this research the term ‘phraseology’ is mainly used in Clear’s terms of “recurrent co-occurrence of words” (1993: 277), which refer to the more-or-less fixed co-occurrences of linguistic elements. Attention in this study has been focused on continuous and discontinuous sequences of words through the introduction of a new computer-based methodology that is ‘concgramming’ (Warren et al 2007). The primary aim of this automatic search is the identification of the phraseological profile of a corpus and then its ‘aboutness’ (Phillips 1989). The idea of using ConcGram (in press) as software relies on the fact that some instances of word associations might be overlooked and that collocations may be also found non-contiguously. Hence, by the use of this methodology we can identify all the ‘potential configurations’ between 2 and 5 words including:

the associated words even if they occur in different positions relative to one another (i.e. positional variation) and even when one or more words occur in between the associated words (i.e. constituency variation) (Cheng et al 2006: 413).

ConcGram allows automatic identification of phraseological variation
and aims to find all the word co-occurrences, called ‘concgrams’, in a text, and it is left to the user to determine from the context in which those co-occurrences are found whether or not they constitute meaningful word associations. The term ‘co-occurrence’ is used here to mean any word which occurs in the environment of another word and which may or may not be there by chance. An ‘associated’ word is one whose co-occurrence is not accidental but represents a collocate of the search word called ‘origin’. Current searches for n-grams generate phrases such as fight against terrorism, but would miss the same phraseological pattern when realised as fight against the crime of terrorism (Milizia and Spinzi 2008: 327) which allows constituency variations. In DiCo such a piece of software discovered instances of non-contiguous collocations (e.g. a threat to international peace and security) where threat was found in a span of 5 words with respect to the search word security. This approach is not new in language but dates back to the OSTI Report in the 1970s, when Sinclair was looking for the canonical form as the prototype of a phrase with all the possible variants.

Drawing on this perspective, we have to concede that multi-word units are the norm in language and that the primary carrier of meaning is not the single word but the phrase. In this approach, collocation becomes the way of understanding meanings and associations between words which, when contiguous in their combinations, will be referred to as ‘clusters’ when using WordSmith Tools (Scott and Tribble 2007). Since words can only take on meaning relying on the context they occur in, “in order to understand the meanings of words, we have to compare them in relation to other words” (Baker 2006: 96).

3.4.1 First stage of analysis: keywords
In order to study the quality that words have in DiCo (“keyness”) the procedure used is the one devised for use in the Keywords utility provided
by *WordSmith Tools*. This is because analysing the “reasons why a particular word appears so frequently in a corpus can help to reveal the presence of discourses, especially those of a hegemonic nature” (Baker 2006: 121). Keywords refer to words which are ‘prominent’ or ‘stand out’ in a corpus and are metaphorically compared to a ‘screwdriver’ which leads us to what a text is about: “What the text boils down to is its keyness, once we have steamed off the verbiage, adornment, the blah blah blah” (Scott 2006: 55-56).

The procedure here contemplates two steps of comparison against two different corpora as background. With the aim to isolate lexical items particular to diplomatic speeches the BNC as a general corpus of English was used. Results are shown in figure 3.1

![Figure 3.1 Keywords - DiCa referenced against BNC](image)

The keyword lists suggest lexical items which warrant further investigation because it is a measure of saliency (Baker 2006: 125) or to put it differently
they represent ‘importance’ and ‘aboutness’ in textuality (Scott 2001). The keyword list contains three types of words: proper nouns, ‘aboutness’ keywords and grammatical words which may be relevant in terms of style. As the figure shows, just as predictably, the lexical items relate to the topic of discourse under analysis (security, Iraq, terrorism) and the specialized field of study, that is the international setting (international, global, world, foreign, UN). Noteworthy is the occurrence of the first plural pronoun (we) and the correspondent possessive (our) which may be relevant at the level of style and, since the “style of a text may play some role in the discourses within it, it is recommended that such high frequency words are not discarded” (Baker 2006: 128).

A further step in this first attempt to understand the ‘aboutness’ of DiCo involves a comparison with an ad hoc specialized corpus containing all Blair’s speeches in his ten-year government. This helps to isolate those features which are peculiar to the diplomatic discourse of the three foreign ministers who are supposed to support Blair’s policy. Interestingly, figure 3.2 reveals that our and security are keywords also with respect to Blair’s speeches and thus relevant to the discourse of foreign policy. Furthermore, a more humanitarian discourse seems to be at work in diplomacy (human, rights) as well as the use of the relative pronoun which, the proposition of and of the definite article the might be indicative of a distinctive feature of diplomacy, namely explicitness. Further investigation through concordances will help in this direction.

---

2 The Blair Corpus used in this study is included in a larger corpus of Political speeches assembled at the faculty of Political Science at the University of Bari by Denise Milizia.
3.4.2 Further analytical steps

Once ‘security’ emerged as a keyword in DiCo the analysis was based on the concgrams retrieved around this search word and, relying on the statistical measure of ‘t-score’ (see chapter four), it was possible to study the collocational profile of the word across the three sub-corpora. The main aim in this second step of the analysis was to look at quantitative similarities and differences in the speeches of the three ministers to trace boundaries in the conceptualisation of ‘security’ by comparing and discussing the most significant concgrams in the sub-corpora. This part of the analysis draws on the concepts of ‘exocentricity’ and ‘endocentricity’ provided by Sinclair and Mauranen (2006: 24):

*Exocentric* is the kind of relationship that is made by subject and predicate, or between a preposition and the following noun phrase; the items related...
have quite different syntactic roles, and extend the expressive possibilities of the language. *Endocentric* relations are the opposite – the items involved collaborate in the construction of a single linguistic entity like a noun phrase.

If the context was the main focus in the second step of the analysis, then context was taken into account: in this phase the canonical one line of the concgrams emerged (e.g. *security/peace; security/prosperity; security/threat(s); security/climate*) was enlarged to be analysed in a larger context and interpreted in the light of the Appraisal Theory (see next sub-section for details). In particular the system of ‘Engagement’ was used to look for those semantic resources employed “to negotiate emotions, judgements and valuations, alongside resources for amplifying and engaging with these evaluations” (Martin 2000: 145). The categories of ‘Appreciation’ and ‘Judgement’ were also useful for the analysis.

An analytical category that is particularly relevant to the purpose of this research in chapter five is that of ‘cause’, which is fairly complex insofar it includes ‘reason’, ‘purpose’ and behalf’. Moreover, the other two categories which fall within ‘cause’ are ‘condition’ and ‘concession’ both labelled as ‘contingency’ (Thompson 2004: 110). In this study ‘cause’ will be treated as a semantic motif rather than as a grammatical category.

Drawing on Martin and Rose (2003: 122-132), conjunctions have two ‘faces’: they are ‘external’ if they interact with the ideational meaning, they are ‘internal’ if they have to do with the logical organization of discourse. External conjunctions are categorized according to four types which include sub-types: ‘addition’, ‘comparison’, ‘time’ and ‘consequence’.

In chapter five, even though instances of ‘comparison’ were found in Beckett’s speeches, the category of ‘consequence’ is the most frequent. The category of ‘means’ operates with resources of ‘appreciation’ as shown in sub-section 5.2.1; the category of ‘cause’ and ‘condition’ interact with
resources of ‘valuation’ and ‘judgement’ as illustrated in sub-section 5.2.2.

It is convenient to point out that in this phase (chapter five) the computer program was used mainly for searching and retrieving, but the analysis remains an intensive manual qualitative labour.

In the final stage of the analysis (chapter six), pronominal choices have been considered in cluster combinations to compare the use of the first personal pronouns (I vs. we) with the most recurrent verbal form in the corpus (e.g. want). Relying on WordSmith Tools, 3-word clusters having I as search word and then 3-word clusters having we as node have been retrieved. The aim is to show that frequent instances of expressions of subjectivity may help to uncover reasons underlying the shift from objective to personal position and the other way around.

3.5 The language of the Appraisal

Since the Appraisal system was used to analyse the context of the concgrams around security, this section deals with a description of the terminology used during the analysis with reference mainly to the system of Engagement and Attitude. The system of ‘Graduation’ is not considered in this study.

Engagement is an umbrella term for all those mechanisms of intersubjective positioning. As table 3.2 shows, it refers to all the resources by which a stance is taken towards the various positions referenced by the text (White 2003: 260). Engagement resources have the capacity for positioning utterances into a dialogical relationship with the past, the present and the future. In other words, written or spoken texts always reveal the influence of, or take up in some way, what others have said before. When utterances disregard the discursive background against which they are set, they are labelled 'monoglossic', otherwise they are
'heteroglossic'. Heteroglossic discourse may recognize diversity acting to dialogically 'contract' alternative voices (i.e. to ‘reject’, ‘counter’, etc.), or to 'expand' them (i.e. ‘entertain’, ‘acknowledge’, etc.). In other words, ‘disclaim’, ‘proclaim’, ‘entertain’ and ‘attribute’ are the resources of the ‘engagement system’.

At the broadest level, heteroglossic utterances may ‘contract’ or ‘expand’ other alternative points of view according to whether the authorial voice recognizes or rejects them. These two main categories (‘contraction’ and ‘expansion’) include other resources, which are realized by a variety of lexical and grammatical elements. Thus, ‘disclaim’ and ‘proclaim’ are contractive mechanisms: in the case of ‘disclaim’, the textual voice rejects some contrary positions through ‘denial’, and ‘concession’, whereas by ‘proclaiming’ the authorial voice sets itself against or suppresses other voices though ‘concurring’, ‘pronouncement’ and ‘endorsement’. When the textual voice presents the proposition as one of the possible alternative positions, it ‘entertains’ other alternatives. If it allows for dialogistic alternatives in the subjectivity of an external voice, it ‘attributes’ it through ‘acknowledgement’ or ‘distance’.

Looking at how intersubjective relations of alignment and disalignment, agreement and disagreement, are linguistically constructed, this system provides an accompanying outlook on ‘Attitude’. ‘Attitude’, as outlined in table 3.3 includes: ‘Affect’, which refers to wordings of emotional responses, ‘Judgement’, which refers to ethical responses, ‘Appreciation’ which refers to aesthetic responses. The sub-categories of ‘Affect’ are best summarized in table 3.3.

Let us now move on the next chapter dealing with the analysis of security in its short diachronic history from Cook to Beckett, starting by introducing diplomacy in its historical context.
Table 3.2 The taxonomy of options under the category of ENGAGEMENT (adapted from Martin and White 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPRECIATION</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Did it grab me?</td>
<td>Did I like it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(impact)</td>
<td>fascinating, exciting, captivating, dramatic</td>
<td>tedious, revolting, disgusting, boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(quality)</td>
<td>lovely, beautiful, appealing, superb, magnificent, fine, good</td>
<td>bad, ugly, nasty, yuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Did it hang together?</td>
<td>systemic, balance, moderate, unified, harmonious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(balance)</td>
<td>simple, precise, rich, pure, detailed</td>
<td>unplanned, irregular, disorganised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(complexity)</td>
<td>Is it hard to follow?</td>
<td>unclear, plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>Was it worthwhile?</td>
<td>significant, crucial, deep, innovative, original, real, helpful, challenging, beneficial, advantageous, valid, appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(significance)</td>
<td></td>
<td>shallow, harmful, insignificant, useless, unclean, detrimental, conventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Framework of Appreciation (Martin and White 2005)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normality (how unusual or special)</th>
<th>cute, gorgeous, unique, trendy, famous, familiar, etc.</th>
<th>cranky, fussy, picky, peculiar, grumpy, choosy, unrealistic, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (how capable is s/he?)</td>
<td>talented, smart, vigorous, intelligent, strong, educated, success, efficient, scrupulous, sane, learn, etc.</td>
<td>pedantic, foolish, ignorant, fail, incompetent, dumb, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenacity (how determined or dependable is s/he?)</td>
<td>plucky, decisive, tenacious, persistent, study, insist, etc.</td>
<td>indecisive, wavering, soft, strong-headed, stubborn, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sanction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veracity (how truthful or honest is s/he?)</td>
<td>naive, trustworthy, reliable, honest, staunch, etc.</td>
<td>gullible, con man, fraudulent, imposter, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propriety (how ethical or how far beyond reproach is s/he?)</td>
<td>moral, fair, concerned, sensitive, responsible, caring, respectful, kind, generous, charitable, etc.</td>
<td>brutal, inhumane, corrupt, mean, barbaric, selfish, immoral, insensitive, biased, abuse, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Framework of Judgement from Martin and White 2005
CHAPTER FOUR

THE EVOLUTION OF SECURITY
IN A CHANGING DIPLOMACY

4.1. Introduction

After the illustration of the methodology behind this work, we now start to interrogate the corpus. The main focus in this chapter is on the ‘new regime of international security’ (Fairclough 2007) as a hegemonic discourse by introducing, first, the broader historical context which justifies the new trends in the foreign arena. Then, a short review of the term ‘diplomacy’ will be provided in order to highlight its flexibility, confirmed by the ‘conceptual knowledge’ extracted from the corpus. Once the scenario of the changing diplomacy has been set up, I will start the investigation of the co-text of the word ‘security’ as ‘origin’ in concordances, in order to trace its diachronic development across the ten years of the British Foreign Policy history. The analysis of the concgrams around ‘security’ also aims to unmask the ideological discursive practices. The main idea is that a “community’s value system is built up and maintained, at least partly, by the recurrent use of particular phrasings in texts” (Stubbs 2002: 166).

4.2 A historical perspective: active diplomacy for a changing world

September 11th terrorist attacks have sealed humanity’s fate in every field and in the arena of foreign policy they have marked the end of the second
phase of diplomacy. Lasted for about 40 years, the first phase was characterised by a more or less stable equilibrium between the USA and the Soviet Union. Finished in the late 1980s this period also saw the formation of the European Union a process that continued in the following second phase dominated by the collapse of communism. As Williams highlights (2002), in the aftermath of the Cold War the western foreign policies have been pursued within the parameters of liberal democratic capitalism. The ideological convergence between Britain and the other European states was also supplemented by the question of European enlargement, which dominated the British foreign policy debates.

If it is true that international priority issues like fight against terrorism, the weapons of mass destruction, conflict prevention and resolution, global economy expansion, sustainable development promotion and poverty reduction are well within the traditional scope of diplomacy, nevertheless it is the wider context that is changing:

One striking characteristic of the strategic priorities […] is that they are as much about domestic policy as about foreign policy. The interdependence of the two is now very strong. [emphasis added] There is almost no foreign policy issue that does not have a domestic dimension, and the reverse is true too. 90% of the heroin on the streets of Britain comes from Afghanistan: so the political stability and economic prosperity of Afghanistan – resting on crops other than the poppy – will have a profound effect on British towns and cities. Effective counter-terrorism liaison in Pakistan an Algeria will have a direct effect on security in London.

Communication revolution, the end of deference, the rise of the consumer-citizen have profound implications for all government departments, including the FCO which was obliged to rethink the challenges faced. Robin Cook himself, highlighted the necessity of an

---

'interdependent’ character of the foreign policy, namely not ‘divorced from domestic policy’ but as playing a central role in the Labour’s political programme (FCO Mission Statement, May 12th, 1997). Nine years later, Jack Straw in his speech that launched the “White Paper”, stressed the importance of a flexible and ‘active diplomacy’ so as to adapt itself to a world that is changing and also influencing the direction of that change:

Diplomacy in the 21st century needs to be hard-edged, clear in its goals and determinedly activist: grounded in core but flexible in the face of rapid change. (Straw, 28.03. 2006)

The new era, dominated by processes of social change, such as ‘globalization’ or ‘new capitalism’, is thus said to require a more engaged foreign policy across a broader agenda, which in turn means a ceaseless concern for a wide range of alliances. As Edwards puts it (2004: 5) “the Labour’s victory marked a decisive break with the selfish individualism of the 1980s, and a rebirth of public commitment to issues of international justice. The ‘giving age’ had arrived said Prime Minister Tony Blair.”

Blair’s administration continued his party’s tradition of cultivating the respect for universal norms and values (cf. Williams 2006), but it also showed off some distinctive features such as a far stronger belief in the use of military force to encourage humanitarian purposes. It is in the military sphere that the process of Europeanization is more evident (Williams 2002), as the Prime Minister himself marked by highlighting Britain’s pivotal role in realising a strong alliance with both America and Europe (Associated Press Luncheon, December 15th, 1998).

If New Labour sprang directly from socialism, however, it “explicitly downgraded the place of socialist ideas in its foreign policy” (Williams 2006: 26). Indeed, in tracing the major points of departure from the old tradition, Williams notices the stress on the concept of globalisation and on
what he calls ‘morality’, namely a strong emphasis on the ‘ethical dimension’ of the foreign policy. At the beginning of his diplomatic service, Robin Cook announced it with the aim of putting human rights at the heart of diplomacy. In his formulation Cook resorts to the adjective *ethical* three times and two occurrences are in the same opening speech, always associated to the British foreign policy:\(^2\):

1. Our foreign policy must have an *ethical* dimension and must support the demands of other peoples for the democratic rights on which we insist for ourselves. (May 12, 1997)

2. It supplies an *ethical* content to foreign policy and recognises that the national interest cannot be defined only by narrow realpolitik. It aims to make Britain a leading partner in a world community of nations, and reverses the Tory trend towards not so splendid isolation. (May 12, 1997)

The ‘peremptory’ tone of the citation (1), due to the double use of deontic modality, aims to give the British foreign policy a new orientation in the portrayal of Britain. What we see here is the ‘emergence’ of a new discourse (human rights) as the facet of a strategy in response to the change in contemporary social life. The statement, which was rephrased by the media in terms of ‘ethical foreign policy’, is clearer in the context of the FCO Mission Statement, which refers to spreading British values in the world. The third occurrence of the adjective *ethical* is found in a context which reveals contradiction and a need for clarification of what was designated as a utopian plan, given by the contradiction between the ethical dimension and the foreign policy itself (see Gallagher 2006):

3. Some people have described our new approach as an *ethical* foreign policy. I created a modest little

\(^2\) Eight occurrences of the adjective ‘ethical’ were found in Straw’s speeches, but none of them in association with foreign policy or variants of it.
4.2.1 New trends in the diplomatic scenario

Researchers in the field of diplomacy have pointed out the complexity of the forms and the functions which characterize diplomacy in the era of globalisation (Hocking 2005). These shifts in diplomacy are mainly due to changes in the environment where diplomats operate, interacting at home and abroad at different professional spheres. As Hocking notes (2006: 15) diplomats work together with other ministries and they are in touch with business people in order to promote trade and fulfil objectives of economic diplomacy.

Increasingly, diplomacy is an activity involving a range of relations with states and non-state actors and hence, it requires the creation of networks where no single member has the monopoly. This means that the traditional view of ‘diplomacy’ relying on the term ‘negotiation’ and defining it as “…the management of relations between countries by negotiation rather than by force” (Oxford Learner’s Dictionary) cannot be exhaustive. Indeed, in his work The dynamics of diplomacy (1990), Sir Peter Marshall pinpoints five more different connotations of the same term. If the focus is on the “content” of foreign affairs as a whole, diplomacy is a synonym of foreign policy, that is the perspective of this study. Diplomacy can be used interchangeably with “statecraft”, when the “conduct” of the policy is highlighted. If the term refers to the use of diplomats, the connotation is more recent, in that the Foreign Ministry, as institution, dates back to the beginning of the 17th century, when Richelieu set it up in France and to 1782, in England, with the foundation of the first Foreign Office (Anderson 1993: 73-87). Finally, diplomacy is the art of persuading
people to perceive things your way by combining crucial ingredients such as logic, science and the gift of proper language (cf. Abu Jaber 2001). These conceptualizations, which are linked by the underlying aim of conflict resolution, make the term ‘diplomacy’ a multilayered concept signifying simultaneously “content, manner, character, method and art” (Marshall 1990: 7) and show the “boundary-spanning” (Hocking 2007: 92) character of diplomacy.

In order to illustrate this multifaceted character of diplomacy and its new trends, the following examples from DiCo, based on diplomacy as search word, have been taken into account to extract more “conceptual knowledge” (Bowker and Pearson 2002: 217):

(1) We are seeing a shift not just in the tools of diplomacy but in diplomacy itself. (Beckett, 20/03/07)

(2) What we need is not so much a diplomacy of hindsight, but rather a diplomacy of foresight. (Straw, 25/03/02)

(3) We must recognise that diplomacy has expanded beyond its international sphere of inter-state relations, security treaties and trade agreements. Vital though this work remains, if I was a few minutes late I apologise because I was signing 20 treaties, but diplomacy now encompasses the fundamentals of the lives of our peoples, their jobs, their beliefs of right and wrong, even the quality of the air that they breath. (Cook, 12/06/97)

(4) Today diplomacy is more than ever about 'soft power' – persuading others that they have an interest in your agenda; that you and they want the same things. Diplomacy today means putting our values into action. (Straw, 24/04/06)

(5) A new diplomacy: achieving national interests through common action (Beckett, 27/02/07)

(6) Today’s global challenges require us to use science as a tool of diplomacy, and to build the scientific consensus which is the necessary foundation for effective international action. (Straw, 21/03/05)

---

3 “When you use a corpus analysis tool to produce a concordance for a specific search term, you will retrieve all the occurrences of that string that are found in your corpus. Some of these will contain conceptual information, while others will be less informative” (Bowker et al 2002: 217).
(7) So an active diplomacy for a changing world means not only the still vital skills of international negotiation and influence, it also means running an effective service operations to millions of customers around the world. (Straw, 26/04/06)

(8) Diplomacy in the 21st Century needs to be hard-edged, clear in its goals and determinedly activist; grounded in core but flexible in the face of rapid change. (Straw, 28/03/06)

(9) It is not state to state diplomacy. It is people to people diplomacy. (Cook, 28/03/01)

A process of democratisation emerges from these instances where actors are not states but people seen as customers (7) with their values, their objectives and their lives (3). This far-reaching diplomacy (2: diplomacy of foresight) not only does it rely on negotiation as management of international relations but global common action (4, 5, 6) is also advocated, due to mutual interests and goals. What emerges matches the so called ‘multistakeholder approach’ to diplomacy (Hocking 2006; Kurbalija 2006) which recognizes a multiple sphere of authority (3), the development of fluid forms with open and inclusive communication patterns in a crossing domestic-international arena. Citation (4) traces a connection between diplomacy and ‘soft power’ considered as the ability to achieve one’s own goals through attraction, in this case a sharing of interests. Soft Power arises from the appeal of some “intangible” country’s elements such as culture, political ideals and policies (cf. Nye 2004).

Interestingly, the axiological orientation of this shift in diplomacy, namely engagement, is best epitomized in the clusters diplomacy is embedded in, as displayed in the table 4.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FOR A CHANGING</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DIPLOMACY FOR A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACTIVE DIPLOMACY FOR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DIPLOMACY FOR DEMOCRACY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: 3-word clusters of diplomacy provided by WordSmith Tools (2007)
What is worth noticing is the use of the preposition ‘for’ in the slogan “Active diplomacy for a changing world” at the place of ‘in’ which emphasises British instrumental and militant role as stated by Straw: “Our diplomacy must be active, not only adapting to a changing world but influencing the direction of its travel” (March 28th, 2006).

The key evaluative adjective active occurs 123 times in DiCo and 16% of its occurrences in the corpus are clustered with another adjective engaged and both depict diplomacy and foreign policy or a variant of them (way; approach) to refer to the policy employed on the international setting. It goes beyond the scope of this research to investigate the concordances of the adjective active. What is relevant to this part of the study is that the combination of these two adjectives, active and engaged, describes the typology of dynamic diplomacy taken and also advocated by the three foreign ministers in a world that changes continuously, as shown in the following citations (for a full list see Appendix Two):

(1) An active and engaged foreign policy is not just a salve to liberal consciences. It is a survival mechanism for our societies.

(2) We both [India and Britain] take an active and engaged approach to the world.

(3) Over the next few weeks, in a series of speeches both here and abroad, I shall be setting out in more detail the reasons why the UK’s interests are best served by an active and engaged global foreign policy, working with our allies to push back the boundaries of chaos.

4.3 Identifying discourse from collocates

The aim of this section is to study the environment surrounding security to determine its diachronic development by pointing out the variability of its usage across the three foreign ministers’ speeches. The assumption is that
words tend to co-occur so strongly that they cannot ‘retain independent meanings’ (Tognini-Bonelli 2001: 101). I am looking at all the words associated with *security* in that “collocation is a good guide to meaning, and when a noun is ambiguous (as many are) collocation can indicate which meaning is relevant” (Sinclair 2003: 38). Collocates contribute to a semantic analysis of a word (cf. Sinclair 1991: 115-116) and furthermore, by browsing among frequent associations of words, “we can glimpse the recurrent wordings which circulate in the social world, and glimpse how linguistic categories become social categories” (Stubbs 1996: 194).

The analysis starts from the keywords list displayed in the previous chapter. Once *security* has been found at the top of keywords list, it becomes the subject of concordance and collocational inquiry. Then, I am looking at the definitions from three different dictionaries and the phrases the word *security* is embedded in. If our starting point is going to be the evidence from the corpus, we have to come to terms that this does not corroborate the traditional descriptions from the dictionaries. In a further step, the concgrams will be retrieved in order to study the complete phraseological environment of *security* and to mark out the new phrases not found in the dictionaries. I shall also rely on the statistical measure of ‘t-score’\(^4\) in order to confirm the lexical realisations of the search word and results will be compared and contrasted across the three sub-corpora. By and large, the analysis takes into account two mainly quantitative parameters: **word and concgrams frequency**: in that the term *security* and its semantic associations are not distributed evenly across the three foreign

---

\(^4\) There are different types of statistical calculations to study the collocational profile of a word. Mutual Information gives prominence to the strength of attraction between the search word and its collocates but tends to score highly low frequency words. Z-score and log-log look at low frequency content words. (For more information see Baker 2006: 102-103). In Sinclair’s words “The t-score is a statistical measure of the likelihood that two or more words occur together by chance. It is a popular measure in corpus linguistics because compared with other measures it gives prominence to the very common words” (2003: 179).
ministers’ sub-corpora and the collocation relationship on the basis of statistical calculations.

4.3.1. Analysis

To begin with quantitative observations, figure 4.1 displays the distribution of the noun across the speeches by the three foreign ministers, showing a crescendo in the frequency of the search word from Cook (0.13%) to Beckett (0.29%) through Straw (0.25%). The highest occurrence of security was expected in Straw due to his tenure after the September 11th terrorist attacks, but the higher percentage in Beckett, despite her shortest service, highlights a certain relevance of the use of this word that does not appertain only to terrorism or military discourse.

The investigation of the definition of ‘security’ across three different dictionaries embodies very clearly the choice to give weight to the idea of ‘protection’ of a person or a country against crime, criminals and attacks by foreign countries, as exemplified in the following quotations:

1. “The quality or state of being secure”;

   Compounds: collective security; security blanket; security council; security
interest; security police; social security; (Merriam-Webster online dictionary);

2. “Security refers to all the measures that are taken to protect a place, or to ensure that only people with permission enter it or leave it” (Collins Cobuild, 2004);  
   Compounds: security blanket; security camera; security guard; security risk;

3. “Safety from attack, harm, or damage; connected with safety and protection”  
   Compounds: national/international security; tight/lax security; security blanket; security guard; security council; security risk; security service; (MacMillan Dictionary, 2002).

A comparison between these definitions and the figure 4.2 shows that the concgrams surfaced in the list from the whole corpus such as climate security, energy security do not float up to any of the three dictionaries consulted, where we read expected phrases such as ‘security council’, ‘security interest’ and ‘security service’ and so on and so forth. What may be inferred at this initial stage of the analysis is that security lends itself to favour new companies in DiCo.
Figure 4.2 gives us an overview of the concgrams around security in DiCo. Neglecting predictable occurrences around the cluster security council, (e.g. members of the security council) or instances which appertain to institutional practices such as Common foreign and security policy and UN security council resolutions, the table seems to indicate that security privileges the friendship of threat, climate, prosperity and energy differently permuted. Furthermore, it also suggests that ‘security’ is framed in an unfavourable picture due to the most recurrent concgram threats to our security.

At this step of the analysis it is crucial to look at the occurrences of these concgrams in the three sub-corpora considered individually, so as to detect any similarities or dissimilarities in their semantic usage. In the lists of selected concgrams displayed below, some criteria have been applied (a full list of concgrams is provided in Appendix Three):

- all grammar associations have not been taken into account in order to focus attention on content words which help define the borders of security in DiCo;
- a list of the first one hundred concgrams has been scrutinised;
- concgrams with less than five occurrences have been disregarded;
- those concgrams which were not relevant in one sub-corpus were considered in the analysis only if they emerged as significant in the other sub-corpora and therefore useful for comparative purposes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>security/concgrams in Cook's sub-corpus</th>
<th>freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. security Europe</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. security Britain</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. security European</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. security peace</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. security international</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. security prosperity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. security world</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. security new</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. security commitment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. security countries</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. security defence</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. security freedom</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. security people</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. security Iraq</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. security Israelis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>security/concgrams in Straw's sub-corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. security prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. security international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. security European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. security global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. security peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. security threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. security Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. security new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. security world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. security Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. security development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. security collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. security common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. security terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. security threat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>security/concgrams in Beckett's sub-corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. security climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. security energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. security global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. security change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. security international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. security threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. security national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. security people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. security new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. security hard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These three lists set out the phraseology around the word *security* and these strings are valuable to study how speakers construct their discourse, in that typical ways of saying things reveal authors’ messages (cf. Partington 2004). Before making inferences about data their normalisation is illustrated in table 4.3. Singular and plural forms are considered together in that, after a study of the lines, it was determined that the meanings were so similar that their combination was justified. Another point to keep in mind in this investigation is that those concgrams in the analysis which contain a forward slash are to be considered as contiguous and non-contiguous collocations, on the contrary, those which do not contain the slash are contiguous collocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security/concgram</th>
<th>COOK</th>
<th>STRAW</th>
<th>BECKETT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosperity</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threat(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue(s)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Normalised data of concgrams of *security* across the three sub-corpora

What this table clearly illustrates is that Cook seems to be worried more with *European security* with respect to the other two ministers. This collocation is a clear reflection of the issues of his time. Then, interestingly, different collocations emerge in the discourse: *peace* and *prosperity* figure very prominently in both Cook and Straw’s speeches, even though in the latter a more negative scenario sets in given by the already signalled associated word *threat(s)*, but also by items such as *issue* and *challenge* that depict the value of security as a controversial phenomenon. *Climate* and *energy* appear as Beckett’s major concerns showing a widening of the concept of ‘security’ with respect to its usage in the other two ministers’ discourse. All the three ministers sort to the qualifier *new* to describe their strategies and to adjectives like *common*, *collective* and *global* to enact a pervasive sense of cooperation and consensus.

As Stubbs observes (1996: 172), “…words occur in characteristic
collocations, which show the associations and connotations they have, and therefore the assumptions which they embody”. These patternings need to be validated in the light of the statistical measure of collocational significance since “a collocational profile is best read as a confirmation of observations” (Tognini-Bonelli 2001: 24). Cleaning away the expectedly encountered permutations, table 4.4 corroborates the strong attraction between security and the associated words indicated previously in this section in table 4.2. Reading this list of collocational relationships, we identify fully lexical collocates, which realise the ‘semantic preference’ (Sinclair 1996) of security in DiCo and confirm the “magnetism” with these items (for a full list of the collocational relation see Appendix Four):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EUROPEAN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>PROSPERITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>BRITAIN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PROSPERITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>8,887</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,673</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>6,519</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>THREATS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>6,418</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>6,298</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>EUROPEAN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,899</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>COLLECTIVE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,633</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>THREAT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>COMMON</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CLIMATE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>9,527</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,656</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PROSPERITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>THREAT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>HARD</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AGENDA</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4: Relational column based on t-score calculation provided by WordSmith Tools

The analysis of the concordances of the concgrams displayed in the table 4.3 has been organised around four groups: firstly, we are investigating the classifying adjectives which pre-modify security; secondly, all the noun-groups around the ‘origin’ are detected; thirdly, the negative ‘neighbours’ are inspected since they invade ‘security’ with an unfavourable halo. Finally, the cluster climate security and its ramifications stand separately in the analysis, since they introduce relatively new nuances to the concept of the term under investigation.

Not all the concgrams have been discussed because some of them do not represent real associates to the origin word in that constructing an ‘exocentric relation’. These neglected concgrams (see Appendices 5, 6, and 7 for the concordances of all concgrams in DiCo which are considered in this chapter) concern words like work and people. The first item either refers to institutional engagement to carry out a project (the UN work on development and security) or to the effort of doing something satisfactorily (to make collective security work). As far as the instances of the collective noun are concerned, people is not syntagmatically related to security as in I have discussed the link between climate and security with many people, but it represents the recipient of this interest. Only one instance of people in Beckett’s speeches is ambiguous in that the noun is not specified, but it is worth noticing it because it marks the respect for the ‘agreement’ between the citizens and the state-protector and highlights the more civic ‘contour’ of security:

The first is that when people talk about security problems they do so in terms which are qualitatively
different from any other type of problem. Security is seen as an imperative not an option. People don’t obsess over cost-benefit analyses or about opportunity cost: they get on with what has to be done because they understand that security goes right to the heart of the basic contract between state and citizen. (Beckett 10.05.07)

4.3.2 First group: security and classifying adjectives
Among the concgrams including a nationality noun (Britain; UK; Iraq) or an adjective as pre-modifier, no ‘endocentric’ relation was found but they are placed as ‘circumstance’ in a clause as in Those disgusting attacks showed again that the security situation in Iraq is serious).

In the few instances where Britain is associated to security, as illustrated in the concordance 4.1, it is identified as an active agent, which has a vital interest in the issue, and its commitment and devotion are highlighted in both ministers’ sub-corpora (Cook and Straw) (see also the instances of flagged and contribution in line 16). Sorting to an economic lexis, line (14) instantiates the feeling of Britishness as a nation completely dedicated to pursue security cause so as to reap the fruit of its labour:

14 And Britain will reap the full benefits - security, prosperity and strength. Which makes it hard to
15 Britain also has a vital interest in peace and security in the Gulf. UK exports to the GCC states were
16 Britain flagged our commitment to the region’s security and our contribution to the five-power defence

Concordance 4.1: 2-word concgram security/Britain in Cook and Straw.

Only European and Europe are frequently found in the vicinity of security even though following a ‘collapse’ from Cook to Beckett, as displayed in
Graph I: Europe across the three sub-corpora

Cook faces up with the question of a security plan for the continent and marks its relevance: in citation (2) in concordance 4.2 the use of vital in marked position emphasizes the significance of the USA-UK alliance for the health of the continent. Historical events have proved the importance of European integration as a major force (10) yet, discourse signals a sort of ‘deficit’ in the traditional approach to it as shown from associates such as improvement (1), enhances (6; 27) enlargement (4) or elements of modality (will...
There is a general consensus that things like security and stability are approved of; we are entitled to them. But this notion of ‘approvable’ seems to be linked to that of ‘absence’ or to that of ‘improvement’, realised both at the grammatical level (3) and at the lexical level. The common thread among these different formal realisations is that security is a ‘thing’ that it is worth having, but it is not completely there. Noteworthy is the emphasis put by Cook and Straw on Europe as the nucleus from where to start in order to reach security and go beyond it, although an underlying tension is revealed insofar Europe is the subject and the object of ‘security’ at the same time (lines 8 and 16). In order to understand this view, we need to step outside the corpus to consider some historical information. At Cook’s time, the Labour Party decided to develop a military capacity for Europe as an aspect of a common foreign policy. It is worth calling to mind UK’s traditional reluctance to develop a EU military capacity, which seems to shift on a more potential role that Europe could play within the security realm. As Williams points out (2006: 61) there are two main reasons for this shift:

First, in contrast to the previous Conservative government, Labour had clearly articulated a different UK identity that involved being at the heart of Europe. Since the UK remained outside European monetary union and on the edge of justice and home affairs issues, foreign and security policy was one of the few areas in which Blair could plausibly claim a leading role. Second, Europe’s weak response to earlier crises in the region highlighted the EU’s lack of an effective mechanism for formulating – let alone implementing – an agreed crisis management policy on anything but the smallest military scale.

Europe is part of a circumstantial adjunct as in lines 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 in the Straw’s sub-corpus (concordance 4.2) leaving no doubt to its interpretation as the beneficiary of this interest. The European integration is an overcome question in Beckett where all the instances show exocentrically unrelated combinations, both security/Europe and security/UK
and thus not considered in the analysis.

The less frequent use of *Europ(ean)* in the last two ministers’ speeches is counterbalanced by a higher frequency of items (e.g. *international; global; collective*) indicating a broader sphere of action. When *security* is combined with *collective*, the ideal of a collective European identity is emphasised.

A scan of the concordance 4.3 tells us that *collective security* is introduced as a *principle* (12) that has inspired some of *diplomacy’s most noble endeavours* (19) and is equated to other values, such as the respect of *international law* (9), (13) and democracy (*freedom* 5, *democratic government* 13), which are those values British government is always committed to:

1. and hope that the threats will go away. Global *security* is our *collective* responsibility, and we must
2. the other was the conviction that our *collective* security was being threatened in new ways, with an
3. I commend this Bill to the House. *COLLECTIVE SECURITY* IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE’ (09/07/02)
4. as we pursue the cause of freedom and *collective* security – the question of *collective* military action.
5. wrote that underneath all the talk of *collective* security could be heard ‘the throbbing of the engines:
6. for their twisted cause. And the
7. the cause of international law and *collective* security is introduced as a *principle* (12) that has inspired some of diplomacy’s most noble endeavours (19) and is equated to other values, such as the respect of *international law* (9), (13) and democracy (*freedom* 5, *democratic government* 13), which are those values British government is always committed to:
8. for their twisted cause. And the
9. as we pursue the cause of freedom and *collective* security – the question of *collective* military action.
10. the other was the conviction that our *collective* security was being threatened in new ways, with an
11. and hope that the threats will go away. Global *security* is our *collective* responsibility, and we must
12. the other was the conviction that our *collective* security was being threatened in new ways, with an
13. I commend this Bill to the House. *COLLECTIVE SECURITY* IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE’ (09/07/02)
14. as we pursue the cause of freedom and *collective* security – the question of *collective* military action.
15. wrote that underneath all the talk of *collective* security could be heard ‘the throbbing of the engines:
16. for their twisted cause. And the
17. the cause of international law and *collective* security is introduced as a *principle* (12) that has inspired some of diplomacy’s most noble endeavours (19) and is equated to other values, such as the respect of *international law* (9), (13) and democracy (*freedom* 5, *democratic government* 13), which are those values British government is always committed to:
18. for their twisted cause. And the
19. as we pursue the cause of freedom and *collective* security – the question of *collective* military action.
20. the other was the conviction that our *collective* security was being threatened in new ways, with an
21. and hope that the threats will go away. Global *security* is our *collective* responsibility, and we must
22. the other was the conviction that our *collective* security was being threatened in new ways, with an
23. I commend this Bill to the House. *COLLECTIVE SECURITY* IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE’ (09/07/02)
24. as we pursue the cause of freedom and *collective* security – the question of *collective* military action.
25. wrote that underneath all the talk of *collective* security could be heard ‘the throbbing of the engines:

Concordance 4.3: 2-word concgrams *security/*collective in Straw

The representation of ‘collectivity’, strongly favoured by Straw (3.3% out of the total of the occurrences of *security*), is a dominant aspect and serves the purpose of aligning the audience by underlying the common objectives through different lexical realisations: *pursue the cause* (5), *shared will* (18). The grammatical presence of *our* contributes to enhance an ideal image with the inclusiveness of all the European members. Redundancy operates in the use of all these ‘integrating’ adjectives (*international, common, global, collective*)
echoed by other lexical elements as best exemplified in the first line of concordance 4.3, where global, our, collective, we, all find their placement just in one sentence. The fact that we live in a ‘common society’ gives people a sense of responsibility (27, 1): in this collective society the individual is a citizen who participates and in so doing he/she can enact change. The symbolic construction of Britishness (see the multiple instances of committed (11), (12), (17)) drawn on the underlying discourse of nationalism coexists with the evocation of internationalism, nationhood and globalisation and their contradictory interconnection lies at the heart of foreign policy.

From the European level we come now to including the humanity as a whole. Even though found in the Cook’s sub-corpus, international does not pertain to security and for this reason its occurrence will be disregarded. The minimal turbulence introduced between international and security, as observable in the table below, includes peace.

| Kingdom and China to promote international security and the rule of law. And I want to suggest the | It goes to the heart of our economic, energy security and international security agendas. Japan has |
| mass migration, the threat to international security from terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the | security - the international fight against crime - the security of the international community as a whole. What |
| such distinctions either in international law. Security Council Resolution 1373 created new obligations | security as a new international strategic priority for the security - a new strategic international priority for the |
| and in order to restore international peace and security on the basis of a mandate from the Security | security threats which the international community faces |
| constitutes a threat to international peace and security. That circumstances in which it is prepared to | Security Council and other international organisations. |
| against threats to international peace and security. We can build there on the growing understanding | |
| of the modern threats to international peace and security. And alongside that, we also need to develop a | security posed by weapons of mass destruction and |
| the threat to international and domestic security | the cause of international law and collective security it is a challenge we must confront. |

Concordance 4.4: 2-word concgrams security/international in Straw and Beckett

Instances of ‘marketing’ verbs such as achieving (6) promote (40), contribute
feature the discourse as exhortative and make it fit into that “proliferation of promotional genres” assigned to the category of “genre of governance” (Fairclough 2003). In particular, what comes into picture is the ‘hortatory report’, namely a description of the negative scenario with a “covert prescriptive intent” (ibid. 96) aiming to make people believe in a certain way and respond to those representations. *International security* has to be *restored* (44) and *guaranteed* (13) and this presupposes a construct in transition, an ideal potential ‘product’ at risk. Certain ideological implications can be clearly seen in operation: the dominant national interests are presented as the interests of humanity as a whole and this union is best served by the furtherance of moral values – more visible in the next sub-section - through the *global* community’s action.

In contrast to the extremes of Thatcherite individualism, (see Donadio 2005) which rejects individual liberty, the so-called ‘third-way’ envisioned a society whose members have responsibilities and rights. In a globalising world foreign policy has to be guided by a more subtle blend of mutual and self interest and moral purpose in defending the values we cherish. The spread of our values makes us safer: if we can establish and spread the values of liberty, of the rule of law and respect for human rights then, that is also in our interest.

The concgram *global security* allows only constituency variation with minimal turbulence (concordance 4.5: 40, 41, 18) and it might be glossed as ‘worldwide’. However, a certain semantic vagueness seems to be operating: does *global security* also refer to all the different aspects of an issue? The evidence from the corpus brings us to notice that ambiguity arises when the concgram is under the form of adjacent pair and lends itself to this double interpretation. The coupling *global security* contributes to depict the multifaceted concept of security as a global sphere, which encompasses
different layers such as food, water and energy security to cite a few (11, 18, 19):

Fifth is the European Union’s work on global security. On data retention, the European Parliament has
most effective support that we can. ‘GLOBAL SECURITY IS OUR SHARED RESPONSIBILITY’ - STRAW (23/09/04)
part of the burden of regional and global security. Following 11 September, the need is more acute
has grown, so too has its stake in global security and global prosperity. China’s partners warmly
and hope that the threats will go away. Global security is our collective responsibility, and we must al
not in Europe, but in the challenges of global security around the world. Today’s threats affect us
UK. These are interlinked in a global agenda. Security is vitally important: we were much more recently
sensitive aspect of today’s global debate on security - the question of collective military action.

Furthermore, quite noticeable in Beckett’s citations is the presence of a larger number of negatively-loaded words than in Straw’s utterances (damaging; desperate; fail) which imbue the cluster with an ‘unpleasant flavour’, revealing the speaker’s alarming attitude with security as a whole. The occurrence of this phrase in Beckett’s speeches, (12% out of the instances of security), twice as much as in Straw, corroborates her steadfast concern for global security and a global homogenising of values and aspirations.

A search into the Bank of English based on the statistical measure of t-score, showed that the adjective ‘global’ is frequently associated with economic matters (warning, economy, a, market(s), fund, economic, financial, system, bond, network, trade) and security is not in the collocation list. This preference, in Beckett’s speeches, might be seen as echoing the numerous ‘economic’ associations of global such as global economy in citation (24). Indeed, meaning is relational and words “acquire meanings from the collocations in

Concordance 4.5: 2-word concgrams security/global in Straw and Beckett

\[\text{At the time of writing the Bank of English contains 650 million words.}\]
which they occur in individual texts, but also from the collocations in which they frequently occur in texts of many kinds across the usage of a speech community” (Stubbs 2002: 146).

To conclude this sub-section, we can safely state that the semantic preference for ‘co-involving’ adjectives is very tangible in the corpus and that this pervasive sense of commonality can be realised also at the grammatical level by looking at all the instances of ‘our’ as in our collective security. These repeated associations of words with a semantic common denominator construe the discourse of a universe by mutual consent with the promise to restore an inclusive social fabric where the security ‘governance’ is thought for the many and not for the few.

4.3.2 Second group: delivering prosperity, peace, freedom

What is consistently shown in this sub-section is the strict correlation between security and prosperity which also extends to other nominalisations. This associated item reaches its peak in Straw’s speeches as pictured in the graph n. 2:

![Graph 2: prosperity across the three sub-corpora]

Cook sets up ‘security’ at top priority in the foreign policy agenda in
order to ensure British prosperity:

1 And Britain will reap the full benefits—security, prosperity and strength. Which makes it hard
2 our geography and our history. Our culture, our security, and our prosperity, are inseparable from the
3 half a century of peace. That has provided the security and good order in which their prosperity has
4 in a modern world where our prosperity, our security and our influence depend on the health of our
5 can have a direct impact on the prosperity, the security and even the climate of countries on the other
6 majority of our exports. The prosperity and the security of our nation depend on foreign contacts.
7 It is here to accelerate. Our prosperity and our security will become increasingly interdependent. I have
8 ever to the prosperity of our economies and the security of our peoples. I cannot guarantee that our

Concordance 4.6: 2-word concgrams security/prosperity in Cook

All the lines (except n. 9) show a strict interdependence between these two nouns which is instantiated through relational processes (are inseparable; depend on; interdependent) that can be attributive or identifying. In these instances security represents the ‘Token’ and prosperity the ‘Value’. As stated by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 234) the ‘Value’ represents the values speakers use (and the culture they are part of) to categorize the ‘Tokens’ they deal with. Items such as reap, provide, benefits, as already pointed out in the previous sub-section, characterize security on the economic level so as to transform it into an asset for investment. This connection in turn depends on the health (4) of foreign contacts. The last citation brings security to a more civic layer by the phrase the security of our peoples and represents one of the few examples of this humanitarian connotation of security in Cook’s sub-corpus. The rhetoric of ‘our’ – visible on the paradigmatic axis in concordances 4.6 and 4.7 - including the British people, as explicitly stated in citations (6) and (9), puts an emphasis on the building of solidarity and contributes to enact that sense of commonality of interests and goals already noticed in the previous sub-section.

The concgram security/prosperity is so frequent in the Straw’s sub-corpus that it takes on the status of a binomial. It has been observed that although binomials are usually made up of two synonymous words, “at least a slight difference in emphasis is always there. The second term is perhaps felt to carry more weight, even semantically” (Koskenniemi 1968,
in Bugaj 2006b). According to this interpretation prosperity is given more emphasis and, hence, the economic dimension is highlighted as already observed in Cook’s discourse. In other words, maintaining law and order at the domestic level sets up the conditions for efficient commerce.

Out of 83 occurrences of this concgram in the Straw’s sub-corpus, we count 5 contiguous collocations, 50 occurrences of security and prosperity, 8 instances of non contiguous security/prosperity and 20 instances of prosperity/security. Regardless of numbers, the visual lay-out of the table itself clearly illustrates this strong friendship between security and prosperity:
both issues are vital to our prosperity and security. And both require not just domestic but
importance to our future prosperity and security that the relationship between Europe and the US
individual lives, but on common prosperity and security beyond one country’s borders. And the gravest
the best guarantor of collective prosperity and security.
show how a virtuous circle of prosperity and security can be built. Greater security encourages
demonstrate that national prosperity and security are more dependent than ever before on a stable
Europe, increasing our prosperity and our security, promoting our values, and enhancing our power.
circle of security and prosperity. Greater security can encourage businesses to invest for the long
in general: to provide prosperity, justice, security and opportunity for all citizens. It affects
Europe’s economic prosperity and collective security. First, research and development. We need a
lives – on jobs, prosperity, crime and personal security. Indeed the EU has not only to deliver on thes
own prosperity by working for the prosperity and security of all nations. I therefore ask all of your
of prosperity and security can be built. Greater security encourages business to invest for the long term,

Concordance 4.7: 2-word concgrams security/prosperity in Straw

The lines from 56 to 61 display some intruding words like global, peace and stability which add no turbulence to the prototypical form that is security and prosperity. Line 62 shows considerable variation although a connection between the two items is still underlined by the use of the verb underpins. Line 63 was not counted because it was judged that in this instance the two words are not associated in the way they are in the other concordances. Overwhelmingly, this binomial is seen as a ‘common desirable goal’ – on the vertical axis of concordance - (2; 3; 5; 6; 10; 54; 57) from which the entire community can gain benefits (20; 25; 46; 47). The connection between these two frequent nominalizations is more evident in the Straw’s speeches by the high frequency of items such as link(s) (1; 31), partnership (1; 42), membership (51), alliances (37) and again by instances of relational processes (e.g. depend on). Noteworthy is the texture of different discourses, also reflected by other nominalizations representing unquestionable ‘assets’, which become associates in this combination of values and interests: justice, peace and freedom are merged with security and prosperity. An involvement of humanitarian, democratic, military and legal discourses is thus clearly manifest.

A cursory look at concordances (9), (15), (20), (27), (40), (42) highlights the use of a pervasive metaphor in the corpus that is the figurative use of ‘building’. Some nouns such as foundation(s) or cornerstone or the verb build itself, which feature prominently the discourse of security,
help to make abstract concepts more tangible. Again, in Beckett’s speeches the conogram security/prosperity seems to strengthen a more civic and domestic dimension already found in Straw’s corpus (line 28): the congram is being constructed as a commodity to deliver (1; 3;) to the citizens (2; 10; 4).

Concordance 4.8: 2-word concgrams security/prosperity in Beckett

In a number of occurrences of security, development takes the place of prosperity sharing the same environment and stressing the economic nuance of the concept:

columns on which it was founded: development, security and human rights. Each of these goals is both international policy – bringing development and security, as ever, together. And in making the world less

The use of this noun suggests a process of change and is fused with positive meanings of progress and improvement. The high number of material verbs such as provide, give, deliver, show that security is qualified as a ‘thing’ which is ‘supplied’ and therefore the focus is on the transitive action. This places emphasis on the agents of the action (cf. Simpson 1993: 106) represented by the inclusive ‘we’ as in today we share a commitment to bringing security, prosperity (concordance 4.7 line 3).

The presence of a collocate like justice (concordance 4.8 line 1) introduces a pre-prepared package containing more values to be delivered. The discourse mirrors the liberal ideology of cooperation and the promotion of interdependence since the state-government and diplomacy are not the only ‘guardians’ of security (safeguard, concordance 4.8 line 3),
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but the so called ‘trans-national’ society. This is in contrast with the ‘realist’ worldview of security, which sees it as a function of power balancing and self-help.

Another binomial is peace and security, which occurs less frequently going from Cook’s speeches passing through Straw and then to Beckett’s as seen in table 4.3. Peace calls to our mind an unassailable principle, which enhances the positive self-representation of the speaker as a pacifist. As was noted, security is an elusive term just like peace or justice which repel definition (cf. McSweeney, 1999). The concgram security/peace, as Van Dijk (2007: 78) notices, invokes conservative values:

Peace and Security serves to appeal to the fears of people who feel insecure and need a strong government that will primarily satisfy the fundamental needs of security. [...] to legitimate power policies and wars, it is essential to use the vague general concept that does matter for many people: feelings of (in)security.

In Cook’s speeches peace is the ‘condicio sine qua non’ for achieving security as illustrated in the concordances below, which show peace and security as being the canonical form even though positional variation is allowed in the Straw’s sub-corpus, as marshalled in the first two lines of concordance 4.10:

Concordance 4.9: 2-word concgrams security/peace in Cook

1. And both Hungary and Britain will have the security of being part of a Union that brings peace and
2. two states, Israel and Palestine, co-existing in two states, Israel and Palestine, co-existing in two states, Israel and Palestine, co-existing in
3. security, peace and prosperity. the implications for security, peace and prosperity. the implications for security, peace and prosperity. the implications for
4. presents the greatest threat presents the greatest threat to our national to our national to our national
5. efforts, and have taken action in the UN efforts, and have taken action in the UN efforts, and have taken action in the UN
6. of the modern threats to international peace of the modern threats to international peace of the modern threats to international peace
7. against threats to international peace against threats to international peace against threats to international peace
8. living alongside a state of Israel in peace living alongside a state of Israel in peace living alongside a state of Israel in peace
9. modernising the UN’s approach to modernising the UN’s approach to modernising the UN’s approach to
10. that this cannot advance the cause of peace and security. We welcome the proposal for a Peacebuilding that this cannot advance the cause of peace and security. We welcome the proposal for a Peacebuilding that this cannot advance the cause of peace and security. We welcome the proposal for a Peacebuilding
11. and to undermine international peace and to undermine international peace and to undermine international peace and
12. who want nothing more than to live in peace and who want nothing more than to live in peace and who want nothing more than to live in peace and
13. security. Terrorism requires a firm security. Terrorism requires a firm security. Terrorism requires a firm

69
most serious threats to international peace and security. It is not only terrorism within one state which we all have an interest in seeing peace and security entrenched, because insecurity and tension, or fighting terrorism and building peace and security, ours is a modern partnership which is firmly

Concordance 4.10: 2-word concgrams security/peace in Straw

4 to tackling the problems of peace and security - the international fight against crime - the
5 member states have benefited too. Our peace and security has been enhanced by spreading stability and the
6 threatens all our hopes for wider peace and security in the region. Many thousands of British

Concordance 4.11: 2-word concgrams security/peace in Beckett

The other undeniable value is freedom. Remarkably, whereas Blair seems to prefer the use of ‘liberty’ (Fairclough 2006: 158), which is strongly related to the neo-liberal economic view, the three ministers sort to the larger-scale global assent given by freedom. The 248 occurrences of freedom against 11 instances of liberty throughout DfCo, speak in favour of a preponderance of a more universal humanitarian value, where democracy is assumed to be the inherent corollary. 3.1% of these occurrences are found in Cook’s speeches and the percentage decreases in the other two ministers’sub-corpora:

Concordance 4.12: 2-word concgrams security/freedom in Cook, Straw, Beckett

As it happens for the other associations with nominalization, even in this case there is a relation of equivalence between security and freedom and thus a mergence of an interest and a value, that is more evident in The Cook’s sub-corpus, where the concgram is once again binomial-like. The
two words are inextricably linked and the vicinity with development (1) and prosperity (7) grounds all freedoms in a market-based economy and open trade. Furthermore, the furtherance of moral values, in this case freedom, is a way of persuading the audience, in that “one must argue that a particular policy would enhance the general morality that they all share” (Roselle 2006: 10).

4.3.4 Security as an endangered entity

The very frequent association with words which carry a negative pragmatic load addresses the analysis of the concgrams security/threat; security/issue(s) and security/challenge(s). The concgram security/threat, which occurs only once in the Cook’s sub-corpus is found in 83 instances in Straw’s speeches (9.2% of all occurrences):

and cultural exchanges, goes on undaunted by
the challenges of reform, and tackling today's
relationship is as important as ever. The main
community much sooner to the emerging
and improving our capacity to face today's
The Balkans, you are well aware of how European
election. There are challenge ahead - above all
the other was the conviction that our collective
security was being threatened in new ways, with an
around the broad criteria for action by the
in the task of preserving our peace and
is that: what would you do to protect global
the real and serious divide between our common
the countries have direct repercussions on our own
not in Europe, but in the challenges of global
consensus on action to strengthen international
to address the links between development and
those persistent conflicts which threaten the
massive scale present the greatest threat to our
no one can doubt that the primary threat to our
such weapons presents the greatest threat to our
one can now doubt that a primary threat to our
But it is not the only threat to our
face. Those conflicts show how threats to our
ability to act globally against threats to our
also became more complex, and new
create the conditions in which
response to the three main
foundation. Today the greatest threats to our
And we would all agree that the
form, but about the substance, our
power and prosperity, today's threats to our
or indeed other potential
network of relationships. The threats to our
EU of the need to deal with new threats to our
presents the greatest current threat to global
conflicts which are a potential threat to global
tensions and tackling threats to our own
each security. We all invite threats to our own
its region, for so long a threat to European
presents the greatest threat to our national
terrorists and terrible threats to our national
security threats and material hardship. Through DFID’s
security threats, is in our interests, and those of every
security threats we now face - weapons of mass
security threats. The same applies to Iraq, where
security threats. In all these areas, change is already
security can be threatened by ethnic rivalries and lack o
security and the threat of terrorism and inter-communal
security was being threatened in new ways, with an
Security Council against threats to international peace
security in the face of new threats. We do not
security from a regime which threatens regional or
security, and all those who would threaten it. The
security and prosperity, today's threats to global
security around the world. Today's threats affect us
security, including tackling emerging threats at an
security; and to act more effectively on threats such as
security of us all; * And fourth, that the global
security today. That is why fighting terrorism and
security is now posed by groups acting formally outside
security. Forty years ago, President Kennedy voiced the
security comes from groups which act outside states and
security today. Combating weapons proliferation is also a
security today are often linked to a range of factors such
security - from terrorism, proliferation and internationals
security, while building on its strength as a force for
security emerged. Conflicts in the dissolving Yugoslav
security can thrive. Ladies and Gentlemen, I began with
security. We all need good and reliable partners around
security: the proliferation of weapons of mass
security often come not from other functioning sovereign
security - from terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security, concern about human rights, wars, famines and
security come from outside the EU's borders; terrorism,
security. Those who seek to undermine global stability -
security today are as likely to come from non-state actor
security and prosperity: global terrorism, the spread of
security. And now we have the opportunity to establish
security. Nowhere in the case for universal support for
security. KASHMIR A few months ago, the international
emerged as one of the greatest
security, spreaded to global Africa and providing
security - international terrorism and unstable or rogue
security and prosperity is very real. And that diplomacy
Japan’s contribution to the economic
security, into one of our greatest assets.
CONCLUDING
From a rapid scan of the concordances it is immediately visible that \textit{security} collocates contiguously and non-contiguously with \textit{threat}, constructing concigrams where the semantic relation is established with the preposition \textit{to} and the prototypical form is \textit{threat to security}, which allows both constituency and positional variation. Two and more words intrude between \textit{threat(s) to} and \textit{security}, generally a possessive (\textit{our}) or a classifying adjective (\textit{national/international/global}) or the by now close friend \textit{peace}.

Scrolling down along the vertical line, we read how the concgram is pre-modified by adjectives, which intensify the force of threat, such as \textit{greatest, primary (18, 19, 20, 21), grave (65) serious (64), unique (74)}. A sort of continuity with the past is implicit in the collocate \textit{traditional (57)} if compared to the reiteration of the 7 instances of \textit{new (1215 occurrences throughout the corpus) and modern (2 instances)}. The language becomes categorical and antithetical in comparing the new with the old: \textit{new} implies that the world is changing and the challenges posed are different from the traditional ones, hence, new responses are legitimised (pro-active and pre-
emptive ideology). By the use of the adjective common, everybody feels threatened in their own values and life. The collocate potential (39) seems to make appeal to the public’s anxieties in that “Political language tries to construct an ideological vision of what is desirable but also what is undesirable in a given culture [emphasis added] ” (Bayley et al 2004: 187). A word like threat implies intimate knowledge of the mental state of the enemy. Bayley et al’s study of this lexical item has pointed out that ‘threat’ is a polysemous lexeme, conveying different but related meanings. In its verbal form (threaten) can be a verbal process, a material process, a quasi-modal, a relational process, and can also be interpreted as an ideational metaphor (Halliday 1994: 344) of an existential process (Bayley et al 2004: 190). In DiCo all the meanings of the nominal form threat(s) are related to the possibility of causing harm or danger and thus associated to material processes: security is represented as the ‘endangered entity’ as well as its collocates such as stability, peace and prosperity. The actor/threatener is given by explicitly stated external forces. Even though differently described four main dangers are outlined below which are unified under the only category of ‘threat’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>failing and failed states</th>
<th>weapons of mass destruction</th>
<th>terrorism</th>
<th>environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-groups acting formally outside states;</td>
<td>-proliferation of WMD;</td>
<td>-international crime;</td>
<td>-climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-places where no state functions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-man-made shocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-from places where the rule of law do not function;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-non-state actors;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-from places where no state functions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Lexical realisations of the different ‘threats’ in Straw
The claim that there is a threat to security is the crucial premise for a preventive and multilateral strategy.

As noticed (cf. Fairclough 2006: 146), there is an overstatement in the claim that the internal threat is everywhere, in the same community where we live in an ‘alarmist and paranoid way’. The unfavourable environment in which security is embedded in Straw and Beckett’s sub-corpora is broadened by instances of words like challenge and issue. According to the Collins Cobuild Dictionary, ‘issue’ is more neutral than ‘challenge’, in that it stresses the importance of a subject that people are arguing about. ‘Challenge’ on the contrary is “something new and difficult which requires great effort and determination”. This is supported by corpus evidence: all the concordances below show the relevance of security issue(s) as a core problem in foreign policy. It is so important that it requires strong engagement and it is encompassed in the so called hard issues (6). What can be argued here is a shift from ‘soft’ to ‘hard issue’, which involves a number of challenges in the female minister’s corpus:

Concordance 4.14: 2-word conegrams security/issue(s) in Straw, Beckett

More negatively loaded items feature the vicinity of the prototypical phrase security challenge above all in Beckett’s speeches. This challenge is appraised
negatively as pressing, huge, profound, daunting and greatest against Straw’s predilection for the verbal forms such as tackle, confront and underpin.

1 to contribute as the UN adapts to today’s global
2 that it continues to do so, to address the
3 global threats should not blind us to the real
4 security challenges. Our armed forces are second to none,
5 the coming months. There are other political and
6 the cause of international law and collective
7 to assume our share of responsibility for global
8 for which this institution was founded. Yes, the
9 match. Having dealt with terrorism and regional
10 with NATO, as the twin foundations of European
11 The most fundamental of these challenges is
12 to confront the greatest challenge to our
13 confront new threats. Future challenges to our
14 not in Europe, but in the challenges of global
15 flexibility to tackle the challenges of global
16 Meanwhile on the many challenges ahead – on
17 election. There are challenge ahead – above all
18 there are serious challenges ahead for Iraq – on security, on employment, on making a success of the
19 That posed new challenges to our stability and
20 and specific challenges: terrorism, regional security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
21 The crucial challenge for the future, alongside
22 the challenges of reform, and tackling today’s
23 the challenges outside our borders concerns our security. Like those to our economic power and prosperity
24 challenge I want to speak about is regional

Concordance 4.15: 2-word concgrams security/challenge(s) in Straw, Beckett

Before moving on to the examination of the next concgrams, it is worth highlighting how in the line 20 from the above concordance, the term globalisation is categorised as a challenge and equated with terrorism and regional security. From a survey in the Bank of English of the collocational profile of challenge, this tendency to be negatively connotated was confirmed. Collocates such as legal, greatest, more amplify this negative ‘aura of meaning’ around challenge. What is argued here is that globalisation is also felt as a menace.

4.3.5 Security and the ‘environment’

Not one instance of the concgram security/climate was found in Cook and Straw’s speeches. Climate appears 35 in the Cook’s sub-corpus, but never
associated with *security* and neither it is in the Straw’s sub-corpus. The only collocation found in both ministers is *climate change* whereas in the Straw’s speeches *security* is only associated to *energy* in 9 citations. Hence, in the Beckett’s sub-corpus, the scenario changes and her main concern encompasses environmental threats, namely *climate* and *energy*.

Indeed, *climate* as collocate of *security* appears in the Beckett’s speeches for the first time on September 13th, 2006. The minister herself recognises the newly coined cluster by stating: “A year ago, when I became Foreign Secretary, the idea of ‘climate security’ was an alien one – to many inside the FCO as well as outside” (May 5th, 2007) and one month later she adds “But in less than a year climate security has become accepted *doctrine* - debated in the chamber of the United Nations Security Council itself” [emphasis added] (June 6th, 2007). In the light of this assertion, one might presume that ‘climate security’ was not an issue before Beckett’s tenure and only in the last year of Blair’s government she puts it at the heart of her foreign policy. This point is clearly proved by corpus evidence.

Concordances of the concgram *security/climate* show that the prototypical form is *climate security*, which allows constituency variation in lines from 91 to 98 in concordance 4.16, setting up a linkage with another cluster that is *energy security*. Considerable turbulence is exhibited in instance 99 (*So while an instable climate has obvious hard security implications*) or in line 101 (*the recognition of climate change as a core security issue*). Despite the dilution the attraction between *security* and *climate* is still strong and they are combined in ‘endocentric relation’, namely they create a single semantic entity. *Energy security and climate security* are either recognised as parallel clusters combined by the conjunction *and*, as in the first eleven concordances, or they are treated as two aspects of the same issue, as in the final concordances (e.g. *climate and energy security*). Whereas Cook is engaged with promoting the
strong connection between security and prosperity, Beckett is mainly concerned with the connection between energy security and climate security by employing the same language resource that is the relational process as best displayed in citation (51): energy security and climate security are now indivisible. These two adjacent concgrams are indicators of Beckett’s main concern and the negativity of their environment clearly suggests an unfavourable pragmatic load. Words like threat, challenge pre-modified by ‘inscribed appraisals’ such as ever-growing, greatest, serious, new, and attitudinal lexis like issue, struggle, tackling, effort, create an unpleasant aura around the phrases, which are described in terms of imperatives (9) to deal with. Prescription is implicit in the lexical choices. The word threat is now being used as a catch-all term to condemn a wide variety of phenomena from those which are germane to terrorism to those which are related to environmental issues. This word highlights the peremptory character of the question also emphasizing its alarming aspect. Beckett’s discourse of security seems to have a core that is global security with multifaceted aspects all coming from the semantic sphere of the natural environment. As she explains food, water, energy, climate are all ‘pillars’ of a system that is global security, hence dealing with one of those inevitably affects the whole system. Neglecting one of them, in her metaphorical instantiation, means having a house with extremely shaky foundations (32). The paradigmatic axis of concordances in concordance 4.16 shows the rhetoric of ‘cooperation’ when speaking of climate security through lexical and grammatical variation: cooperation (3), to meet our shared goals (10), collective (30), and the numerous instantiations of we and our. As already observed, emphasis is put by Beckett on the personal sphere of human beings as shown in line 30, where the collocation with individual features only her speeches.

The presence of these new collocations (climate security, energy security,
food security) may be seen as representations which circulate at a given time or better, to use a new expression in CL, they might be seen as ‘seasonal collocations’ (Baker et al. 2008). As Stubbs maintains (2002: 165) “it is individuals who produce individual texts, but these texts are not produced with complete freedom”. Relying on Foucault (1980) not all the subjects are alive prior to being talked about, but “they are brought into existence by the discourse itself” (ibid.) hence, the topics are linked to the power of the speakers.
global market for bio-fuels. Put simply, climate security creates commercial opportunity. And again, as challenges we face - energy security and climate security - both demand the same solution. So what’s the threat to our climate security comes not from outside but from within: we are New York. The UK had taken the issue of growing concerns over threats to our climate security at the heart of our foreign policy. We will not just as it is the reason why I have made And it is unsustainable in terms of our climate security. As we pump out more carbon emissions we are policy towards energy security and the recent UN Security Council debate on climate security last month. The Ghanaian representative, L.K. be it global trade and investment flows, climate security, energy security, cross-border crime, illegal our shared goals on energy security and in the FCO too. But in less than a year climate security has become accepted doctrine – debated in the Countries starting early this year. And climate security is almost the perfect instance of where the to this threat - I call it achieving climate security - a new strategic international priority for the the threat that defines our generation, climate security; a Europe that is at ease with the forces of a month. I was on the cusp of launching Climate Security as a new international strategic priority for the invaluable. Having raised the issue of climate security up the agenda and having put it on the table at we form a collective effort to achieve climate security. Consumers, politicians, NGOs, media, security with many people. Some of them are sceptical. I have discussed the link between climate and legislation – the Global Climate Change money laundering, building climate and energy to bring the requirements of climate and energy security into alignment, for example by combining Chinese climate, and energy at the moment: trade, and climate and energy Global issues – terrorism, climate and security, sustainable development – need common, global climate security. The MD round seems to be stalled. If we don’t have the recognition of climate change as a core issue today will, in my view, be treading in the The implications of climate change for our security are more fundamental and comprehensive than any had taken the issue of climate security to the of the links between climate security and the recognition of climate change as a core issue and investment flows, energy security, cross-border crime, illegal migration - is real determination. On climate change and energy security, we are using GOF money to bring about change in other words increasing energy efficiency security - not least with the Chinese and with Africa. An strong determination. On climate change and energy security: in other words increasing energy efficiency climate security and energy security: it is our job to get to the heart of our foreign policy. We will not put climate change on the agenda of the UN Security Council last month. Even then, we were surprised by climate security. And it will improve our energy security: making us less reliant on increasingly

Concordance 4.16: 2-word concgrams security/climate in Beckett

4.4 Is security an ambiguous concept?

Traditional definitions of ‘security’ as noticed in this chapter, point out the aspect of immunity from ‘any’ external menace, which may cause damage. The phrases from the dictionaries consulted have shown an inherently military semantic preference of the concept (risk, forces, measures, guard) whereas the non-military ‘company’ has been overlooked. What I have argued here is that in DiCo security ‘marries’ new collocates by the company of which it acquires new meanings. Concepts construed as non-arguable nominalizations (peace, stability, justice, freedom, prosperity) are its associated words in the three ministers’ speeches, even though with a different frequency. The high frequency of economic company that the term seems to favour (development, prosperity), reflects the dominant ideology of liberalism in the international setting and the notion of the promotion of
exchange and interdependence. As observed by Buzan (2000) during the Cold War the notion of ‘security’ was based on the dominant role of the state and the notion of state sovereignty. Quite different is the usage of security in Beckett’s corpus, where the abundance of items pertaining the natural surroundings (climate, energy, food, water), shifts the focus to closer environmental and personal issues.

Because of the plurality of its referents, security often has little definite content of its own and gives rise to semantic vagueness ascribed to the category of ‘broad ambiguity’ (see chapter 3, sub-section 3.3.1). For instance, we might wonder: does the conecgram ‘global security’ have geographical implications or does it refer to the concept as a whole? This ambiguity cannot be neatly compartmentalised and it serves the function of merging the allusion to internationalism and at the same time to the concept in its totality. As illustrated, this “wholeness” includes food, water, climate security for Beckett but not for Cook.

After September 11th, the scenario becomes more complex: the word ‘threat’ seems to be a buzzword and it is found to be a strong collocate of the word security. The main threat comes from the ambiguous expression “failed and failing states” and from “climate change” described also in terms of “man-made shocks”. The concept of ‘climate security’, an alien in Cook and Straw’s speeches, appears as Beckett’s major concern together with energy security. Climate and energy security acquire a sense of threat because we usually think of security against something harmful. Thus, again, do we speak in terms of ‘security against deterioration in the climate due to global warming’ or ‘for’, in the sense of protecting the climate? These ambiguous situations emerge while the meaning is in transition, which is after its adoption in language to reflect newly born realities to its adaptation and stabilization. Ambiguity is an asset and a design fault at the
same time, inevitable and indispensable, depending on what language areas it involves and on the addresser’s intentions. Words are polysemic and semantic differences imply different interpretations of reality but in the case of ‘climate security’ ambiguity is inescapable because it derives from language adjustments. This is in line with the post-structuralist view on the proliferation and of interpretation and fluidity of meaning. As Edelman observes (1988: 95) “ambiguity and subjectivity are neither deviations nor pathologies…they constitute the political world”. As Beckett herself explains the question:

I am optimistic that the wind is beginning to change. Two years ago the debate about the science of climate change was still going on. Today that debate – as it relates to the main findings of human-induced global warming – is effectively over” […] But though this conceptual change is starting to happen, it is not happening fast enough. Just as ‘energy security’ is now an accepted and central part of the hard security discourse, so too must be ‘climate security’ – not least indeed, as I will come to later, because of the very close links between those two agendas - tackle one and you are tackling the other. (10.05.07)

4.5 Concluding remarks

Drawing on the historical studies, the first two sections of this chapter have traced the main shift towards a more active and engaged diplomacy, which has blurred the borders between the domestic sphere and the international fora. The extraction of “conceptual knowledge” of the term diplomacy from DiCo has shown its multifaceted nature and conceptual complexity, but above all a sort of flexibility which mirrors the changing facto in the international setting.

Security is the main issue in the British foreign policy and its analysis has shown a continual evolution over these 10 years. It can be seen as a nucleus around which there is a cluster of arguments and other discourses,
identified through concgrams, such as economic (e.g. prosperity; development), military and political (peace and security), environmental (climate; energy) and humanitarian (freedom and justice). Dominant is the rhetoric of ‘commonality’ and ‘cooperation’ seen at work in the combination with ‘co-involving’ adjectives but also in the preponderant occurrences of the possessive pronoun ‘our’. Global as pre-modifier features the Beckett’s speeches in particular, showing her preference for the issue as a whole.

Security is undergoing a process of ‘rescaling’ and from its main traditional meaning linked to territorialisation, it is penetrating all levels of ‘governance’. Drawing on Fairclough (2006) these discourses can be seen as claims:
- the new era where borders are fuzzy is facing new challenges which require new responses;
- the search for security involves any layers of political, social and personal life as ever before.

The discourse appears as to be ‘interdiscursively hybrid’ “with the strategy offering a ‘bold vision’, which evokes the discourse of marketing rather than that of defence policy” (Fairclough 2006: 155) (see for instance the high frequency of binomials). What has been argued is a shift from ‘soft power’ to ‘hard power’ and the “emerging nexus of strategies and associated nodal discourses around which many other discourses cluster”. Figure 4.3 is an attempt to visualise the different discourses the collocates of security point at and the plotting links between the collocates themselves.

The ministers speak in terms of ‘moral values’ (the blending between national and global security and interests), which might be seen as a justification of ‘imperialism’ but in a new meaning that might be labelled as ‘civilising mission’ (Fairclough 2006: 157). Nevertheless, the highest frequency of prosperity as a collocate shifts the emphasis from moral to
economic interests. In conclusion, the state has lost its monopoly and as a consequence the concept of security has become less state-centric and more human as the instances of citizens and individual have shown in Beckett’s speeches.

Figure 4.3: Intercollocations of security in DiCo
CHAPTER FIVE

THE DISCOURSE OF SECURITY

5.1 From co-text to context: the ‘dialogic’ perspective

In the previous chapter we plunged into the analysis of the collocates of security pinning down its complex conceptualization and its development across ten years. Different linguistic categories have emerged which become ‘social categories’ (cf. Stubbs 1996): peace and security, security and prosperity, the threat to security and the issue of climate security.

Security is an interest, but the vicinity of other collocates which represent values such as freedom and justice construct it as a value, too. These positions have been instantiated co-textually through equation between collocates, often connected by the use of relational processes. Security is going through a process of re-scaling insofar it includes territorial values but also economic, political and environmental values as the occurrences of new ‘seasonal collocates’, mainly encompassing items semantically related to the environment (e.g. climate security), have demonstrated. Furthermore, lexical repetitions of items belonging to the semantic category of ‘alliance’ and ‘cooperation’ have pointed out the pervasiveness of the rhetoric of interdependency grounded on the recurrent instances of the possessive our.

Dominant is the oratory of internationalism and globalism which instantiates security as a common objective to achieve through a common shared will. The above cited ‘social categories’ will be now investigated in their wider context on the grounds of the ‘engagement system’ drawing on
the congruence revealed in the previous chapter.

More precisely, the analysis in this chapter will explore those mechanisms by which foreign ministers take a stance towards the proposition debated and the concurring or conflicting voices. The investigation of evaluation or stance is relevant in this context of study since it functions as indicator of speakers or writers’ opinion and thus expresses the value system of the speakers and their community (Hunston & Thompson 2000). This investigation is in line with White's attempt (2003) to respond to Stubbs’ aim to go beyond the category of ‘modality’ by including all those expressions of alignment to and detachment from what is referenced in the text. Modality is intended here in Stubbs’ words (1996: 202) as:

> the ways in which language is used to encode meanings such as degrees of certainty and commitment, or alternatively vagueness and lack of commitment, personal beliefs versus generally accepted or taken for granted knowledge. Such language functions to express groups membership, as speakers adopt positions, express agreement with others, make personal and social allegiances and contracts.

The point is that every propositional content encode a point of view towards it and the assumption underlying the approach adopted in this research is that the concordances work as pointers to a larger-scale discursive practices of which instances of speakers’ ideological value positions are usually part.

The approach is informed by Bakhtin’s notion of ‘dialogism’ and ‘heteroglossia’ ([1935] 1981; 1986), meaning that all verbal communication reveals the influence of what has been said before, setting up a dialogical relationship with other voices in the text. However, utterances may disregard the background against which they are set and in this case they are labelled as ‘monoglosses’. This dialogic perspective entails that
speakers/writers establish a community of (un)shared beliefs or value with those who have previously taken a stance towards the issue focus of the debate.

In the following analysis, which considers the second research question set out in the introduction to this study, I am interested in seeing whether key propositions discussing security as a key issue are formulated monoglossically or heteroglossically. Then, the investigation aims to see whether the minister’s point of view is dialogically ‘contractive’ or ‘expansive’. It is worth remembering, that as White points out (2006: 39), ‘attitudinal evaluations’ might be observed according to a range of more explicitly stated to less explicitly articulated. Thus, if formulations carry an attitudinal value they are labelled as ‘inscriptions’ otherwise they are termed as ‘attitudinal tokens’, which may trigger or provoke negative or positive responses. I am also concerned with looking at those wordings which rely on more indirect evaluative mechanisms, namely analogy and inference.

The analysis in this chapter is carried out as follows: first, we are dealing with the identification of evaluative keys around security and its appraisal relying on the reading of concordances; second, the tendency to construe a contractive stance and the discursive strategy of the ideology of ‘causation’ or ‘causality’ will be pointed out in the light of the analysis of the concgrams security/peace and security/prosperity; third, the concgram security/threat will reveal the ideology of ‘undesirable’. Then, the issue of security/climate will be considered on the basis of analogy. Finally, the analysis will focus on the ideology of nationhood which construes an image of strong commitment of the British country to the issue of security showing how this topic is also a means for ideological intent.

Before starting the analysis it is useful to keep in mind that ‘Appraisal’ works not on single words but its interpretation is based on the
so called “cumulative groove” the systemic counterpart for ‘semantic prosody’: the evaluative meaning is construed over stretches of text (Miller 2007: 164). For this reason those resources of ‘attitude’ that are instrumental in the analysis will be taken into account. As stated in chapter three, even though corpus-assisted the analysis in the following sections remains qualitative in its nature and the following notations are used:

- [MP] which stands for ‘power monoglosses’;
- [MS] is used for ‘solidarity monoglosses’;
- [±] indicate the negative or positive resources of ‘appreciation’ and ‘judgements’.
- the elements in the sentence that contribute to the identification of the resources of ‘engagement’ are boxed in.

Finally, the items which are relevant to the analysis are underlined.

5.2 Axiology – value orientation in the discourse of security

From an evaluative perspective the discourse of security is primarily organized around several semantic motifs, namely points of attitudinal alignment which can be described as follows:

- **positive valuation** and **negative composition** with the latter leading to
- **concern** for the lack of security> *there is a lot more that we have to be doing on climate security;*
- **participation**> *Our future security and prosperity depend on both working together to pursue common interests.*
- **repulsion**> *they seek to paralyse and impoverish the world;*
- **support** to the Government’s arguments justifying the Iraqi war;
- **pride** for Britain’s actions.

Some of these orientations are not evident at the surface level of the text, they are interrelated one another and this interconnection brings about the
rhetorical effect of the discourse.

5.2.1 The ‘Appraisal’ of security: closing off any alternative
In this sub-section the appraisal of security built on the two following semantic categories is focused on:
1. ‘valuation’: ‘security’ is a crucial value, it represents self and mutual interests and, hence, it is relevant at both national and international level;
2. negative ‘composition’: ‘security’ is instantiated as a desirable and good goal, based on a network of alliances, but this goal is not completely achieved and much work has still to be done. Hence, the resource of ‘composition’ is construed through an ideal representation of the concept often based on assertive formulations (e.g. the security of our nation depends on foreign contacts). The conflation of these two evaluative positions is instantiated in the following citation, which is ‘contractive’ in its formulation:

1. JACK STRAW: Security is vitally important [+VALUATION] [MP]: we were much more recently reminded of how important [+VALUATION] it is to fight global terrorism by the appalling [-REACTION] attacks in Istanbul on 15 and 20 November [PROJECTION]. But security cannot be isolated from other issues [-COMPOSITION] [DISCLAIM: COUNTER/DENIAL].

Here security is appraised in terms of positive ‘valuation’ (important) intensified by the adverb vitally and by the marked syntactic position of the adjective itself in the passive construction of the ‘projection’ (we were reminded of). The ‘enhancement’, introduced by the counter-expectational but, adds further information to the ‘composition’ of security by emphasising its connection to the other issues revealing an unplanned, not systemic concept of security.
Equally, relevance features Cook’s discourse of security by sorting to an intertextual element from the Renaissance. “No man is an island” is called to the reader’s mind in a modified and dynamically modalized version which functions as resource of ‘judgement’ of negative [-capacity] (no nation can be an island) if working in isolation. John Donne’s recurring imagery of the island and the mainland¹, points out that no one man, and in our case no nation, can exist on its own, cut off from all the rest of society.

2. ROBIN COOK: There is no higher national interest for our foreign policy than the promotion of our national security [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].
   In the context of international security, no nation can be an island [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]—not even such a distinguished [JUDGEMENT: +NORMALITY] island state as Britain [DISCLAIM: DENIAL/COUNTER].

A sharp contrast between isolationism and interconnectedness is thus set up and it is further voiced through the positive ‘judgement’ of ‘social esteem’, [+normality] for Britain: distinguished island. Even though considered a successful and respectful country Britain, that is an island in its physical nature, cannot achieve security and thus prosperity, if it does not rely on the security of other countries. The speaker’s assertiveness is here corroborated by the use of the comparative form, which ranks ‘security’ as the first priority of foreign policy and the ‘contractive’ formulation There is no higher national interest objectivises his position.

The introductory bare assertion in Beckett’s citation conveys a heightened personal investment that is also evident in Beckett’s attitude to security. Moreover, it evokes feeling of positive judgement [+capacity], for Britain which succeeded in the drawing the Security Council’s attention to

¹ Margaret Thatcher used the same quotation in her speech on December 18th 1979: “Today it is painfully obvious that no man – and no nation – is an island.
the issue of climate security. Indeed, in Beckett’s speeches, resources of ‘appreciation’, worded as ‘valuation’, are employed to identify climate change as a core security issue. Nevertheless, the use of a mental verb in negative polarity (I do not exaggerate) seems to indicate an effort to gain credibility:

3. MARGARET BECKETT: The UK had taken the issue of climate security to the Security Council for the first time [MP]— I do not exaggerate when I say that this was a true landmark [+REACTION] [PRONOUNCEMENT]. It marked the recognition of climate change as a core security issue [MP].

4. MARGARET BECKETT: The implications of climate change for our security are more fundamental and comprehensive than any single conflict [MP].

In her defending the importance of the question of climate security, Beckett does not hesitate to sort to an analogy with conflict. The use of this ‘inscription’ does not leave the attitudinal position open: given the British democratic system of values any conflict is condemned and the analogy has the effect of evoking its consequences.

The other axiological orientation of combined effort and collective participation to achieve security is expressed in an assertive way and the use of monoglosses plays here a crucial role. According to White (2003: 263) the ‘bare assertion’ construes either ‘solidarity’ or ‘power’. ‘Solidarity monoglosses’ present indisputable ‘factual’ versions of events, whereas in ‘power monoglosses’ the textual voice takes on the status of moral authority and excludes any alternatives. The point here is that the principle of ‘cooperation’ (which implies an opposition with ‘isolation’), permeates all the acclaimed values around ‘security’ (e.g. interdependence between economic and political dimension; the supremacy of international law and the European integration) and is encoded through un-negotiated statements of power which reveal its unquestionable aspect:
5. ROBIN COOK: To deny that Britain is European is to deny both our geography and our history. Our culture, our security, and our prosperity, are inseparable from the continent of Europe. [MS]

6. ROBIN COOK: The prosperity and the security of our nation depend on foreign contacts. [MP]

7. ROBIN COOK: Promoting our values enhances our prosperity, and reinforces our security. [MP]

8. ROBIN COOK: Our national security depends on NATO. [MP]

9. ROBIN COOK: Our security depends on the strength of our alliances and safety on our streets depends on the resolve of the international community in maintaining the peace. [MP]

10. ROBIN COOK: European integration has been a major force for security and freedom in Europe for the last fifty years. [MP]

11. JACK STRAW: Our future security and prosperity depend on both working together to pursue common interests. [MS]

12. ROBIN COOK: The past three weeks has carried with it the very important message [PROJECTION] that vital to the freedom and security of Europe is the partnership between America and Europe, a partnership which goes back to the last war.

These citations set up an “undialogised” environment where the authorial voice is construed as a single voice and is highly invested. As White maintains (2003: 263), these types of declarations are typically found where:

there is an assumption of ontological, epistemic and axiological commonality between voice and audience, where the addressee is assumed to operate with the same knowledge, beliefs and values as those relied upon by the proposition. The undialogized bare utterance typically operates when this commonality is assumed not to be at risk or in doubt.

Thus, the undeniable fact in segment number (5) is that Britain is geographically and historically part of Europe. The other monoglosses (6; 7; 11) reveal what has emerged as the critical aspect in security discourse, namely the interdependence between security and prosperity, construed only through ‘relational processes’. Segment (9) enacts persuasion by
triggering alarming emotions: *the safety on our streets* implies the potential presence of danger everywhere and in so doing everybody feels involved. In example (10) the speaker is appraising the relevance of ‘European integration’ to the discourse of security in terms of ‘valuation’: the fact of being a *major force* evokes feelings of positive ‘reaction’ [+secure].

Moreover, the proposition is soaked with a certain degree of ‘taken-for-grantedness’ due to historical evidence, given by the adjunct ‘for the last fifty years’. The tendency towards ‘atlanticism’ is ‘projected’ in citation (12) which, combined with the resource of ‘valuation’ [+importance] (*vital*), stimulates positive judgements of evaluation. As White maintains (2003: 265), the bare assertion works by itself as an unquestionable proposition and thus, ‘modal’ in a broad sense: what is assumed not to be at risk is the significance of security and its compositional nature, which requires a network of alliances. Sometimes the border between resources of ‘valuation’ and those of ‘judgement’ (capacity) is obfuscated, as in citation (15) for example, where the significance of alliances is worded in terms of positive ‘appreciation’ (advantages of partnership have been showed through history) but also ‘capacity’ for setting up partnership.

The following instances are other examples of the instantiation of the semantic motif of participation and cooperation through heterogloss but where different elements contribute to make them assertive:

13. ROBIN COOK: *We have learnt* that we can achieve more *security* for our nations by *integrating* our markets and our economies than we *ever* achieved by arming frontiers that kept us apart [CONCUR: CONCEDE].

14. ROBIN COOK: *We have learnt* that we can have greater *security* by *bringing down* barriers than by building walls between us [CONCUR: CONCEDE]

15. ROBIN COOK: Britain’s alliance with the United States has *of course* been the *anchor* of our *security* for half a century [CONCUR: AFFIRMATION].
16. ROBIN COOK: Through the Stability Pact we are sharing with the countries of the Balkans the key lesson of post-war Europe - that the best formula for security is not arming our frontiers [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] but dismantling barriers to trade, mobility, and cooperation [DISCLAIM: COUNTER + ENHANCEMENT].

17. ROBIN COOK: The most positive development for our security over the past year has been the strengthened alliance between London and Washington [MP].

I assume the utterances (13) and (14) as being ‘concurring’ formulations in that, by grounding the proposition on past experience, through the inclusive-we cluster we have learnt, the speaker sets out only one position, once again integration as the only strategy to the problem of enhancing security. The same aim is instantiated in citation (15) through the use of the contractive locution of course, which projects the audience as sharing the speaker’s positive view that alliance (again with the USA), rooted in a half century of history, is the core of security. The occurrence of the attitudinal ‘inscription’ anchor triggers positive response of ‘security’ and ‘stability’ and, therefore, by giving a capacity-oriented representation of Britain, the speaker presents himself as aligned with the construed audience, as having the same knowledge and belief. This image of anchor [+valuation], relationally construed, reinforces the idea of security as a value achievable through integration and ‘naturalises’ the ideological position of ‘atlanticism’ via an ‘inscribed’ metaphor. This of course echoes Blair’s governmental decision that UK interests were best served by remaining Washington’s closest ally and by promoting ‘US leadership’.²

These citations put the past in terms of lesson by using “the method of fictional realism in rhetoric” (Pehar 2000: 130) and can be interpreted as positive ‘appreciation’ of ‘relations of means’. If we look in particular at

instances (13), (14) and (15) we notice the presence of ‘circumstances’ introduced by the external conjunction by. The focus here is on ‘ability’: the international community will be able to integrate markets or destroy barriers. This metaphor may be interpreted as ‘barriers-mean-lack-of-alliances’ and bringing down barriers is praised positively via the criticism of the same, but missed opportunity, during WWII. Since arming frontiers brought about negative effects, therefore, the opposite is now desirable. Ideational meaning is instrumental in the construction of the evaluation: all the alliances from the past have shown their validity and thus persevering in this direction helps achieving the goal of more security.

The practice of the legitimation of new strategies on the basis of past experience (lesson of post-war Europe, segment 16) is a usual practice in diplomacy where decision-makers recur to past analogies to “make their views broadly acceptable” (Pehar 2000: 117) and hence, I would add, strongly evaluative. In this strategy, words like lesson(s) and the verb learn play a key role in that functioning as ‘tokens’ of evaluation. To put it starkly, the positive ‘appreciation’ [+beneficial] is triggered in these citations in that the alignment of the audience is ensured through the experiential value. It might also be worth noting that the rhetorical strategy of representing the British community as being keen on its past alliances is worded in terms of judgement of ‘social esteem’ in particular ‘capacity’. The reference to past events is seen as having a persuasive function “not just as an attempt to convince the listener of the rightness of a political position or of a certain course of action, but as a legitimation strategy, involving a justification of controversial or criticised actions” (Dibattista 2004: 158) that in our case might be the American partnership.

If the citations analysed above plunge the listeners into the past to substantiate their position, the tool of analogy as setting up a comparison
by similarity is enacted in citation (18):

18. ROBERT COOK: Without peace there will no be lasting security [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. We ourselves in Britain know from our experience in Northern Ireland how difficult [+CAPACITY] it can be to put aside long-standing suspicion and hostility [AFFECT], and work together for a common goal of peace [MP: PROJECTION]. The last few days have reminded us [MENTAL PROJECTION] that too many people are still prepared to sacrifice the common good for partisan advantage [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. Yet Northern Ireland also shows [DISCLAIM: COUNTER] that you do not have to accept a stale-mate. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

The appeal work together for a common goal is another variation which instantiates the rhetoric of cooperation. Here the problem of achieving peace in the world and the same issue in Ireland, a country that has always had a prominent role in British history, invites the listener to reason inductively, namely to assume that certain things are true by grounding them on analogous past experience. The speaker is contrasting two different situations united by a common goal: peace which brings security. In so doing a high degree of ‘tolerance’ is shown as characterising Britain through its ‘capacity’ to overcome hostility for a good objective. The use of the pronoun we, which refers unambiguously to the British people, the occurrence of the epistemic know and the monoglossic formulation, leave no space for embracing a different view:

As shown, the concept of ‘security as a value achievable only through networking is pervasive in the corpus and it is intensified by recurrent words from the same semantic sphere: alliances, links, partners, network, partnership or through material processes (work together). What comes into the picture, as noticed in the previous chapter, is ‘overwording’ (Fairclough 1989: 115) which involves nearly synonymous words and has the ideological function of repeating the crucial concept of unity against
isolation or put differently it aims to render isolationism anachronistic with reference to globalisation. Furthermore, the evidence so far illustrates a strong preference for nominal choices that, as I will show later in this chapter (sub-section 5.2.3), also invades the field of ‘projection’.

Drawing on the findings displayed so far, table 5.1 is an attempt to sum up the resources used in DiCo to appraise the value of ‘security’. Italics indicate the elements from the corpus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Lexical realizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>landmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>international</td>
<td>Unfinished &gt;</td>
<td>more security; greater security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>global</td>
<td></td>
<td>promoting our values reinforces our security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td></td>
<td>more security by integrating our markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak &gt;</td>
<td>will deepen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by dismantling barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>there is a lot more that we have to be doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on climate security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Appreciation of security in DiCo (cf. Martin 2000; 2003; 2005)

This high frequency of resources of ‘appreciation’ may find its reason in the inherent character of the diplomatic speeches, namely explaining the foreign policy choices depending on past failure or success. As mentioned at the beginning of this work, diplomacy is undergoing a process of change and, as instances have shown, continuity with the past is also relevant. Appraising security as important, vital means having fundamental consequences in social life by its implementation and this explains the focus on the ‘ability’ to set up alliances. Britain is therefore taken as example of the ‘capacity’ to achieve this purpose. Thus, far from being neutral, the speaker is going through a process of interpretation.
The last point to highlight in this section brings us back to the segment (8) (Our national security depends on NATO. [MP]) which enacts a connection with NATO through the usual relational process. This is another value position that is, expectedly, ‘unhedged’ in the discourse of security. The legally recognized existence of this institutional reference constitutes a constant yardstick in the corpus. The respect for legality and supra-national institutions is highly recognized and it is always instantiated through ‘undialogized’ positions as in the following instance where the first bare assertion provokes judgements of admiration for the institutional work:

19. Jack Straw: the United Nations has saved lives by the million, and saved millions more from fear, poverty and tyranny [MS]. Without the United Nations, there could have been no salvation for the people of East Timor, no prospect of lasting peace in Sierra Leone, no-one to help rebuild Afghanistan [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].

In this citation, the evaluation of the UN is construed more on experiential meaning which is instantiated through a peculiar conditional formulation where the ‘premise’, placed in thematic position, is the starting point of a series of realisations which, in this case, are also worded as parallelisms which contribute to the persuasive power. The positive appraisal of the UN, which can also be seen as ‘token’ of positive judgement of ‘social esteem’, and the ensured solidarity with the audience relies on the following resources: denial, un-negotiated condition, ideational meaning as positive token of evaluation. The rule of the law, predictably, is an unquestionable value in the corpus. The effects of the action of these international institutions are seen as positive and therefore a continuity of relation with them is contemplated to achieve security. Putting the emphasis on the favourable results, this finding can be also interpreted in the light of the
ideology of ‘casuality’ which brings us to the next sub-section.

5.2.2 Attaining peace to reach security and prosperity: the ideology of ‘casuality’

In the previous sub-section we have noticed how the circumstantial adjuncts (e.g. by integration) have construed interpersonal meaning through the interaction of ‘appreciation’. In this sub-section we attend to another semantic category that is extensively used in DiCo: the cause. Let us start from the observation of the following segment which looks at security in association with the nominalisations found in the previous chapter. An opposition is here given by a bifurcation implicitly constructed between ‘us’ and ‘them’ voiced also as industrialised vs. poor countries:

20. COOK: The industrialised nations have enjoyed half a century of peace. [MS] That has provided the security and good order in which their prosperity has advanced at a rate without precedent. [MS] Yet, in the same half-century, peoples elsewhere on the globe have lived through violence and conflicts, which have broken their human rights and impoverished their standard of living. [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. It is largely poor countries that now experience the scourge of war.

Security is the pivotal element that guarantees peace, order and wealth whereas the lack of it is a source of disorder, war and poverty. The opposition is lexically and co-textually construed once again from a historical perspective:

-industrialised nations vs. poor countries;
-order vs. conflicts (namely disorder);
-prosperity vs. impoverished (poverty is the result);
-peace vs. war.

The argumentative ground given initially, security as basis for good order, is then countered in order to show the consequences of the opposed historically supported case. Such counters “are aligning rather than
disaligning in that they construe the speaker as sharing this axiological paradigm with the reader” (Martin and White 2005: 121). The discourse of ‘security’ is thus legitimised through this well-built binary opposition: ‘security’ excludes automatically war and poverty, or better, wealth and order are the pillars to build up ‘security’. Attitudinal lexis (in italics) and experiential grammar contribute to construct assumed-to-be-shared evaluation, which brings the hearers to share the empathy (cf. Miller 2004) for the western country and concern for the poor ones.

The concgram security/peace, more frequently used by Cook, is construed according to what I call the metaphor of the order/peace-as-a-pathway-to security3, which is worded in terms of ‘disclaims’. The segment analysed is a clear example of the ideology of causality which was found to have connection with processes of change (Coffin 2000: 342). This means that the main intent is the assessment of the degree of causal force in historical events and “valuation resources are critical in meeting this purpose” (ibid.). The following utterances are formulated according to the pattern ‘without X…no Y’ that is ‘without peace no security’. A relation of conditional causality is clearly evident and its instantiation through negative polarity closes off any alternative, namely there is no sign that these propositions operate within a continuing debate.

21. ROBIN COOK: According to the recent opinion polls over 60% of the Israeli public want to see their government accept the current US package to break the log-jam on the peace process [MS]. Mr Netanyahu was elected on a commitment to peace with security [MS]. Most of the Israeli people, including many who voted for him, know that without a just peace there will be no lasting security [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].

22. ROBIN COOK: Britain has long and strong [+VALUATION] ties with Israel. We have consistently [+TENACITY] supported the Israeli people’s right to security [MS]. And it is worth remembering that they

---

3 Vasta in her cross-cultural study of the debate from the House of Commons (2004: 113) found a similar metaphorical construction: “war-as-a-pathway-to-peace”.

99
elected the present government because of Mr Netanyahu’s promise to deliver peace with security. The Israeli people know that without peace there can be no real, lasting security. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

23. ROBIN COOK: The Palestinians will not find a just solution on their homeland without peace [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. We will not resolve the hardship of the refugees without peace. But the Israelis will not find true security without peace [DISCLAIM: COUNTER-ENHANCEMENT]. That is why Britain regards itself as a friend of the Palestinians, and also a friend of the Israelis - because we are friend to peace [JUSTIFICATION].

By sorting to ‘denial’, the speaker is negating that the Israeli and the Palestinians will enjoy security if stability is not introduced and, in so doing, he is distancing any addressee’s ‘entertain’ of supporting the opposite view. He does so also by using the epistemic or grammar fact know (21; 22) which increases the degree of ‘realizability’ of the cause-condition (if there is no peace). The position is also emphasised through the repetition of the same structure. Likewise, as disorder brings about insecurity for the Middle East, the same formulation is employed with reference to Europe: without a complete integration no security is conceivable. The subjectivised epistemic verb (I believe) introduces a feeling of ‘dissatisfaction’ with the current situation of cooperation with Russia and integration would be the right solution:

24. ROBIN COOK: I believe there is more to be done, not just to cooperate more with Russia, but to include that country back into the mainstream of European life [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. Without close Russian involvement, no security system for Europe is credible [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].

25. JACK STRAW: we all have an interest in seeing peace and security entrenched, because insecurity and tension, however far away, can affect us all [JUSTIFICATION].

26. JACK STRAW: As a sovereign state, our strength is enhanced by the strength of our alliances: [MP] our
security and prosperity depend on our ability to influence events in the rest of our continent and the rest of the world, not on our ability to stop others from influencing us [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].

The link between security and prosperity is expressed in terms of relational processes (entrenched, depend on) in Straw’s speeches where there is a preference for resources of nominal ‘affect’ (tension and insecurity). The ideology of ‘cause’ is here expressed incongruently, namely through ‘grammatical metaphor’ (Halliday 1985: 321): tension and insecurity can affect all. This choice may be due to Straw’s preference for negative nominalised lexical items which serve, as shown later, ideological purposes.

As noticed, negatives are pervasive in diplomatic discourse and this matches our finding about the strong collocational relation between security and no above all in Cook’s speeches (see Appendix 4).

In denials contesting positions are addressed and set aside; their use highlights more semantic content with respect to an affirmative formulation insofar “semantically, negation belongs to the realm of the non-realized” (Miestamo 2005: 196). Indeed, the foreign ministers indicate their objectives (security, peace, prosperity) as non-attainable if some conditions are not achieved. By negating an event the speaker is reporting the absence of ‘stability’, hence a status which requires change. These ‘denials’ present the speaker as having expertise in this area and as intervening to adjust some misconceptions of the addressee’s part (Martin and White 2005: 119).

Furthermore, studies on denials recognize “many typological similarities between negatives and other non-realized contexts, such as questions and conditionals” (Miestamo 2005: 196). Biber’s research (1988: 107) considers conditionals as playing a significant role in the textual dimensions as ‘overt expression of persuasion’ and involved in argumentative discourse and, therefore, seen as markers of affect or stance.
in relation to the beliefs being debated. Most of the conditional instances in \textit{DiCo} are of the ‘hypothetical’ nature (see Taylor 1997)\footnote{“In a \textit{FACTUAL} conditional, the content of the if-clause is presumed to be the case, whilst in a \textit{COUNTERFACTUAL} the content of the if-clause is taken to be the contrary to fact. Between these categories stand the \textit{HYPOTHETICAL} conditionals, in which the content of the if-clause is entertained as a possibility, neither in accordance with reality, nor inconsistent with it.” (Taylor 1997: 301)} and thus classified as ‘irrealis’, where other possibilities are entertained:

27. \textsc{Robin Cook}: \textit{If we value} our national security, we must work for international stability. \textit{If we value} our prosperity, we must promote international trade and \textit{if we value} our freedoms, we must demonstrate that by supporting the same freedoms for others \texttt{[Entertain]}.

In the segment (27) Cook construes a series of truth-value protases from which the inference cannot deviate from the speaker’s viewpoint: after introducing the premise, \textit{if we value}, an effect follows. The speaker is certain that people desire those values stated in the premise and the consequences acquire validity and are expressed according to a principled guideline based on deontic modality. The parallelisms used intensify the persuasive function of the clauses. On the basis of this evidence, we might infer that Cook only apparently sorts to hypothetical formulations to entertain, because contraction is worded through the use of \textit{must} as well as through obligation implied in the consequentiality. The parallelism is also used to persuade and to soften his tough attitude.

An interesting variation of this conditional construction is based on the comparative correlatives as shown in the following segment:

28. \textsc{Robin Cook}: In that globalised world there is a hard headed national interest for that. \texttt{[The more countries]} that make the transition to democracy like Serbia, \texttt{[The more partners]} we will have for peace and security. The \texttt{[more countries]} that obey the rule of
law, the sounder will they be as partners with us to trade and invest in.

What I suggest here is that the comparative pattern *the more...the more* may be seen as form of logical consequentiality which can be included in the pattern preferred in *DiCo*. The second clause instantiates the effect determined by the first part of the sentence which contains the premise. The use of the comparative *more* presupposes the fact that there are already countries which are changing their status becoming ‘democracy’, like Serbia, and that the number of these nations can be increased. This pattern is extensively used in the corpus and most of the instances concern the future of Britain as in the following segment:

29. It is in Britain’s interest that we are a leading partner in it. The *stronger* Europe is in the world the stronger will be Britain. The more Europe embraces economic reform, *the more prosperous* will be Britain. *The more* Europe co-operates to defeat organised crime *the safer* will be the streets of Britain. *The more* successful Europe is in the negotiations to halt climate change *the better* will be Britain’s environment. And the more Europe’s military capacity for crisis management the *stronger* will be the security of Britain [EXPANSION].

Considering the equation between *security* and *prosperity*, the pattern is also valid for *prosperity*, occurring, in the above segment, under the adjectival form. These patterns of preference were always found in the conclusive part of the speech showing also a rhetorical function in that leaving the audience with the expectations of further developments of already implemented events. These patterns instantiate what the ideology of ‘causation’: once the initial premise is stated, it unchains a set of ripple-effects which imply potential developments. These patterns are summarized in table 5.2:
Patterns of preference | Instances from the corpus
---|---
Without X.....no Y..... | Without peace there can be no real, lasting security
More X.....more Y | The more countries that make the transition to democracy like Serbia, the more partners we will have for peace and security
If X.....then Y..... | If we value our national security, we must work for international stability.

Table 5.2 Patterns of preference illustrating the ideology of ‘causation’

5.2.3 security/threat(s): the ideology of the ‘undesirable’:

In order to grasp the expected different scenario found in Straw’s discourse on security due to his confrontation with terrorist attacks, let us start from the following citation:

30. JACK STRAW: By spreading fear, they [terrorists] seek to paralyse and impoverish the world, so that our security, our freedoms and our prosperity decline together. [CONSEQUENTIALITY]

This hypotactic formulation prefaced by a circumstance, which functions as ‘means’, highlights the ‘ability’ of the terrorists to put into practice a set of negative actions. The segment contains negative attitudinal items (fear, paralyse, impoverish, decline) and terrorists are depicted as the main responsible for the degeneration, given their position as ‘actors’ in the sentence. The resource of evoked ‘judgement’ based on ‘impropriety’ glosses terrorism as a menace to security and Straw constructs a pervasive emotional negative axiology enacting the emergency semantics of fear, poverty, and paralysis.

As observed in the previous chapter, the most frequent collocate of security in Straw’s sub-corpus is threat which occurring mostly as a noun does not have a specific temporal location. A look at the concordances below shows that the coneagram threat/security is embedded in a context of
certainty from the speaker, where patterns like no one can doubt that (32; 33) mark emphatic conviction and signal the truth value of the proposition which is not debatable. Likewise, in the following citations the same functional meaning is instantiated through the modalized expression we can no longer ignore (34), which has the same basic function of asserting the speaker’s strong conviction and at the same time excluding an alternative view, with the ultimate aim of making the audience align because evidence does not allow any different position:

31. JACK STRAW: After the murder of thousands of people in the heart of Manhattan, no one can doubt that the primary threat to our security is now posed by groups acting formally outside states, or from places where no state functions. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

32. JACK STRAW: No one can now doubt that a primary threat to our security comes from groups which act outside states and the rules of the international community, or from places where the state and the rule of law do not function. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

33. JACK STRAW: The appalling lesson of 11 September is that we can no longer ignore the challenge, or indeed other potential threats to our security. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

34. JACK STRAW: Then came 9/11 [MS]. We saw with terrible clarity that unstable, failing states did not have to be right on our borders to be a direct danger to our security. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] We understood, even more clearly that tackling threats to international peace and security – including global terrorism and proliferation – relied on dealing with problems at source, as they arose, not allowing them to fester. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

35. JACK STRAW: This reflects a common perception that Saddam’s appetite for WMD, when married to his willingness to use all possible means to repress his own people and intimidate his neighbours, makes him a unique threat to international peace and security [PRONOUNCEMENT].

These patterns fall within a group of dialogically contracting meanings, labelled as ‘proclamation’, where the “textual voice conveys a
heightened personal investment in the viewpoint being advanced and thereby explicitly indicates an interest in advancing that viewpoint, typically against some opposed alternative” (White 2003: 269). In number (35) the wordings we saw with terrible clarity and we understood intensified by the evaluative formulations terrible and even more clearly, represent the textual voice as concurring to admit what is evident once again. Since terrorism and WMD constitute a threat to security, as shown by September 11th terrorist attacks, that is a historical and undeniable event, pre-emptive action (dealing with problems at source, segment 34) is justified. The equation is the following: WMD =failing states=terrorism > insecurity.

This sorting to ‘pronouncements’ shows an emphasis on the insistence to convince the hearers of the inevitability of the consequences, which imply the presence of some resistance.

An example of ‘endorsement’ is found in the extract (36) where the pattern this reflects the common perception, working retrospectively, indicates that the textual voice is corroborating the common view that Saddam is a unique threat to security. Furthermore, appetite here works as ‘token’ of attitudinal meaning: it connotes Saddam’s voracity, while repress and intimidate, are categorized as processes of the “mental affection” typology5 and thus having a persuasive function. The “cumulative effect” triggers feelings of ‘impropriety’ such as [-legality; -humanity; -responsibility]. Accordingly, the addressee who might dissent from this negative representation is the minority, namely at odds with the “solidarity affiliation constructed for the modelled reader” (White 2003: 277).

Similarly, segment (36) offers another example of the instantiation of

5 “Whereas mechanisms of convincing and conviction obviously work mainly along cognitive argumentative lines, seduction [=persuasion], instead of trusting in the truth and/or credibility of arguments, rather exploits the outward appearance and seeming trustworthiness of the persuader” (Sornig 1989: 87)
the ideology of ‘legitimate use of force’ through the speaker’s contraction which closes off the few expressions of dialogism.

36. JACK STRAW: The paradox we face is that the only way we are going to achieve disarmament by peace of a rogue regime, [DISCLAIM: COUNTER] that all of us know has been in defiance of this Council for the past 12 years [COGNITIVE PROJECTION], the only way we can achieve their disarmament of their weapons of mass destruction, which this Council has said [VERBAL PROJECTION] poses a threat to international peace and security, is by backing our diplomacy with a credible threat of force [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. I wish [AFFECT] we lived in a different world where this was not necessary, but sadly we live in this world and the choice, Dominique, is not ours as to how this disarmament takes place, the choice is Saddam Hussein’s. It’s his choice [MP]. Would that it were ours because it would be so easy, [ENTERTAIN] but sadly it is not. [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]

37. JACK STRAW: The Security Council last night was therefore absolutely correct [JUDGEMENT: +VERACITY], in calling for the unconditional release of the hostages, to reaffirm that terrorism is one of the most serious threats to international peace and security [PROJECTION].

The contractive attitude is the result of the cumulative evaluative effect of the strategies altogether. But let us consider them individually. The attitudinal item which introduces the segment, paradox, indicates perplexity from the speaker who cancels any doubts by employing the countering the only way twice: he is rejecting ‘alterity’ and supporting his stance through the ‘verbal projection’ that the Council considers the weapons of mass destruction a threat to security. The explicit subjectivity expressing a strong desire for a different situation is substantiated by the ‘modal adjunct’ (sadly) that expresses negative ‘Affect’, as ‘comment’, and is concerned with the variable of un/happiness. The space for dialogism ‘would that it were ours because it would be so easy’ is immediately sealed with a wording which

---

6 Other studies have already put forward a similar aspect, see Vasta (2004).
combines the counter-expectational *but* and the negation preceded by another occurrence of objectivised ‘affect’ (*sadly*). In other words, the solution manifested, namely the use of ‘a credible threat of force’, is introduced as the only possible answer to terrorism represented here by Saddam Hussein. The intensification which amplifies discourse and enacts emotions of self-pity (*the only way, when, sadly*), the use of the counter (*but*) uncover the speaker’s cautious attitude which reverberates through the surrounding discourse.

Endorsement is also at work in citation (37) through the use of the intensified (*absolutely*) evaluative adjective *correct* [Judgement: +veracity] representing the speaker’s position as generally held or as taking up what has been previously said by the Security Council and hence, safeguarding his propriety and veracity.

A less assertive attitude noticed in the citation (37) is also visible in the segment (38), which deals with the military aspect of the issue. The speaker ‘entertains’ dialogic ‘expansion’ by the use of the modal *may*, immediately followed by the formal pattern *in extremis*, which restricts the applicability of his proposition: the force (*military response*) will be used only if the situation is so difficult to require extreme methods. Even though the speaker allows dialogic space, nevertheless, the use of the modalised formulation *we would all agree that*, together with a very negatively connoted lexis, provoke a reaction that aligns the audience with the speaker in his position of stopping this ‘disease’. *Contagion* in particular constitutes an attitudinal item, which causes a negative reaction in that it makes tangible the idea of global contamination:

38. **JACK STRAW:** And we would all agree that the threats to our security—*from terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and chaos and contagion from failing states—*may* in extremis require a military response. [EXPANSION: ENTERTAIN]
Such an intensely negative potential setting has little chance to attract the receiver (cf. Miller 2002). Citizens are manipulated into believing that society has become increasingly insecure. A firm premise of solidarity is visible in Straw’s citations: he always sorts to attitudinal lexis (menace, undermine, conflict, diseases, malaria) and experiential material (the displacement of people from their land) which has the potential to provoke a negative ‘reaction’ in the hearer via process of inference, as in segment (39):

39. JACK STRAW: The threat is no less intense for being longer-term [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. It is not just an environmental menace, [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] but one which can undermine our security and our well-being [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. It is a potential source of conflict over scarce resources, from the displacement of people from their land and from the spread of tropical diseases such as malaria. [MP]

40. JACK STRAW: I know that many disagreed [VERBAL PROJECTION] with the action the British government took in joining military action against Iraq [PROJECTION]. But I ask them to reflect on [DISCLAIM: COUNTER] how dangerous the world would be today if we had shown that 17 mandatory UN Resolutions over 12 years were merely empty words [ENTERTAIN: INDIRECT QUESTION]. The big question left unanswered by those who still disagree with our military intervention, is this [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]: what would you do to protect global security from a regime which threatens regional or international stability, and places itself defiantly beyond the reach of the international system on which our security depends? [EXPOSITORY QUESTION] These are questions we and our partners must now grapple with, co-operatively and creatively. We cannot ignore them [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. The modern world is too dangerous for that [MP].

41. JACK STRAW: When we face determined terrorists [JUDGEMENT: -TENACITY] and terrible threats to our national security, our response needs to be proportionate [+REACTION] and in line with our commitments under international law, including international human rights law. When we ask others to open up their markets and sign up to international standards we can’t respond to outside competition ourselves with a knee-jerk return [JUDGEMENT: -NORMALITY] to protectionism [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. And when we say that we will do all that we can to help
the poorest in the world [EVOKED JUDGEMENT: +PROPRIETY] we must honour our commitments on aid and debt after the cameras have been switched off. [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]

In the segment (40), wordings of judgements are mainly negative and are based on social sanction: murder, unstable, danger, rogue regime, repression. This condemnation is enhanced by the use of dialogically contractive values of objectivised pronouncements and counters, which are mainly employed to promote his reading of Saddam’s lack of ‘veracity’, as the main responsible of the Iraqi war. This point is clearly illustrated when the speaker, subjectively, recognizes (I know) the presence of British people who do not agree with the choices made with respect to Iraq. Furthermore, in his effort to persuade them to see the opposite as true, his stance becomes ‘challenging’ by using the resource of direct and indirect question.

The utterance containing the question makes dialogic space for other voices and can be clearly interpreted as ‘expository’ (Goatly 2000 in Martin and White 2005) since it is seen as open-ended. The token of judgement (the big question left unanswered by those who still disagree with our military intervention) embedded in a ‘countered’ formulation triggers an assessment of incapacity with a vaguely expressed reference to ‘those’ who unexpectedly (still) reject the choice made. As far as solidarity is concerned, the audience backs off a little from the speaker’s position and is invited to take into account another viewpoint keeping in mind that the modern world is too dangerous.

The last citation of threat/security contains an example of ‘consequentiality’ prefaced this time by the temporal adverb when which mentions the circumstances when an action will happen and not a condition, as is the case of if. Each parallel formulation introduces an explicit modal consequence: from necessity to impossibility to obligation.
Tellingly, the last wording contains a resource of evoked judgement (to help the poorest in the world) or strong emotional reaction together with a directive (must honour) supported by the challenging final triggered judgement of veracity (after the cameras have been switched off) which allows a gain in credibility.

The high numbers of ‘proclamations’ (see table 5.3), in particular ‘pronouncements’, interact with a high number of attitudinal lexis, (paradox, danger, chaos, malaria, conflict, disease, contagion to cite a few), verbal and nominal forms of negative ‘affect’ (paralyse, undermine, fear) and their addition creates strong evaluation to instantiate the ideological view of the ‘undesirable’ which can justify the choice of backing diplomacy with a credible threat of force.

| No one can doubt that |
| We can no longer ignore |
| We saw with terrible clarity |
| We understood even more clearly |
| This reflects a common perception that |
| We would all agree that |

Table 5.3 ‘Proclamations’ used by Straw

5.2.4 The issue of climate security: ‘we are all our own enemies’

The citation in the title of this sub-section comes from a speech by Beckett (Royal United Services Institute, 10.05.07) which gives an idea of her confrontational attitude towards the topic debated: the issue of climate security. Moreover, her monoglossic utterance, containing a negative judgement (-veracity) we are all our enemies, is another element supporting this consideration.
The threat to our climate security comes not from outside but from within [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]: we are all our own enemies [MP]. And what is at stake is not the relatively narrow national security of individual states but our collective security in an interdependent world [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. So while an unstable climate has obvious hard security implications, the traditional tools of hard security — in simple terms bombs and bullets — are not going to be able to solve that problem [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].

The occurrence of the adverb but as countering the previous assertion characterizes Beckett as opposing to some viewpoints. The association between security and the concessive but was found to be very strong in the collocational relation table (Appendix 4) in the previous chapter. The interpersonal function of a conjunct such as but is confirmed in literature by Thompson and Zhou (2000) and White (2003). This function is due to the fact that the presence of but alerts the hearers that what follows is not exactly what they expected to find.

The two ‘counters’ in the above segment preceded by the negation work, as Martin argues (1992: 198), as “anti modulation” in that they efface “the potentiality or obligation which would otherwise enable or determine the consequential relation between events”. In so doing she advances her position to attend to climate security as a collective issue and to solve it in a way rather different from the use of bombs and bullets. This comparison implies criticism and thus detachment from the government’s policy. The choice of the word enemies gives the key to understand the meta-language she has chosen to speak about the issue of climate security. The choice of the metaphor of ‘war’ or ‘conflict’, to use her terminology, mirrors her competitiveness.

In her speech on the memorial day for the death of John Smith (06.03.07), Margaret Beckett praises the qualities of a former member of the New Labour such as his pragmatism and his sense of social justice. What is relevant is not the act of praising or the words of ‘affect’ and
‘judgements’ of positive ‘capacity’, but the fact that the eulogy serves another scope, namely comparing and contrasting the topic of climate security:

43. MARGARET BECKETT: I said a little earlier that one of John’s great achievements was to break down the false dichotomy between social justice and economic growth. **We too must be iconoclasts; but** this time the false dichotomy is between economic **security** and climate security. [DISCLAIM: COUNTER].

Relying on the indirect evaluative mechanism of attitudinal inference, the recipient is provoked to favour John Smith’s approach to the issue of economic growth and is exhorted by the judgement (+normality) *we too must be iconoclasts*. The following locution counters the expectation insofar the question this time concerns the climate security issue as being part of economic security. By the use of the attitudinal lexis *false*, the speaker suggests her dissociation from those who support the view of dichotomy between the two faces of the problem. This criticism becomes explicit in segment (44) where Beckett defends her decision to use the Presidency of the Security Council to highlight the threat of an unstable climate. As foreign minister, she rejects the ‘entertained’ formulation worded as mental projection (*some who suggest that I would be better off*) by a resource of modalized ‘judgement’ in negative polarity (social sanction: -veracity): *they could be not more wrong*.

44. MARGARET BECKETT: Just as it is the reason why I have made climate **security** such a priority of my first year as Foreign Secretary. [JUSTIFICATION] In doing that, I know full well that there are some who suggest that I would be better off concentrating instead on the ‘real’ **security** problems in the world. [EXPANSION: ENTERTAIN]. *They could not be more wrong*. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] I am as focused on and as determined to address the so-called ‘hard’ **security** agenda as any Foreign Secretary. [AFFECT: +CONFIDENCE; +TRUSTING]

Tellingly, the speaker makes different overtly attitudinal interventions into
the text to negatively characterize those who concentrate on the ‘real’ (the emphasis is ironic) security problems and in so doing she saves her personal credibility by means of justification (the reason why), the intensified epistemic verb (I know full well) and resources of ‘affect’ (I am focused and determined).

Determination and foresight are the two qualities that Beckett requires for a good politician and in her attempt to convince her hearers about the seriousness of the climate security issue she sorts to an inductive analogy with Winston Churchill as backdrop. In her speech entitled “Climate change The Gathering Storm” (16.04.97) the title informs in advance of its double function: praising the politician and writer’s qualities and showing the topicality of the phrase at the same time. In her projection of history she says:

45. It was a time when Churchill, perceiving the dangers that lay ahead [MENTAL PROJECTION], struggled to mobilise the political will [MENTAL PROJECTION] and industrial energy of the British empire to meet those dangers. He did so often in the face of strong opposition and not always with success [DENIAL]: wasted opportunities that he subsequently referred to as ‘The Locust Years’ [VERBAL PROJECTION]. But in the end it was his foresight and his determination to prepare for a threat which - to many - was still seemingly distant and uncertain that in the end guaranteed the liberty and indeed survival of my country and that of many others [DISCLAIM: CONCEDE].

Today politicians and business leaders alike once again face an increasing danger to our security and prosperity, and growing calls for early and resolute measures [MS]. Climate change is the gathering storm of our generation [MP]. And the implications - should we fail to act [ENTERTAIN]- could be no less dire [DENIAL]: and perhaps [ENTERTAIN]- even more so [COUNTER].

More indirect mechanisms are preferred here by which authorial viewpoint may be indicated: the use of the mental projection perceive which triggers judgements of admiration for the implied far-sightedness; the choice of the verb struggle which highlights how people made it difficult for him to
succeed, as explicitly stated later in discourse through the expression in the face of strong opposition. Something implicit is intentionally left out: the speaker skips over the ‘responsible’ (to many) for the opposition and the ‘reasons’ for the wasted opportunities but, it is just the use of the adjective wasted that implies hard feelings for something that could have been done. From the inference of the presence of obstacles and disagreement, Beckett marks a turning-point by the use the counter-expectational but. The ‘disclamation’ and the comment adjunct seemingly allow the speaker to naturalise her ideological position: despite the criticism of being distant and uncertain, in the end history proved Churchill’s clairvoyance.

At this point she is ready to sketch a parallelism with the current days (today; once again). The argumentation by analogy is founded on the main claim that the gathering storm today is climate change, a danger to our security. From two more analogous molecules (today we are facing similar hard times; we might have similar serious implications) the conclusion is obvious: (so) similar resolute measures need to be taken. The two final ‘entertains’, despite the initial monoglossic environment, open a break for dialogism and failure is contemplated (should we fail to act) soon closed down through the counter even. Indeed, by the use of another concession, Beckett this time introduces differences and she construes discourse through a series of arguments and counter-arguments introduced again by the counter-expectational but. The argumentative ground that is given initially (the analogy above explained) is then re-taken to be re-countered. Given that, in such environment where “there is often a sense that the concurrence is in some way reluctant, grudging or qualified on the part of the speaker/writer” (Martin and White 2005: 125), we can safely state that Beckett’s assertiveness brings about a low degree of hesitation:
46. But while there are parallels between those two situations there are also crucial differences [DISCLAIM: COUNTER].
For a start, whereas Churchill’s cause during the 1930s was one of rearmament - more guns, more planes and, in particular, more ships - we are not going to be able to ensure climate security through the exercise of hard power [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].
An unstable climate is a direct threat to our security [MP]: but it is not one that can be met by bullets and bombs [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].
Diplomacy failed in the late 1930s and force of arms took over - in this battle there is no backstop to diplomacy [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. But we also have an advantage [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]- perhaps even a head start [ENTERTAIN] over Churchill in the 1930s.
He sensed the intentions of Hitler, but he could not prove them [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]. He had to convince people to prepare for something which could only be a possibility.
In climate change, there is strong evidence to tell us that we are dealing with an inevitability [PROCLAMATION]. This is something that is happening and that will go on happening. Those who reject that claim [PROJECTION] - and there are some who still do [COUNTER] - are choosing this time to ignore both evidence and the massive scientific consensus as to what that evidence tells us. But the [DISCLAIM: COUNTER], perhaps rather sad [ENTERTAIN], truth is that the international community will not move [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] with the necessary urgency or the necessary resolve if climate change [ENTERTAIN], is seen as primarily something that effects insects, animals and plants: although they may in turn hold the key to our own survival [DISCLAIM: COUNTER].
Particularly over the past year, I have discussed the link between climate and security with many people. Some of them are sceptical [JUDGEMENT - TENACITY]. They respond [VERBAL PROJECTION] that we can’t prove [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] that climate change will or has lead to this or that particular event [VERBAL PROJECTION] - still [DISCLAIM: COUNTER] less that it will cause any one outbreak of violence or hostilities. But that is to misunderstand the issue and the argument [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. If you are looking for a simple, linear connection between climate change and a particular flash-point, [ENTERTAIN] you are only picking up a glimpse of a much wider picture [DISCLAIM: COUNTER].
Now it is time for us [EXHORTATIVE] to rise to our newest and biggest challenge: to fight the first great war of interdependence, the struggle for climate security. There will be no winners unless we all emerge victorious [DISCLAIM: DENIAL].

As noticed the ‘denial+counter strategy’ constructs an audience who is presumably resistant to the minister’s claim of equating climate security with ‘the gathering storm’ and thus the “pairings occur as the writer bids to win the reader over” (Martin and White 2005: 125). She continues her argumentation drawing on the same prosaic framework as Churchill’s, namely ‘challenge and response’ and, in so doing, she traces a line between what politicians are doing and what should be done.

In saying and criticising what they are doing, she is categorical and peremptory, as the use of ‘disclamation’ has shown. The hearer is thus attracted into a position of opposition to the ‘those who do not act’, so as to become as potentially susceptible to the ‘wrong’ vision of the ‘scepticals’. This is conveyed by the argumentation provided and the hearer is constructed as still needing more information in order to be convinced. Some ‘entertained’ formulations disclose tentativeness in her disapproval of the international community’s behaviour through negative ‘affect’ (perhaps rather sad truth). In this part of her discourse dogmatism takes the place through the illustration of all the potential consequences of the devastating effect of climate change and she takes on the role of a pragmatic expert (So let’s look at the effect on humans if we do nothing).

Beckett distances herself from those who do not understand the real entity of the issue showing a passionate attitude in defending her position through the series of constructed enhancements. The ‘alterity’ worded as verbal projection (they respond) is countered and also negatively assessed insofar lacking the capacity of looking at the issue as a whole. By inference,
this means that the speaker may boast her holistic view of reality with respect to a ‘simple, linear connection’ between the issue and a ‘flash-point’. More than asserting or denying, Beckett’s rhetoric of war seems to challenge her hearers (that is to misunderstand) who know that, if they favour the ‘other’ view, they will be sanctioned as missing their capacity of looking at ‘a wider context’. This challenging and exhortative attitude is worded in the introductory it is time that sounds like an invitation to face with this issue metaphorically described as a ‘war’. In the conflict-like analogy, also the label is war-echoing (interdependence) and the ‘reservation’ to win it stands on unity (unless we all emerge victorious).

A range of mechanisms is deployed: from ‘bare assertions (47) to explicit subjective locution I am in no doubt (47) until strategies as it is now clear that.

47. I am in no doubt - and the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, was in no doubt when he asked me to take on this role [PROJECTION]- that today being a credible foreign minister [means] being serious about climate security [MP].

48. MARGARET BECKETT: It is now clear that tackling climate change is an imperative not a choice, [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] a problem for today not tomorrow.

What is remarkable in Beckett’s formulations with respect to the other two ministers is a foregrounding of the subjective involvement of the textual voice. As the summarizing table below shows, the counter-expect resources frequently interact with judgements so as to motivate them, but also to increase the social esteem towards Churchill’s extraordinary sense of perception in a way to reinforce the backdrop on which to build up the contrast.
Examples | appraisal | concessive | function  
--- | --- | --- | ---  
We too must be iconoclast | + normality | But this time the false dichotomy is between economic security and climate security | contrast  
It was a time when Churchill….struggled | +capacity | But in the end…. | contrast  
An unstable climate is a direct threat to our security | -composition | But is not one that can be met by bullets and bombs | Contrast /denial  
Diplomacy failed in the late 1930s… | -capacity | But we also have an advantage | enhancement  
He sensed the intentions of Hitler… | +capacity | But he could not prove them | denial  
Those who reject that claim…. | -capacity | But the international community will not move with the necessary urgency | Denial/criticism  
The answers do not lie |  | But in the earnest and consistent pursuit of justice and peace | enhancement  
They respond that we can’t prove that climate change will cause…hostilities | -capacity | But that is to misunderstand | denial  

Table 5.4: Summary of the concessive resources in Beckett

It can be argued that all the resources of dialogism introduced are not a way of interpreting events but are strategically used to serve the ideological purpose of pushing the climate security issue in the international agenda. Another pattern of preference is given by the conditional clauses which are used for persuasive purposes, even though in a less ‘directive’ function with respect to Cook. Furthermore, a break into non-negotiable approach is here more evident:

49. Collectively we have a responsibility to protect human life and a duty to defend the international institutions that help us as a community to achieve that goal [MP]. The answers do not lie in division or in personal attacks but in the earnest and consistent pursuit of justice and peace [DISCLAIM: COUNTER].
We will not solve this problem if we do not each take our share of the responsibility for tackling it [ENTERTAIN]. Nobody can protect themselves from climate change [DISCLAIM: DENIAL] unless we protect each other by building a global basis for climate security [ENTERTAIN]. This goes to the heart of the UN’s mission. And the UN must be at the heart of the solution [MS].

To put it starkly, if we all try to free ride, we will all end up in free fall, with accelerating climate change the result of [CONSEQUENTIALITY] our collective failure to respond in time to this shared threat [ENTERTAIN].

Look just at the danger posed by rising sea levels: potentially this could cause massive damage to some of the key urban centres of our global civilization: London, Shanghai, Dhaka, Singapore, Amsterdam, Cairo, and - yes - Manhattan - all are at risk.

The hypothetical clauses are of the ‘if-then’ type mostly expressed in negative polarity are used as a linguistic device for valid and logical argumentation. The hypothetical argumentation is always preceded by a premise that in this case is the advocacy of cooperation which involves responsibility. The resolution of the problem requires collaboration and this claim is expressed in conditional terms: “we will not solve....if we do not”. After opening dialogism, Beckett introduces another break by entertaining again (unless we protect each other). If the negative indefinite pronoun nobody is considered, if we take into account the ‘reserve’ (unless), the cumulative effect is that of shifting from ‘un-dialogism’ to ‘dialogism’ and back again in a repeated way. Indeed, in the following clause introduced by the locution to put it starkly, in order to guarantee honesty and realism, she goes on with another ‘if-then’-entertain, until her direct involvement of the audience by calling their attention through the interactive ‘look’. The twisted reasoning ends with the evidence and the monoglossic utterance all we are at risk.
5.2.5 Construing a positive brand

One of the assumptions in this research was that ministers in their explanation of their political choices try to construe a positive image of their country. In the previous sub-sections we have noticed some examples of positive appraisals with respect to Britain, which I have summed up in the table 5.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical realisations in DiCo</th>
<th>Appraisal resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>distinguished island</td>
<td>Judgement of self esteem +capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We ourselves in Britain know from our experience in Northern Ireland how difficult it can be to put aside long-standing common goal of peace.</td>
<td>judgement of self esteem: +capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK has taken the issue of climate security to the Security Council for the first time</td>
<td>judgement of self esteem: +capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have consistently supported the Israeli people’s right to security</td>
<td>judgement of self esteem: +tenacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because we are friends to peace</td>
<td>judgement of social sanction +ethics through relational process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 Overview of the resources used to appraise Britain

As we notice most of the analysed instances contain tokens of ‘judgements’ or ‘indirect invocation’, which permeate the discourse of security and that are revealed as the text unfolds. The thematic position of the subject and the narration typical of recording genre (cf. Coffin 2000) give prominence to the British country and attribute to it the active role claimed by the ministers.

Cook’s discourse on Britishness, which is pervasive in his speeches, is connected to that of security to serve persuasive aims but also political and economic objectives (e.g. prosperity). In order to illustrate this point a wider and longer context of the word security is necessary. In this extract
from a speech at the Social Market Foundation, London, Cook is persuading the eurosceptics of the fact that integration, which is vital to security, does not mean blurring the concept of national identity. He does so by demanding more confidence in the British identity in order to achieve more security at a broader level. What I argue here is that the evocation of the nationhood is re-contextualized in the discourse of security for ideological purposes:

+++ every day the importance of our relations +valuation] with foreign countries to the strength of our economy, to the security of our nation, to the safety of our people against organised crime, even [DISCLAIM: COUNTER] to the health of our environment [PROJECTION].

A globalised world demands more foreign contacts than [even] Britain has experienced in the past [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]. I also know that we are likely to make our way more successfully in the world [PROJECTION] if we are secure in our British identity, and confident about its future. EXPANSION

That security and confidence is important for the inner strength it gives us in our conduct of business with others [VALUATION -MP]. I want to argue the case why we can be confident about the strength and the future of British identity. Sadly, it has become fashionable for some to argue that British identity is under siege [PROJECTION] perhaps [even] in a state of terminal decline [ENTERTAIN].

The threat is said to come in three forms. [PROJECTION].

First, the arrival of immigrants who, allegedly, [ENTERTAIN] do not share our cultural values and who fail to support the England cricket team [DENIAL]. Few dare to state this case explicitly, but it is the unmistakable subliminal message. [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]

Second, our continued membership of the European Union, which is said to be absorbing member states into 'a country called Europe' [ENTERTAIN – VERBAL PROJECTION].

Third, the devolution of power to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, which is seen as a step to the break-up of the UK [PROJECTION].

This evening, I want to set out the reasons for being optimistic about the future of Britain and Britishness. [JUSTIFICATION]

Indeed, I want to go further and argue that in each of the areas where the pessimists identify a threat, we
should instead see developments that will strengthen and renew British identity. [DISCLAIM: COUNTER]

Example 50

The complex and articulated logical reasoning is based on the ‘claim’ that security gives confidence and this self-assurance increases reliance when in business with others.

Despite the presence of some clear ‘entertain’ formulations in this argumentative defence of the British identity, Cook employs ‘disclamation’ to counter the projections presented. First of all, his premise to his persuasive reasoning is given by the accepted view that globalisation requires strong forms of associations among countries [-composition]. In this context security is the stone on which to build confidence for the future, which, consequently, provides success on the economic level. At this point a resource of ‘reservation’ is introduced if we are secure in our British identity, and confident about its future. ‘Reservation’, that glosses ‘as long as- conditions,’ restricts here the scope of applicability of the statement that we are likely to make our way more successfully in the world.

It can be stated that this ‘reservation’ “deactivates possible future objections to the proposed recommendation and is a way of refuting them in advance” (Montolio 2007: 271). Righteousness and toughness feature the speaker’s image and in so doing credibility is enhanced. This ‘expansion’, which opens dialogism, is countered by the following monogloss where the key role of security is stated through the resource of ‘valuation’. In order to align his audience with his position on the ‘British identity’, the speaker sorts to an attitudinal emotion-oriented adverb (sadly). Its textual prominence puts the hearers in a position to colour the following counter-argument with a negative evaluation so as to reject it. The speaker thus takes the distance from the ‘acknowledgement’ (British identity is under siege) by using an ‘ironic projection’ (it is fashionable for some to argue), which
highlights the transiency (fashionable) of the adverse viewpoint. The following topoi of his discourse, which are however soon ‘disclaimed’, involve (first) multiculturalism, (second) European integration and (third) devolution.

The minister’s argumentation develops according to an inspection: he passes in review any kind of ‘entertained’ positions which may blur the image of ‘British identity’ to object them by the means of ‘disclamations’, both ‘denials’ and ‘counters’. Some examples here illustrate the structure of his logical reasoning: the ‘argument’ is followed by the counter-argument substantiated by the speaker through a series of historical ‘data’. From the previous complex structure we notice now a set of binary sequences which do not give the audience the time to consider another viewpoint because the speaker soon contracts the other voice:

The first element in the debate about the future of Britishness is the changing ethnic composition of the British people themselves.

The British are not a race, but a gathering of countless different races and communities, the vast majority of which were not indigenous to these islands. [DISCLAIM: DENIAL]

Example 51

In example 51, the speaker explicitly considers the argument of the debate he wants to demolish, that is the ethnic composition of the British society, which is thought to be compromising the British identity and counter-argues it by the resource of negation. In example 52, he objects against the ‘pureness’ of the British society by denying it at the lexical level (fantasy), at the grammar level (pluralism is not a burden) and by adding an ‘enhancement’ where the connective ‘but’ is implicit. The reiteration of the ‘inscription’ false calls to mind resources of social sanction [-veracity]:
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The idea that Britain was a 'pure' Anglo-Saxon society before the arrival of communities from the Caribbean, Asia and Africa is fantasy. But if this view of British identity is false to our past, it is false to our future too. [DISCLAIM; COUNTER]

This pluralism is not a burden we must reluctantly accept. It is an immense asset that contributes to the cultural and economic vitality of our nation. [IMPLICIT COUNTER]

Example 52

Example 53 again, aims to highlight the positive ‘face’ of multiculturalism that is a pretext to point out the flexible fabric of the British society. The resources are always the same: an argument is rejected explicitly with the view of satisfying the British pride:

Example 53

It is evident that this type of argumentation, where disclamation from the speaker dominates, leaves no doubt to what the ‘true’ choice is. All this without considering the high interpersonal investment from the minister who intervenes through resources of subjectivity and ‘affect’ as in example 54 and where criticism is also implied:

Example 54

125
I get impatient [AFFECT] when I see opinion polls that ask respondents whether they feel more Scottish or English than British, or more British than European, as if these choices were mutually exclusive. Identity is not a finite substance to be shared out between competing loyalties [DENIAL]. It embraces numerous dimensions, each of which serves to amplify and reinforce the others [IMPlicit ENHANCEMENT; COUNTER].

Example 54

It is worth noticing the high number of projections which are introduced in the arguments to be rejected. They are marshalled in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Cognitive process</th>
<th>Relational</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see; I also know;</td>
<td>It has become fashionable;</td>
<td>unmistakable subliminal message; the idea; the view; The past three weeks has carried with it the very important message;</td>
<td>which is said; which is seen;</td>
<td>allegedly;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Resources of projection in Cook’s discourse of security

The presence of projections under nominalised or passive constructions is a clear indicator of impersonality but they serve the scope of not naming either subjects or sensers and by keeping this vagueness everybody is involved.

To sum up, it can be stated that the complex argumentation recontextualises different discourses: ethnicity, European integration and devolution. Then it becomes simpler in its structure and each step serves the scope of cancelling any doubt to serve a clearly ideological agenda: to enhance the British self-confidence based on ‘security’ and not on politics of fear to achieve economic stability.

It is a strategy to sweep away any impediment to the full implementation of the ‘global economy’, where security is only a ‘tool’,
insofar as Flairclough underlines, the neo-liberal discourse has the power to:

make a contingent set of policy choices appear to be a matter of inexorable and irreversible world change. This work is remarkable in highlighting the absolute importance of discourse and language in the transformations of ‘globalization’ and the new capitalism, but its impact is somewhat lessened because they do not have the analytical resources to show how the slippage between description and creation (‘bringing into being’) is pervasively effected in contemporary policy and other texts, or how the contingent is textually construed as necessary (online, forthcoming).

5.2.6 Justification
In the analysis in this chapter we have noticed how the ‘modal consequentiality’ seems to feature the discourse of security above all Cook’s discourse. This section wants to provide further evidence for patterns which involve ‘causality’. In some examples analysed in the previous sub-sections the occurrence of ‘justification’ was noticed through the presence of the cluster that is why. This expression encodes a particular type of consequentiality, that has to do with those ‘non-factual’ propositions which need justification or substantiation (White 2003: 274).

Looking at the cluster that is why in the whole corpus it was found a great discrepancy across the three foreign ministers as far as the frequency of this expression is concerned. Speaking in terms of relative frequency the highest frequency is registered in Cook’s speeches with 0.06% with respect to 0.002% for Straw and 0.03% for Beckett. What these numbers tell us is that Cook is more inclined to sort to the use of this cluster of logical meaning to make the audience to conform to his viewpoints than the other two.

The ‘dispersion plot’ utility provided by WordSmith Tools (Scott 2006: 43), which maps the textual position of this cluster, also shows that the
cluster is not confined to the conclusion in the speech, but it is evenly distributed in the text. This means that the cluster is employed as the text unfolds as a resource to account for the speaker’s positions.

Figure 5.1: Dispersion plot of the cluster that is why in Cook

As the figure above shows, Cook sorts to *that is why* in almost all his speeches (44 out of 58) and 26% out of all the instances of the cluster involve justifications of Britain’s actions or commitments.

Only two instances pertain the discourse of security, but a cursory glance at the concordances in the whole corpus shows that Cook sorts to ‘modal consequentiality’ to justify his directives, his predictions, but above all ‘counters’. In the examples provided we notice how ‘Justification’ concerns mainly Britain as supporter of the European enlargement, a
supporter of peace and thus the tendency to deontically justify the political strategies of a moral country. Most of the citations where Britain immediately follows the cluster come from speeches delivered abroad. This represents the textual voice as adopting an ‘argumentative position’ (White 2003: 274) by which Cook tries to persuade the foreign audience about the position of Britain with regard to the European enlargement. This dialogic space is only apparent if the ‘contractive’ retrospective formulations are taken into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT: Retrospective formulation</th>
<th>resource</th>
<th>conjunction</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enlargement is an inclusive process, and they are inside that process.</td>
<td>monogloss</td>
<td>that is why Britain is a firm supporter of the European Conference for all European Union applicants and members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 We want a European Union that welcomes the Central Europeans back into the European family, that erases the artificial divide between East and West and restores the common European heritage.</td>
<td>inclination</td>
<td>And that is why Britain is such a firm supporter of enlargement. we eagerly look forward to the day that the Czech Republic will join us round the table in Brussels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 But the Israelis will not find true security without peace.</td>
<td>Counter/Denial prediction</td>
<td>that is why Britain regards itself as a friend of the Palestinians, and also a friend of the Israelis - because we are friend to peace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Crime knows no boundaries and the fight against crime should know no boundaries.</td>
<td>Denial Directive/recommendation</td>
<td>we are already working with our neighbours in the EU to make Europe an area of freedom, security and justice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cook: Example 55
6 There are a number of distinguished members of the Asian community serving with distinction in the Foreign Office. But I want more. Monogloss That is why I have set for the Foreign Office the target of recruiting from the ethnic minorities within Britain 10% of all our total recruitment annually for the Foreign Office.

7 It (FCO) is open to every community and I want it to be representative of every community. monogloss I want to end by asking for your help in getting me to meet that target I have set myself of 10% recruitment per annum from the minority ethnic communities throughout Britain.

8 When this government came to power, I wanted this Department to be both business-oriented and business-like. monogloss I drew up a Mission statement. And it is why I set out in it that trade and investment work must be a key priority.

9 Every part of civic society has its role to play. monogloss I end with an invitation to the nation to join with the government in the difficult but necessary task of defending human rights wherever they are under threat.

Cook: example 56

When the first personal pronoun follows the ‘justification’ Cook is dealing with his concern about the renewal of the FCO and there is a high investment of the textual voice in this role of explaining the changes of the new policy. It is clear that in these cases he is speaking to the nation and a further check of the setting of these speeches has proved this consideration.
(57) BECKETT: If we don't act on climate change, we risk undermining the very basis of the prosperity and security we are seeking to achieve. That is why we must recognise that talk of having either a successful economy or a stable climate is a false choice; we must work together to find paths for economic growth which protect our climate.

(58) BECKETT: And, more than that, they can see that by increasing energy efficiency and moving to renewables they not only hit their climate goals, they are also bolstering their energy security – one of their highest national priorities. That is why China has set itself such challenging goals on energy efficiency. It is not rhetoric, it is a radical restructuring of their economy.

If Straw never uses this logical conjunction with reference to the discourse of security, Beckett employs it to persuade the foreign audience of the connection between prosperity and climate. It is easy to recognize the minister's preferred patterns, namely the 'if-then' formulation in segment (57) and the implicit 'counter' in citation (58). Both contribute to her 'contractive' stance and both reveal her need to rely on evidence to persuade the audience about her position.

5.3 Concluding remarks
The main aim of this chapter was to investigate the patterns of preference through which the foreign ministers express and naturalize their ideological positions towards the topic being explained, namely security.

The ‘appraisal’ analysis of security has shown that all the three ministers evaluate security on the scale of the significance (vitally important, vital, core issue) and on that of negative ‘composition’, insofar security is still an entity to work on. The use of evoked negative ‘appreciation’, worded through ‘circumstantial adjuncts’, aims to focus the attention on the ‘how’ namely on the ability to reach the objective. In advocating cooperation to achieve security, this interest is perceived as not harmonious and still
unattainable. The significance of security is expressed mainly in a monoglossic environment which interacts with resources of positive valuation.

Different semantic motifs have been pointed out: all the three ministers are concerned with achieving more security and all the three suggest the way how to do it, namely promoting enlargement, not only at the European but also at the international level. The main thrust of discourse is given by the semantic of interdependence. The principle of cooperation is mainly expressed through ‘un-dialogized’ formulations where no alternative voice is contemplated and through redundant occurrences of items belonging to the same semantic category of ‘link’. This semantic preference embraces different discourses from military (alliance) to business (partnership) and includes also instances of relational processes (depend on).

Values of ‘entertain’ occur with a significantly low frequency in the discourse of security whereas ‘denials’ play a fundamental role in the construal of a ‘contractive’ stance. This finding corroborates Miller’s results (2002) about Bush’s foreign policy. The numerous ‘projections’ found in the speeches feature this discourse as a kind of narrative but also as an attempt of interpreting and evaluating what said before. An evident example is Beckett’s analogy with Churchill and her way of projecting mentally what the writer perceived rather than said. Furthermore, projections were also found in the other two ministers in combination with many indefinite pronouns (many, some, groups, some of them), which are an indicator of the tendency to avoid deliberately any precise reference. Furthermore, they contribute to increase the abstraction characterizing the ministers’ speeches but above all Straw’s cub-corpus.

The association security/peace/prosperity instantiates the ideology of
‘causation: given a premise a set of potential effects are carried out in an ‘irrealis’ environment. Peace is the *condicio sine qua non* for security which is, in turn, a means to achieve stability and prosperity. The patterns of preference include the semantic category of consequence, mainly the ‘cause’.

Working after the terrorist attacks to the twin towers, Jack Straw’s speeches reflect the atmosphere of *fear* and *concern* for the potential *threats*. Foregrounding on the interaction between proclamations and resources of verbal and nominal ‘affect’, he instantiates the ideology of the ‘undesirable’. This preference for explicit objectivised authorial interpolations put the emphasis on the insistence on the warrantability of the assertion.

Beckett’s discourse of security sorts to resources of ‘concession’, even though ‘contingency’ is also used. Relying on metaphorical analogy she instantiates the comparison also at the clause level through the pattern ‘denial+counter’, showing a contrasting attitude but also an effort to overcome difficulties in persuading the audience on the validity of her ‘holistic’ view of the climate security issue.

In an attempt to sketch out the stance of the three ministers, we can safely state that all the three make use of the ‘contraction’ to explain political choices. Many instances of pronouncements feature in particular Straw’s style, whereas Cook sorts to logical connections as the high frequency of *that is why* showed. More logical and assertive appears Cook if compared to Straw’s more cautious and justifying stance and to Beckett’s contrasting attitude. This diversity may find its reason in the social events of their times. Being the first Minister of the new government, Cook had to launch the new political strategies. Working after the terrorist attacks, Straw had to be more cautious due to the delicate Iraqi question, but also to resistance of those who were against the war. Finally, Beckett faces a new
issue, the climate security, and she has to fight against those who believe that it is not a question of diplomacy because still anchored to the traditional view of diplomacy as ‘peace-keeping’ activity. But her attitude might also be due to gender variability, but this is only a hypothesis to be tested elsewhere.

As far as the British image is concerned, what emerges is a hegemonic identity with a nurturance orientation. Britain has always been playing a relevant role in history and ministers manifest their inclination to give it a pivotal role in Europe. This comes out from the range of judgements of ‘social esteem’ expressed, which involve admiration, sense of tolerance (see the Irish analogy) and strong capacity. The tension between the advocacy of internationalism and the evocation of nationhood has also pointed out the speaker’s manipulation of the discourse of security to enhance national identity confidence to achieve more prosperity.
6.1 Introduction
The previous chapter has looked at the resources foreign ministers resort to in their speeches to build a shared view on the specific multifaceted issue of security. It has been noticed how the speakers’ patterns of preference mainly include resources belonging to the category of ‘contractions’ so as to sound assertive in their positioning. A slight diversity has been highlighted in the use of the contractive formulations chosen by the three ministers, which make the difference at the level of their stance. The investigation has also pointed out how the subjectivity of the speaker is often obscured or couched in the process of interpretation. In their intent to present an objective and credible vision of reality their institutional strategies, foreign ministers evaluate their material and claim solidarity with their audience. With the aim of building a plausible argument these speakers control the level of personality in their speeches. Hence, managing and controlling the presence of the ‘I’ in a text is relevant to the objectivity of the discourse. Moreover, the investigation of the different levels of the self may help to elucidate the mechanisms of alignment and disalignment through the acceptance or resistance to superimposed roles. Considering that diplomatic language shares many features with political language,¹ this

¹ See for instance the high number of ‘contractive’ forms in Miller 2002; the use of the institutional ‘we’
chapter takes into account some of the studies focused on similar aspects of subjectivity. For example Partington (2003) finds that the podium shifts from an institutional position (where the use of *we* is more common) to the use of *I* when a much more informal relationship\(^2\) with his audience is established. As also Schäffner (1997) notices, politicians tend to interact as institution representatives but they are individuals with their own beliefs and consciences. Thus, the analysis of the shifts from the institutional role to the individual sphere pertains this research in that they are linked to negotiation of individual and group identity. As Goffman states “a change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (1981: 128).

Benveniste (1981) discusses meaning distinctions in utterances that contain the same verb but contrast in subject. For example, ‘*I*’ in combination with some verbs such as *feel, believe,* and *suppose* typically express the speaker’s attitude regarding a subsequent piece of discourse; nevertheless, when these same verbs are associated with the third person singular subjects ‘she’ or ‘he’, it seems that what is conveyed is descriptive or informative. In a similar line, in this chapter I will be dealing with grammatical stance marking including resources of explicit expressions in the first singular person. In order to study the characterization of subjective phenomena the first personal pronoun will be considered embedded in clusters with the most frequent verbs. Then the same clusters will be compared to those with *we* as subject in order to see the shifts of the textual voice. At the interpersonal level I shall be investigating the employment of *I* versus *we* to look at the power relations and the author-audience interaction. The focus on the two pronouns (*I* and *we*) is due to

---

\(^1\) In Schäffner 1997 and Partington’s study of the White House Press Briefings 2003.
their higher frequency with respect to other pronouns; the preponderance of we was noticed in the keyword list, (see chapter 3 section 3.4.1) but also during the analysis through the rhetoric of ‘our’ and some examples of subjectivity emerged in the previous chapter. The perspective of the analysis is phraseological in that, as Hopper argues (1987: 150), linguistic form, often in prefabricated chunks, is shaped by discourse use. The purpose is to determine to what extent the ministers emphasize their role as individuals within their speeches.

The analysis is carried out according to four different steps. Using the Wordsmith Tools concordancer, the three sub-corpora were searched for the first singular and plural personal pronouns to compare and contrast their frequency (first step). The cluster utility was then interrogated to look at the use of pronouns in their phraseological environment (second step). In the third step a manual investigation of the clusters was then carried out. To isolate factors accounting for the shifting from plural to the employment of explicit subjectivity, the fourth stage compares and contrasts the same clusters with the different subjects.

6.2 Analysis

As said above, the analysis here starts by looking at the frequency of the two pronouns across the three sub-corpora to highlight discrepancies among the ministers. Predictably, table 6.1 illustrates that we, occurs almost twice as much as I in all the three ministers’ speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pron.</th>
<th>Cook</th>
<th>Straw</th>
<th>Beckett</th>
<th>Tot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>2534 – 1.80%</td>
<td>4107 – 1.33%</td>
<td>1714 – 1.61%</td>
<td>8355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1067 – 0.75%</td>
<td>2017 – 0.65%</td>
<td>927 – 0.87%</td>
<td>4011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Overview of the occurrences of the pronouns in each minister
Furthermore, Cook resorts to *we* more frequently with respect to the other two, whereas Beckett employs *I* slightly more than the others. Finally, Straw makes recourse to the two pronouns less often than all others. These data make us hypothesize that Straw employs more impersonal formulations with respect to his colleagues, or that his subjectivity is couched under other forms.

The second step in the analysis is given by the illustration of the top-list clusters around *I* marshalled in tables 6.2 and their comparison with *we*-clusters displayed in table 6.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COOK</th>
<th>STRAW</th>
<th>BECKETT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>I want to</em></td>
<td><em>I want to</em></td>
<td><em>I know that</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>I hope that</em></td>
<td><em>I know that</em></td>
<td><em>I want to</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Is why I</em></td>
<td><em>I hope that</em></td>
<td><em>I do not</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>I know that</em></td>
<td><em>I do not</em></td>
<td><em>I was in</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>I will be</em></td>
<td><em>And I am</em></td>
<td><em>I am sure</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Relative frequency of 3-word-clusters around *I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COOK</th>
<th>STRAW</th>
<th>BECKETT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>We need to</em></td>
<td><em>We need to</em></td>
<td><em>We need to</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>We will be</em></td>
<td><em>We have to</em></td>
<td><em>We have to</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>We want to</em></td>
<td><em>We want to</em></td>
<td><em>That we are</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>If we are</em></td>
<td><em>And we are</em></td>
<td><em>We want to</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>That we can</em></td>
<td><em>We have seen</em></td>
<td><em>We do not</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Relative frequency of 3-word-clusters around *we*

From a glance at the five most frequent 3-word clusters associated with the two pronouns the centrality of ‘volition’ is immediately visible around the pronoun *I*. Table 6.2 shows the strong attraction between *I* and the verb
want in Cook and Straw, whereas Beckett tends to prefer the phrase I know that, also shared by the other two, even though with a lower frequency. The same verb also ranks in the top list in combination with we as illustrated in table 6.3. Furthermore, I hope that features again Cook and Straw’s discourse but not Beckett’s where not even a single instance of this cluster was found. This increases the degree of willingness in the first two ministers. After these preliminary considerations let us move on to the investigation of the most frequent cluster (I want to) starting from the plural form (we want to) which will be compared and contrasted.

6.2.1 The central function: volition

The high occurrence of the verb want signals a strong desire from the speaker who oscillates between the two positions we and I. Out of the 46 instances of the cluster we want to in Cook’s speeches, only one citation contains an inclusive we. Similarly, in the Straw’s sub-corpus three citations, out of 56 concordances, were found as being inclusive, whereas Beckett never uses an inclusive formulation of this cluster. All the other instances are introduced by an exclusive-we, which indicates either the administration of the British Foreign Policy according to the different levels of action, from the national to the international arena, or the British government. A scan of the following enlarged concordances shows that the cluster in these instantiations of inclusiveness tends to be supported by the possessive ‘our’:

1. Cook: If we want to keep them that way we must constantly educate our young people in the evil of Nazism and remind them that all of society is diminished and corroded by the poison of persecution.

2. Straw: If we want to be seen to deliver justice and offer a stronger and better worldview than
that of the terrorist, we have to be seen to stand by our values and our strengths.

3. Straw: If we want to deliver economic prosperity, a cleaner environment and safer streets for our citizens then we should embrace enlargement, not postpone it.

4. Straw: It (building close international partnership) is essential to almost everything we want to deliver for our citizens. [my adding]

Furthermore, the inclusiveness in these citations is due to the sphere of interest which, in this case, concerns people and values. Given that the speeches where this inclusive- we was found were delivered in international locations, we may infer that the inclusion is at the global level. In example (1), through the prescriptive formulation of deontic modality, Cook exalts assertively the value of knowledge, while Straw hopes for more democratic values and safer environment for the citizens. The character of the inclusiveness mirrors the content of the citations, namely the inclination towards a global world.

Predictably, considering the explanatory nature of these speeches, all the other instances are introduced by an exclusive- we, which refers to the staff of the FCO as representative of the government. Sometimes it is easy to recognise the referent because it immediately precedes the pronoun. In other cases more context is necessary as in the following citation, where, significantly, the government is represented through the formulation firmly committed, which grounds the proposition on self-confidence:

5. Cook: This Government is firmly committed to embracing the changing nature of the international reality as a condition of domestic success. We do not want to cling to a Little England. We want to build a Global Britain.

In order to investigate the action object of desire, the verbs following want were grouped according to the semantic categories indentified by
Biber et al (2002). Findings are marshalled in table 6.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic categories of lexical verbs</th>
<th>Verbal realization (COOK)</th>
<th>Verbal realization (STRAW)</th>
<th>Verbal realization (BECKETT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental verbs</td>
<td>see (12), ensure, preserve, remove, find out (2), take forward, engage</td>
<td>go further, participate, see (15), achieve (4), intensify, reinforce, reinvigorate, secure, strengthen</td>
<td>agree, attract, ensure, plan, look, remove, see (3), achieve,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>help (2)</td>
<td>sustain</td>
<td>encourage, help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity verbs</td>
<td>build (5), catch, create (2), make (3), put, use (5), work</td>
<td>avoid, bring, build, deliver (3), extend (5), fight, keep off, lower, make (2), rebuild, restore, use, create,</td>
<td>give, build, diversify, do, invest, lessen (2), make, produce (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of existence or relationship</td>
<td>play (a role), bring responsibility, have, live,</td>
<td>be (2)</td>
<td>Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-discursive</td>
<td>discuss</td>
<td>show, welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of aspect</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>maintain (3), restart,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tot.</td>
<td>Tot.</td>
<td>Tot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 types</td>
<td>28 types</td>
<td>20 types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 Verbs following the cluster we want to

A reading of this table points out that the verbs grouped as ‘mental’ are those more frequently found after the cluster we want to in Cook and Straw, whereas Beckett uses this category and the ‘activity’ category with the same frequency. Moreover, Beckett and Cook recourse to material verbs more often than Straw does. These data suggest that planning and desire follow ‘volition’ and in the Beckett’s sub-corpus both planning and action-oriented perspective of desirability are instantiated. In other words, her institutional representation is more pragmatic-based with respect to the other two.

As for the mental category, the most frequent mental verb following the search cluster is see in all the three ministers. As concordances show, it ideally shapes the results of the actions set out for the future:
1. **We want to** see a Europe in which war is unthinkable and in which prosperity is entrenched.
2. **We want to** see the European Union become more of a Europe that belongs to people.
3. **We want to** see more liberalisation…
4. **we want to** see human rights integrated more closely.
5. **We want to** see a modern and adaptable policy framework…
6. **we want to** see universal suffrage introduced in Hong Kong as

Concordance 6.1: **we want to** in Cook, Straw, Beckett.

The higher use in particular of a verb of perception such as *see* invites the hearers to activate their visual capacity and represents the ministers, together with their government, as strongly committed to truth not only about their material processes but also in terms of what they feel. The ‘desirable’ here reflects moral and economic values. Similarly, the occurrences of the material verbs *build* and *create* aim to make idea, plans and desire less abstract as the following concordances show:

1. **We want to** create a European Union that secures peace and prosperity throughout Europe.
2. **We want to** be in a positive debate about the sort of Europe **we want to** build.
3. This will be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build.
4. We do not want to cling to a Little England. **We want to** build a Global Britain. A country which accepts... 
5. **We want to** be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build. We want it to be a substantive meeting, discussing...
6. **We want to** be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build. We want it to be a substantive meeting, discussing...
7. **We want to** be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build. We want it to be a substantive meeting, discussing...
8. **We want to** be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build. We want it to be a substantive meeting, discussing...
9. **We want to** be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build. We want it to be a substantive meeting, discussing...
10. **We want to** be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe **we want to** build. We want it to be a substantive meeting, discussing...

Concordance 6.2: **we want to** – Cook, Straw, Beckett

Remarkable is in Straw’s citations the use of a plethora of verbs with the prefix *re-* such as *rebuild, reinforce, reinvigorate, restart, restore* which emanate the sensation of a propensity to ‘re-new’ the state of affairs. The occurrences of these verbs were found in national diplomatic speeches where a continuous emphasis is put on the ideology of change. In the light of this evidence, the ‘volitional’ formulation seems to be the default way to
express the objectives of the foreign policy, the measures taken and to imagine and realize the future as potentiality.

6.2.2 From *we want to* to *I want to*

The analysis of the verbs following the cluster *I want to* reveal another scenario with respect to the same cluster in the plural form. As the table 6.5 displays there is a good number of instances where speakers sort to *I* for metadiscursive reasons or as Partington calls it, “discourse managing *I*” (2003: 77):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic categories of lexical verbs</th>
<th>Verbal realization (COOK)</th>
<th>Verbal realization (STRAW)</th>
<th>Verbal realization (BECKETT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meta-discursive</strong></td>
<td>Address (3), announce, begin, close, end, focus (3), identify, launch, present, put across, re-cast, set out (2), speak, spell out, start, put on record, argue (2), reach out, share (4), celebrate, bury (3), go further</td>
<td>Answer (2), begin, concentrate, conclude (2), deal with (3), discuss, draw, emphasise, end, examine, explain, explore, focus (6), highlight (4), identify, make the point (6), mention, offer (2), return, set out (2), sketch out, speak about (2), start (2), stress, take (2), talk (7), turn, underline, use my speech, applaud, do (2), endorse, dispel, explode, galvanise, pay tribute (4), share, thank (11);</td>
<td>begin, end (5), lay down, mention (3), talk about (5), touch, use, push the agenda, be clear;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental</strong></td>
<td>make sure (5), propose, reinforce, see (7), suggest;</td>
<td>assure, build on, see (8), suggest (5), look (3),</td>
<td>achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>Make, do (2)</td>
<td>Make, do (2)</td>
<td>Make, do (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td>Say (2), report;</td>
<td>Report (2), say (7);</td>
<td>Put a question, say;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tot.</strong></td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental</strong></td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material</strong></td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Verbs following the cluster *I want to*

The mental category following *I want to* is similar to the group in table 6.4 above all the verb *see* which has the same function as signalling the desire of achieving certain goals and visualise the future. The mental group
seems to express the institutional ‘footing’ given by the speakers as leader of the FCO and thus by their role as minister, as explicitly stated by Beckett in citation 10 in the following concordances:

1 I want to make sure that the Foreign Office is giving the same first class service to British business.
2 I want to make the FCO’s commitment to human rights irreversible.
3 I want to see a zone of peace, prosperity, stability and democracy from the Baltic to the Black Sea
4 During the British Presidency, I want to see this taken forward across the whole of Central Europe.
5 I want to see each applicant state with quality people, trained to the highest standards, able to apply the
6 I want to see a European Union that is focused on their concerns. I want a European Union that helps

7 But the EU has yet to realise its full potential as a global actor. I want to see the EU pulling its weight in the
8 I want to see an EU which delivers real benefits to its citizens. The Convention
9 So the partnership which I want to see developing between South Africa and the UK is not just one based o

10 It goes to the heart of what I want to achieve as Foreign Secretary

Concordance 6.3 I want to + mental group - Cook, Straw, Beckett

Apart from the obvious projection of an optimistic future, another concern which features Cook in particular is his constant apprehension for the image of his ministry that is a clear example of the phenomenon of ‘aestheticization’ of public identities (Fairclough 2003: 183).

The major difference with the cluster in the plural form is then found in the meta-discursive group. Relying on relative frequency, Beckett is the most meta-discursive of all; a slight difference distances Straw from Cook who sorts to this category less often than the other two, even though the analysis of concordances, as shown later, reveals Straw as the least meta-discursive of all.

From the analysis of this metadiscursive group two main macro functions were identified: 1) discourse-managing and 2) opinion holder:

1. the first one manages discourse by introducing the main focus of the speech;
2. the second one signals the speaker’s voice;

These functions are unevenly distributed across the three ministers’
speeches. The analysis yielded the following comparative results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>COOK</th>
<th>STRAW</th>
<th>BECKETT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse managing</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion-holder</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Distribution of the metadiscursive functions across the three ministers' speeches

As the table 6.6 seems to suggest, Cook is the minister that more often than the others makes recourse to the cluster *I want to* in order to manipulate discourse by introducing his voice, followed by Beckett and then by Straw. But let us move on the description of these functions through concordances, starting from Cook:

1. To other members: CURBING SMALL ARMS. The second task I want to address is curbing the volume of arms in circulation. I
2. move on to the last impact from what happened in Bosnia which I want to address, and that is the very powerful ingenuity it has
3. Human Rights The last important aspect of our partnership that I want to address is human rights. We respect the different
4. assemble a UN police force to keep civil order. Today, therefore, I want to announce that Britain will follow up our Standby
5. inner strength it gives us in our conduct of business with others. I want to argue the case why we can be confident about the
6. Union. Before I turn to these European matters though, I want to begin by providing a rather wider context to the
7. I want to bury the myth that Brussels is Them. Brussels is us. I want to bury the myth that Britain can only win when Europe
8. Europe in this country. A debate based on fact, not myths, I want to bury the myth of a supranational - national identities are
9. the myth of a supranational - national identities are too strong, I want to bury the myth that Brussels is Them. Brussels is us. I
10. London Speech Date: 1994/01 Speaker: Robin Cook Tonight I want to celebrate Britishness. As Foreign Secretary I see every
11. and invest in. And there is also an argument of human decency. I want to close by sharing with you what for me has been the
12. I want it to be representative of every community. That is why I want to end by asking for your help in getting me to meet that
13. for our work programme for the next year. This morning, though, I want to focus my remarks on the urgent challenges facing us on
14. But we have not avoided a world with too much war. That is why I want to focus my remarks today on what we must do if we are
15. a consensus. That also requires changes of substance. So now I want to focus on two issues of substance, two essential building
16. optimistic about the future of Britain and Britishness. Indeed, I want to go further and argue that in each of the areas where the
17. in their present form, but as a foundation on which to build. I want to identify four directions for the building of Europe. In three
18. our joint objectives, STRENGTHENING OUR DIALOGUE. Today I want to launch that new dialogue with initiatives that will
19. We value these relationships - and we hope they do too. But I want to make sure that small and medium enterprises also
20. Office has been receiving from the CBI has been first class. I want to make sure that the Foreign Office is giving the same
When verbs such as *address, announce, launch* are found in the right context of the cluster, the function is clearly that of managing and organizing discourse. In this macro category two other sub-categories may be distinguished: the speaker as ‘architecturing’ his discourse, given by verbs such as *begin, close* and the speaker as ‘illustrator’ when verbs like *emphasize, focus* are in the left context of the cluster. Lines 5 and 16 emphasize the argumentative voice as a constitutive factor in the construction of discourse that in this case is Britishness. The same topic concerns concordances 7, 8, 9, which contain an interesting pattern that is unusual in everyday English: *to bury the myth*. The item *myth* is attitudinal in its meaning insofar it may refer either to a legendary story representing a hero or to an unproved or false collective belief that is used to justify something. Whereas the former is connotatively positive the latter has a negative pragmatic load. A search into the *Bank of English* of the word ‘myth’ has showed that this item never collocates with the verb ‘bury’. It is common to speak of ‘exploding’, ‘destroying’, ‘dispelling’, ‘debunking’ the myth (collocates which were found in the Straw’s sub-corpus), but not of ‘burying’. The use of this formulation has to be considered idiosyncratic.
of Cook’s style and hence, constituting a sign of personal deviation from the standard way of communicating in diplomacy. It is an indication of what Martin and White call ‘signature’ (2005: 208): “the idiolectical reconfiguration[s] of meaning-making potential by which individual authors achieve a recognisable personal style”. The connotation of the verb ‘bury’ is commonly known and its ‘fatal’ nuance underlines Cook’s assertiveness. The wider context of these three citations tells us that this assertiveness concerns his commitment to fight euroscepticism:

(6) I want to bury the myth of a superstate - national identities are too strong. I want to bury the myth that Brussels is Them. Brussels is us. I want to bury the myth that Britain can only win when Europe loses, or vice versa. (Cook, 13.11.01)

As it can be noticed, Cook recurs to parallelism to give emphasis to his position to negate in a decisive way the fallacy of the belief that Britain may be self-adequate without Europe. Straw uses the same pattern but in the traditional form as shown in the following example:

(7) But there is another myth about diplomacy which I want to dispel. Von Clausewitz’s maxim that: ‘War is nothing more than the continuation of politics by other means’, has convinced many people that the reverse is also true – that international diplomacy is just a watered down version of war; a zero-sum game where each country presses its own advantage to the exclusion of all others. (Straw, 19.10.05)

Here Straw is defending the results of the work of diplomacy by rejecting the ‘endorsement’ of the theorist of the war and expressing opinion through the formulation the reverse is true. The occurrences of this type of patterns signal that these speakers evaluate on the parameter of ‘true versus false’.

Again going back to Cook’s concordances and moving down the
vertical axis, we note that the examples which convey a more attitudinal
meaning are also instantiated through the pattern *I want to share with you* or
the more diplomatic expression *I want to start our discussion by sharing with you
some thoughts* that may be seen as a paraphrase of the simple epistemic verb
*I think*. The speaker tends to establish a relationship with the audience to
the extent of asking for their help (10). In so doing distance is cut because
the speaker proposes a stance of equality with the audience. Citations 16,
41 which denote argumentation once again have to do with Britishness.
This seems to suggest that when Cook takes on the opinion-holder role
the British identity or the ideology of the nationhood is the main concern.

Whereas completely absent in Beckett, this strategy of interaction is
used in 22.8% of the instances in Cook against only 6.25% in Straw. Like
Cook, Straw appears as opinion-holder, even though less frequently, in
citation 15 through the highly rhetorical formulation *what I want to do is just
to offer you my thoughts* or in concordance 20 by endorsing Bush’s words of
praise for Russian involvement in the fight against terrorism. Most of the
instances of this interactional strategy are found in national speeches and
sometimes extended to interstate communication. This shows the
activation of the ‘policy legitimacy’ (Roselle 2006: 9): the speaker must
convince that he knows how to achieve the desired objectives and first, he
must persuade the others from the same administration.

15 persuaded. You don’t want too long a speech, but what I want to do is just to offer you my thoughts on some of the
16 European Union but rather absolutely opposed to it. What I want to do today is reach out to the genuine sceptics – the
17 for European economic and political reform. In doing so, I want to draw some parallels with the UK’s experience over
18 international partnerships will play an important role. But I want to emphasise again that our most important
19 relationship between Britain and the Czech Republic – and I want to and on the same theme. We may not agree on
20 Russian Government’s role in the fight against terrorism. I want to endorse that message. Russia has been a key ally
Apart from the concordance 39 where Straw involves the Nigerian audience, in all the other citations his role shifts from that of ‘illustrating’ the political strategies (*I want to make the case/point*) as from lines 41 to 45, where argumentation once again is instrumental in the construction of the speaker stance. Concordances from line 50 to line 53 carry out mere institutional tasks instantiated through rhetorical formulations such as *pay tribute to*. If we consider that in 13% of the metadiscursive group the verb *thank* is a right collocate, Straw is the minister who less takes on the metadiscursive role and in half of these instances the ‘illustrator’ position is preferred. Thus, the institutional role is more dominant in Straw rather than in the other two ministers. A more evaluative interference is noticed in context related to the alliances, both with the Arab world as in line 18 or with the USA as in the following citation. Here items like *enormous importance, indispensability* and the involving *us* mark a higher participation from the speaker:

(8) In this context, *I want to underline the enormous*
importance to us – in fact, the indispensability – of our alliance with the United States in the struggle against international terrorism.

The above segment shows that the cluster I want to signals evaluation which is also based on the cumulative contribution from other elements in the sentence.

As seen in table 6.2 Beckett uses this search cluster less often than the other two ministers:

Concordance 6.6: Beckett – I want to

The ‘dispersion plot’ utility shows that Beckett makes recourse to this expression at the beginning and at the end of the speech (see figure 1 below).
This suggests that she employs this cluster to guide her audience by illustrating what she wants to focus on and then she sorts to the cluster again at the end of her speech to cite the topic she wants to close with. But there are other instances, like line 13, where the cluster, preceded by the cautiously entertained formulation, *if I may*, stresses the topic she is strongly committed to as we read in the wider context of that citation …*which I have a particularly strong personal and professional commitment.* This less apparent assertive position visible through the use of this ‘accuracy hedge’ (Partington 2003: 64) is mainly due to the shifting from the discourse of terrorism in the lines coming before this citation to the discourse of climate change. Furthermore, I would add that the variable of female gender might have its influence, too. At the beginning of this speech in
Pakistan, after the usual introductory thanking, she states:

(9) Foreign Affairs is not quite the male preserve it used to be but it is still heartening to see a woman in charge of bringing on the next generation of a country’s diplomats. (27.02.07)

The fact that Beckett appears as being mainly metadiscursive than opinion-holder, like Straw, does not mean that she does not express her personal viewpoint because, the cluster under investigation ranks second in the top-cluster list (see table 6.2). Indeed, the pattern she prefers is the epistemic I know that.

From the reading of the only three concordances which include the plural subject before the cognitive verb know, we might infer that the cluster is used in an impersonal way and in a context of explanation due to the adverb ‘because’.

1 It actually makes that commitment even more vital. Because in the longer term we know that it would be easier
2 a fertile ground for radicalisation and extremism; and because we know that bad human rights can lead to failed
3 that ignores human rights, then that policy will fail - because we know that human rights abuse provides a fertile

Concordance 6.7: Beckett – we know that

On the contrary through the use of the pattern I know that Beckett expresses her cognitive stance based on sources of evidence so as to appear an expert. This seems to put distance between the I-cognisant observer and the audience as in line 5 where the explicit source of knowledge also serves the scope of gaining trust and credibility:
Concordance 6.8: Beckett – I know that

In some instances such as lines 2, 3, 9, 11 the role of cognisant observer and evaluator are overlapped and in so doing the speaker builds up her evaluation on knowledge. In other cases the cluster has an interpersonal function as in lines 4, 13, 14, 15 where the speaker cognitively pre-empts the audience’s feelings or needs. She shifts from the more impersonal everyone to the interactive you and thus she combines cognitive stance with an inclination to pander to her audience. This function counts for almost the half of the instances that is it is visible in 40.2% of the citations.

6.3 Discussion and concluding remarks

Clusters of subjectivity are the interpretation of linguistic expressions in terms of cognisant observer, speaker representative, thinker and emoter.

In this chapter different roles behind the subjectivity have been highlighted. As far as the we-cluster is concerned, it occurs mainly exclusively and, thus, it may be seen as representing of the institution. Used in this way, the cluster reduces the speaker to a ‘mediator’ between the government and the audience and hence, the minister goes under a process of de-personalization.
The shift from *we want to* to *I want to* is determined by metadiscursive reasons due to the high frequency of organizing-discourse verbs following the search cluster. The only overlap function between the two perspectives is given by the mental verb *see* which indicates the projection towards an optimistic future. In the case of the cluster *I want to see*, the vision is shared by both the speaker as foreign minister and the individual. As Biber maintains (2006: 124) the verb ‘want’ followed by the infinitive form implies an indirect-directive function. So an implicit attempt to formulate a directive may be noticed in these instantiations of strong desire.

The analysis of the cluster *I want to*, which features prominently Cook and Straw, has shown that the two ministers sort to it for reasons of discourse organization but also to express their evaluation. In this case the verb ‘want’ is deprived of its volitional function because the emphasis is more on diplomatic expressions such as *offer my thoughts, sharing my thoughts*. In order to persuade their audience the diplomatic leaders must argue that their strategic choices will enhance the global morality that all share.

Differently from Straw, who emerges as the most institutional among the three ministers, Cook has revealed signs of ‘signature’ namely aspects of style (*to bury the myth*) that make him less traditional than his colleagues. Straw’s more pronounced ‘impersonality’ may be read as a sign of strong alignment with his party but also as a sign of his difficult times.

Beckett, like the others, shifts to the first personal pronoun cluster for discourse management reasons uncovering tentativeness (*if I may*). Beckett’s foreign ministry coincides with a rising in the awareness of the importance of the climate change issue in the international arena and she finds herself to fight for a challenge that appears less tangible with respect to terrorism. Nevertheless, the highest frequency of the patterns *I know that* with respect to the other two ministers shows a strong commitment to the
truth and the knowledge. If the plural form (we know that) is mainly used impersonally, the cluster I know that represents the minister as a cognisant observer or better an expert, a role that is mitigated by the interpersonal function of the same cluster, that is anticipating the audience’s needs so as to set up empathy with it.
CHAPTER SEVEN

FINAL REMARKS

7. 1 Summary of the study

This research has set itself up as one primarily concerned with issues of ideology which does not refer to ‘distorted consciousness’ but to a system of beliefs construed as a way of comprehending the world. In particular it has taken the view that the question of ideology is the way in which social subjects position, but also are positioned, in a given culture.

When the Labour Party won the election in 1997, the incoming foreign minister Robin Cook promoted an ‘ethical dimension’ in his foreign policy marking a decisive break with the individualism of the previous government and announcing a different approach to international relations. The changing global setting is seen as posing unique and serious threats, from terrorism to climate change, which require global response and, therefore, diplomacy has to adapt itself to this world in transition.

In this scenario of changing diplomacy this study has explored the axiological and ideological discursive strategies through which the three foreign ministers in their speeches under the ten years of Blair’s government (1997-2007) have ‘naturalised’ their viewpoints.

First, the study has taken a historical approach in order to define the concept of diplomacy. Then, the word security has been investigated co-textually and contextually. In the last part of the study the ‘voices’ of the ministers have been considered in order to look at the shifts from
institutional to individual roles. The main analytical approaches have been Corpus Linguistics and Appraisal Theory.

7.2 Findings

The extraction of the ‘conceptual knowledge’ of diplomacy from the corpus has highlighted that diplomacy, even though still based on negotiation as the core meaning of its definition, is a flexible concept. Moreover, it is more than soft-power and above all, taking an economic approach, it aims at safeguarding its customers’ human rights.

Relying on the methodology of Corpus Linguistics, chapter four has shown an enlargement of the concept of security. This has been noticed through the quantitative investigation of the associated words around security. The quantitative analysis was conducted through ConcGram, a piece of software which allows the automatic identification of phraseological variation and aims to find all the word co-occurrences, called ‘concgrams’, in a text.

The most significant concgrams found around security are the contiguous and non-contiguous combinations of security with a set of nominalizations such as peace, prosperity, freedom, justice and stability. The most frequent concgrams security/peace, security/threat and security/climate characterize Cook, Straw and Beckett respectively. Even though with a peak in the Straw’s sub-corpus, the strong association between security and prosperity features all the three ministers’ speeches, emphasising the relevance of the economic aspect. The provenance of these collocates from different fields makes the discourse of security interdiscursively hybrid. The presence of people and citizens in the concordances analysed, but above all the numerous collocates such as food, water or climate (only in the Beckett’s sub-corpus) covers security with a more domestic connotation,
moving it from the traditional institutional referent to focus on the needs of people. We can safely state that security is undergoing a process of rescaling: from territorial denotation and protection from crime it appears closer to more immediate environmental and domestic questions.

The high occurrence of these collocations, in particular of peace and security and security and prosperity, creates an equation between an interest (security) and the other values (freedom, justice, stability) both moral and economic. Security is represented as ‘commodity’, which lends itself as a potential inward investment, it is an important goal but at the same time it is a means to achieve stability and economic success.

The analysis of the context of security has pointed out how the main purpose of the discourse of security is advocacy: the audience is persuaded that security is an interest and a value at the same time and that the civic society operates to protect citizens from potential dangers. From the evaluative point of view security is appraised in terms of significance, but it is still a desirable entity not fully achieved, as the wordings of negative composition have shown.

The higher presence of co-occurrences of items such as peace, freedom and commitment in Cook’s discourse are clear indicators of the ideological purpose of promoting his ‘ethical dimension’ to foreign policy, namely a moral representation of Britain. A similar purpose concerns the belief in universal values of which international institutions are guardians (see the metaphors of stone or the numerous relational processes which link Britain to the NATO or to the UN).

The axiological orientations of the significance of security and participation and cooperation are mainly expressed monoglossically as well as the respect for the rule of law: these are prerequisites that are not subject to negotiation.
The metaphor of ‘peace-as-a-pathway to security’ is worded in terms of ‘disclaim’ mostly through negative formulations where the role of the ‘cause’ has been found to be dominant. This ideology of causation is also worded through the if-clauses and through the comparative correlatives. In Cook, more particularly, it is reinforced by the use of the mechanism of ‘justification’ through the cluster *that is why*. Many political choices concerning Britain are thus justified in an explicit way, both at home and abroad. The pervasiveness of the causality, but also the numerous instantiations of relational processes (e.g. *prosperity depends on security*), which have given rise to the rhetoric of interdependence, leads me to suggest a new form for the ideology of causation, which I would call the ideology of ‘corollary’. A set of events is posited and the effects described are the natural consequences of them. So for instance, peace is the means to reach security, but security is also a means to reach prosperity and finally, wealth creation should ultimately bring social justice. Furthermore, security is instrumental to the construction of nationhood, which in turn serves the scope of achieving security. This causal force is grammatically and textually expressed; sometimes the ‘corollary’ needs elucidation (*that is why*), sometimes the derivation is more evident (without X …no Y). This dominance of deontic modality, above all in Cook, goes hand in hand with his appeal to the logic of beliefs and desires. The past of humanity was caused by what people wanted and believed in, similarly, the future prosperity will be caused by our desires and beliefs. Cook’s strong commitment and personal investment might be read in the light of two main aspects: the new ethical dimension of the British foreign policy, which needed a strong assertiveness, and the fight against euro scepticism to reconcile patriotism and internationalism.

When an event is set up a number of consequences is ready to be
activated: the call for cooperation enhances a bond that is action-oriented and action is right because all the actors live within the same normative framework. This action is legitimated by the desired homogenisation of interests and values but also by common threats.

The threats identified in Straw come from the external world and are potentially everywhere. This is represented in language through the ideologically-oriented phenomenon of ‘overwording’ expressed lexically (e.g. contagion, disease, malaria, fear) but also through processes, which presuppose the presence of external enemies that paralyse, impoverish and make prosperity decline. The ideology of the ‘undesirable’ relies on the semantic of the fear, which activates a need for protection and tries to ‘justify’ the use of force backing new diplomacy. Straw’s chosen ‘proclaimed’ formulations, which objectivise his position, the less frequent use of personal pronouns with respect to the other two ministers, make him more impersonal and thus more aligned with the governmental viewpoints.

The unfavourable connotation of threat invests the concgram security/climate which represents another big issue. This time the ‘danger’ is not external but we are all our enemies. Dealing with a more contingent topic, namely the security climate issue, Beckett is more contrasting in her stance construction (e.g. many uses of concessive formulations) and her battle, in a role for the first time in the British history covered up by a woman, foregrounds foreknowledge. The negative axiology of victimization of the external threats to security is in her speeches opposed by the axiology of responsibility: the future prosperity depends on our actions but also on our foresight. As Bell noticed in his work (1988) ideology is also passion and desire which need to be transmitted and Beckett’s devotion is worded as a struggle both argumentatively and metalinguistically. Her preference for the cluster I know that with respect to her colleagues’ commitment to promote
the image of the prosperous future Britain in an enlarged Europe (I want to), construes her both as pragmatic but also as inclined to perceive the audience’s expectations.

Looking at the social function of ideologies as supporting group interests and the cognitive function as organizing their social representations (Van Dijk 1998: 2), evaluation in diplomatic speeches serves both by promoting Britishness and the harmony of values and interests. Britain is appraised positively as a nation that is altruistic and sympathetic but above all tolerant towards other countries such as Ireland and the Islam. Civic society is a practice within which our rights protect us from wrongful interventions. Proud of its historical past Britain still appears as having a hegemonic identity (bridge between the USA and Europe) and a nurturance orientation: the ethical call is the engine of benevolence. British national identity constitutes the primary link between the individual and society and between the society and the world.

7.3 Implications for further research
This study has given insights into the language of diplomacy as the language of the foreign ministers. The speeches studied were expected to be imbued with evaluation that is not evident at the surface level of the language and that was the case. Ideological positioning does not avert the expression of evaluations.

Avenues for further research into the nature of diplomatic speech might look, for example, at the discourse of ‘human rights’ which emerged as keywords in the list and focus on the ideological discursive strategies and the patterns of preference so as to compare them with the results in this research.

It has been noticed how Beckett’s more detached attitude and her
subtle criticism places her in a different position with respect to the other two ministers. It would be, then, interesting to look at her speeches from the perspective of the ‘gender studies’ to shed light on her confrontational, almost adversarial discursive strategies, as well as her pragmatism and see if they are typical features of female politicians or dependent on the nature of the topic debated, as was the hypothesised case in this study.

A broader and a bit more ambitious project might investigate the mediatised political discourse to look at how the three diplomatic identities here represented are reconstructed in a more interactive genre, such as interviews, where speakers are expected to be more spontaneous than in the speeches analysed in this work.
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APPENDICES
## APPENDIX 1

The Diplomatic Corpus (DiCo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ROBIN COOK’S SPEECHES</th>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAZI GOLD: JUSTICE, OPENNESS AND REMEMBRANCE’</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02.12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A NEW EUROPE FOR A CHANGING WORLD</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>27.11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NEW LABOUR</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>12.05.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BRITAIN, POLAND AND EUROPE</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>28.11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'THE BRITISH PRESIDENCY: GIVING EUROPE BACK TO THE PEOPLE’</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>03.11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PEACE AND PROSPERITY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>12.06.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HUMAN RIGHTS INTO A NEW CENTURY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>17.07.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A UNITED NATIONS FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>23.09.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A EUROPE WHOLE AND FREE</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>26.11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BEYOND GOOD INTENTIONS - GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS AND THE ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>17.11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>THE ARAB-BRITISH PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>05.03.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MAKING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY WORK’</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>03.11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A NEW PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>Conference London</td>
<td>04.02.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>'BOSNIA - A NEW HOPE'</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>04.03.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>THE EUROPEAN AUDIOVISUAL INDUSTRY’</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>06.04.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A NEW DIALOGUE WITH ISLAM</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>08.10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>KEEPING HOPE ALIVE IN THE MIDDLE EAST</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>09.07.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>THE BRITISH PRESIDENCY</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>14.01.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EUROPE AND AMERICA: THE DECISIVE PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>15.01.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>HUMAN RIGHTS: MAKING THE DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>16.10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ANNUAL FOREIGN POLICY REPORT</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>23.04.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>BRITISH PRESIDENCY OF THE EU, JANUARY-JUNE 1998</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>25.06.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BRITAIN</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>27.11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PROSPERITY, CONFLICT PREVENTION AND DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>24.09.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>HONG KONG: LOOKING TO THE FUTURE</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>21.01.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>BRITAIN AND THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>15.02.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WINNING INWARD INVESTMENT FOR BRITAIN</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>14.07.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>INVESTMENT IN BRITAIN: THE BEST BRIDGE INTO EUROPE</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>06.09.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WHY THE COMMONWEALTH MATTERS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>28.10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>CONFLICT PREVENTION IN THE MODERN WORLD</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>21.09.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SUPPORTING BUSINESS: A TOP PRIORITY AT THE FCO</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>21.10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>FOREIGN AFFAIRS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>22.11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>BRITAIN’S FUTURE IN EUROPE</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>23.11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>BRITAIN PLAYING A LEADING PART IN EUROPE</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>25.11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>BUILDING A COMMONWEALTH OF HOPE</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>22.09.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SHAPING THE FUTURE OF EUROPE</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>06.01.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>LORD MAYOR’S EASTER BANQUET SPEECH</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>03.05.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>THE CASE FOR EUROPE</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02.07.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>THE INFLUENCE OF IDEAS OF 1989 ON FOREIGN</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.01.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL INTEREST</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>28.01.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE 2010</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A BETTER UN FOR A BETTER WORLD</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14.09.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDING UP FOR BRITAIN BY STANDING WITH EUROPE</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>16.11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDING HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>19.07.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFLECTING THE DIVERSE FACE OF MODERN BRITAIN IN DIPLOMACY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>19.07.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL NEIGHBOURS IN A GLOBAL ERA</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>20.01.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMEMBERING THE HOLOCAUST; LOOKING TO THE FUTURE</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>26.01.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITIES FOR THE OSCE IN THE YEAR AHEAD</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>27.11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPIONING ENLARGEMENT</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>25.07.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRENGTHENING BRITAIN'S RELATIONSHIP WITH JAPAN</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>29.06.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRINGING TODAY'S TORTURERS TO JUSTICE; SPARING TOMORROW'S VICTIMS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>29.03.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CHALLENGES OF GLOBALISATION</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>09.03.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULATING AND REDUCING SMALL ARMS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.02.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELEBRATING BRITISHNESS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>19.04.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVENTING CONFLICT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>26.03.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RIGHTS - A PRIORITY OF BRITAIN'S FOREIGN POLICY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>28.03.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>JACK STRAW’S SPEECHES</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A EUROPE FOR ITS CITIZENS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>27.07.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ORDER OUT OF CHAOS: THE FUTURE OF AFGHISTAN</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>22.10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>NOT A BALANCE OF POWER BUT A BALANCE OF TRUST</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>31.10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>THE TASK OF DEFEATING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11.11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>BALANCING PROFIT WITH RESPONSIBILITY IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>03.12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>EUROPE AFTER 11 SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>11.12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CHAMPIONING GREATER UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN DIFFERENT FAITHS AND CULTURES</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>25.01.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>THE FUTURE OF ARMS CONTROL AND NON-PROLIFERATION</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>06.02.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>REFORMING EUROPE: NEW ERA, NEW QUESTIONS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>21.02.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RE-ORDERING THE WORLD</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>25.03.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF A MODERN GLOBAL COMMUNITY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10.04.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>HUMAN RIGHTS ENSURE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND PROSPERITY</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>18.04.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>EU-US RELATIONS: THE MYTHS AND THE REALITY</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>08.05.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A NEW MISSION FOR EUROPE</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>27.05.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>AGENDA FOR THE SEVILLE EUROPEAN COUNCIL</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>18.06.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>09.07.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>PROMOTING A SECURE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>16.07.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>BRITAIN AND JAPAN: A 21ST CENTURY PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>17.07.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>BRITAIN'S MUSLIM COMMUNITIES</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>24.07.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>STRENGTH IN EUROPE BEGINS AT HOME</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>27.08.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>PARTNERS IN PREVENTION</td>
<td>Helsingborg</td>
<td>30.08.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>SECURITY IS NOT AN OPTION, IT IS A NECESSITY</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14.09.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>THE UK AND THE UNITED STATES: A PARTNERSHIP FOR STABILITY AND PROSPERITY</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>15.10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>LEADERSHIP IN EUROPE</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>17.10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>THE FUTURE OF FOREIGN POLICY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>13.11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>DEFEATING ORGANISED CRIME</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>25.11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>ROLE OF THE FREE PRESS IN FOREIGN POLICY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>26.11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>UK’S EDUCATIONAL AND SPORTING LINKS WITH AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>28.11.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>THE CONTINUING IMPORTANCE OF THE ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>CRITICAL DECISIONS FOR THE EU</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>05.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>PROMOTING TRADE UNIONS AT HOME AND OVERSEAS</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>18.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FOR BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>06.01.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE MUSLIM</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>09.01.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>Vindicating The UN's Founding Ideal</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20.01.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>A Challenge We Must Confront</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>11.02.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Reintegrating Iraq Into The</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>21.02.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Community - A Cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With 'Compelling Moral Force'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>We Have To Put Saddam To The Test</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>07.03.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Commitment To The Liberation And</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>01.04.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Prosperity Of Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>The Future Of Iraq And The Roadmap</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>30.04.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Peace In The Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>South Africa Is Making A</td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
<td>14.05.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good In The World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Europe In The World</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>19.05.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>A Blueprint For The New Europe</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>17.06.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Combating Torture</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>26.06.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Human Rights Annual Report 2003</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>18.09.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>UN Should Remain 'An Effective</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>25.09.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Forum'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Faith And Foreign Policy</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>08.10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Making The Positive Case For Europe</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>23.10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Pursuing An Active And Engaged</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>27.11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>A New Strategy For A New Era</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02.12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Bringing European Enlargement -</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>09.12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities And Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Building A Strong Relationship With</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10.12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Muslims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Building A Modern And Effective</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>10.12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership With The Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Territories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Britain And Ireland: Strong</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>16.12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partners In An Expanding Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Franco-British Relations 100 Years</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>12.01.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After The Entente Cordiale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>We Must Build Strong Partnerships</td>
<td>Davos</td>
<td>21.01.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Combat The Threats We Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Our Commitment To Reconstructing</td>
<td>Davos</td>
<td>21.01.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq Is Firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Middle East Peace Process At A</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>02.02.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fork In The Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>India Has Huge Potential To Be A</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>06.02.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Force For Good In The World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Britain And India: A Changing And</td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>07.02.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prospering Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>A New Era For Foreign Policy</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>12.02.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Partnerships For Reform In The Arab</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>01.03.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Pakistan And Britain: A Strong</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>05.03.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership For A Safer World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Europe Must Come Together To Defeat</td>
<td>Copenaghen</td>
<td>23.03.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Negotiations On The EU Constitutional</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>30.03.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Cross-Channel Currents: 100 Years</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>08.04.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of Entente Cordiale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>We Must Engage In Europe And In The</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>21.04.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

181
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDER WORLD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67. BUILDING AN EU THAT CAN DELIVER ON ITS CITIZENS' PRIORITIES</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. GLOBAL SCIENCE FOR OUR COMMON FUTURE</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. SHAPING A REFORMING EUROPE</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. THE SOUTH ASIAN DYNAMIC</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. BY ENGAGING IN EUROPE WE CAN LEAD REFORM</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. BREAKING THE DEADLOCK IN THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. STRAW SPEAKS AT RECEPTION TO MARK LAUNCH OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING GUIDELINES</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. THIS IS A TREATY FOR AN EFFECTIVE EUROPEAN UNION OF NATIONS</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. THE ALLIANCE IS AS IMPORTANT AS EVER</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. STRAW CONCLUDES COMMONS DEBATE ON IRAQ</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. PEACE IS VITAL ABOVE ALL</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. WHAT IS CHANGING IN THE NEW EUROPEAN UNION?</td>
<td>Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. SHAPING A STRONGER UNITED NATIONS</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. SUDAN</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. WHITE PAPER ON THE TREATY FOR A EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. GLOBAL SECURITY IS OUR SHARED RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. JACK STRAW AWARDS HONORARY OBE TO PROFESSOR SURYA PRAKASH SUBEDI</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. LONDON RIGHT VENUE FOR 2012 OLYMPICS</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. FOREIGN SECRETARY SPEAKS AT RECEPTION COMMEMORATING 300 YEARS OF BRITISH GIBRALTAR</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. STRONGER PARTNERSHIPS TO TACKLE A COMPLEX AND GLOBAL CHALLENGE</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. THE CHALLENGES AHEAD FOR AFGHANISTAN</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. FOREIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. JACK STRAW AWARDS HONORARY GCMB TO RYSAK KACZOROWSKI</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. FCO ANNUAL HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT 2004</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. MIDDLE EAST AND UKRAINE: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. A CONSTITUTION FOR OUR KIND OF EUROPE</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. FOREIGN SECRETARY OUTLINES AGENDA FOR NEXT EUROPEAN COUNCIL MEETING</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. STRAW ATTENDS 'SPECIAL ASEAN LEADERS' MEETING ON EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. SPEECH BY FOREIGN SECRETARY AT INTERNATIONAL POLICING RECEPTION</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. UK-JAPAN: 'A SHARED COMMITMENT TO TACKLING CLIMATE CHANGE'</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. BRITAIN AND CHINA: A GROWING GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. ELECTIONS IN IRAQ 'SHOULD UNITE US ALL'</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. PROSPECTS FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>EU CONSTITUTIONAL TREATY - A STRONG BRITAIN IN A REFORMING EUROPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>A MODERN PARTNERSHIP FOR ENGAGEMENT AND UNDERSTANDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>BRINGING EUROPEAN ENLARGEMENT - OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>BUILDING A STRONG RELATIONSHIP WITH BRITISH MUSLIMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>BUILDING A MODERN AND EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE OVERSEAS TERRITORIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>BRITAIN AND IRELAND: STRONG PARTNERS IN AN EXPANDING EUROPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>FRANCO-BRITISH RELATIONS 100 YEARS AFTER THE ENTENTE CORDIALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>A PARTNERSHIP FOR WIDER FREEDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PRE-EUROPEAN COUNCIL DEBATE - OPENING SPEECH BY THE FOREIGN SECRETARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>INDIA: THE NEXT DECADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>EU WHITE PAPER RELEASED ON EVE OF UK PRESIDENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>LAUNCH OF ANGLO-POLISH HISTORICAL COMMITTEE REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>LONDON 2012 OLYMPIC BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>STRENGTHENING THE EU AS A FORCE FOR GOOD IN AFRICA AND THE WIDER WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>SECURITY IS THE KEY TO THE FUTURE OF IRAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>COMMEMORATION OF SREBRENICA MASSACRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>OUR CHANGED AND CHANGING WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>EUROPEAN UNION: TURKEY AND CROATIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>STRAW SPEAKS AT UK FUNDED CARIBBEAN SENIOR COMMAND TRAINING COURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>UK-US FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM AND ISRAEL SHARE THE SAME DEMOCRATIC VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>CHANGE IN THE MIDDLE EAST ‘MUST BE DRIVEN BY ALL’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>THE EUROPEAN RESPONSE TO GLOBALISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>RECEPTION TO MARK EID-AL-FITR: REMARKS BY JACK STRAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>A DIALOGUE OF CULTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>STRAW OPENS PRE-EUROPEAN COUNCIL DEBATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>BUILDING A VIRTUOUS CIRCLE OF PEACE AND PROSPERITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>THE CENTRAL ROLE THAT MUSLIMS PLAY IN THIS COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>GLOBAL RESPONSE TO TERRORISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2006 - MAJOR FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>TURKEY: STRAW COMMENTS ON EU ACCESSION TALKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>FOREIGN SECRETARY OPENS DAVOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION ON THE MIDDLE EAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. 'AFRICA: A NEW AGENDA' - FOREIGN SECRETARY</td>
<td>Abuja, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. THE PEOPLE OF DARFUR WANT PEACE</td>
<td>Abuja, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. IRAN: THE PATH AHEAD</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. BRITISH MUSLIMS: WHERE BRITAIN AND ISLAM INTERSECT</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. EUROPEAN COUNCIL 23-24 MARCH</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. ACTIVE DIPLOMACY FOR A CHANGING WORLD</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. VALUES WE PROMOTE AT HOME, GUIDE US ABROAD</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. TWO KINGDOMS: FRIENDSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>Riyadh, Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. STRAW SPEECH: LORD MAYOR'S EASTER BANQUET</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. CHINA AND INTERNATIONAL ACTION</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. BRIDGING THE BOSPHORUS - TURKEY'S EUROPEAN FUTURE</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. LOCAL QUESTIONS, GLOBAL ANSWERS</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>MARGARET BECKETT'S SPEECHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>THE NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE EUROPEAN UNION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SCIENCE AND GLOBALISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>BECKETT MARKS LONDON BOMBINGS ANNIVERSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>TRADE UNION CONGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>LAUNCH OF FOREIGN POLICY PAMPHLET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CLIMATE CHANGE IS A &quot;TODAY PROBLEM NOT A TOMORROW ONE&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>UNITED NATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>GLOBAL PRESSURES DEMAND A GLOBAL AND MULTILATERAL RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>GLENNEAGLES DIALOGUE MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>DIWALI: FESTIVAL OF LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>LAUNCH OF THE 2006 ANNUAL REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>FOREIGN POLICY AND CLIMATE SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>IRAQ DEBATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>TERRORISM: DEFEATING THE THREAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>UK-INDIA RELATIONSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>FCO REMEMBRANCE CEREMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>LAUNCH OF GOF ANNUAL REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>REMARKS ON NEED FOR EU UNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>QUEEN'S SPEECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>THE MODERN FCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>'GOING BEHIND THE HEADLINES'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>PRE-EUROPEAN COUNCIL DEBATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>POST-EUROPEAN TURKEY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>BRAZIL CAN HAVE 'PIVOTAL ROLE' IN WORLD TRADE TALKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>UK FOREIGN POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>PAKISTAN: A NEW DIPLOMACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>JOHN SMITH MEMORIAL LECTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>COMMONS TRIDENT DEBATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>UK PERSONNEL IN IRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>CLIMATE CHANGE 'THE GATHERING STORM'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>LORD MAYOR'S EASTER BANQUET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>BECKETT PAYS TRIBUTE TO BORIS YELTSIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>THE CASE FOR CLIMATE SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION IN BEIJING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>UK-CHINA RELATIONS: PROMOTING A HARMONIOUS WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>ENERGY EFFICIENCY: WHAT DOES GUANGDONG HAVE TO GAIN?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>SPEECH AT THE BRITISH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>JAPAN AND THE UK: BECOMING TOP RUNNERS ON CLIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Opening Remarks at a lunch with Japanese opinion formers in Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Towards a low carbon global economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Queen’s Birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>International Community ‘Failing’ Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Iraq debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>We want results on disarmament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Concordance: active and engaged in DiCo

(1) An active and engaged foreign policy is not just a salve to liberal consciences. It is a survival mechanism for our societies.
(2) We both [India and Britain] take an active and engaged approach to the world.
(3) Over the next few weeks, in a series of speeches both here and abroad, I shall be setting out in more detail the reasons why the UK’s interests are best served by an active and engaged global foreign policy, working with our allies to push back the boundaries of chaos.
(4) Britain is more influential today because of the active and engaged foreign policy of this Government.
(5) I want to talk today about the need for an active and engaged approach to international policy, and about the important role which the UK-Pakistan relationship can play in that.
(6) Today, an active and engaged foreign policy does not just mean dealing with so-called global security.
(7) The Strategy explains why the UK will continue to need an active and engaged foreign policy, and must remain ready to use all the assets at its disposal - persuasion, advice, assistance and, if necessary, military force. It also looks at the relationships we shall need to achieve our goals.
(8) To protect the UK from threats such as terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and international crime, and to promote our economic interests, we must be active and engaged in the world.
(9) Safety, justice and prosperity are inextricably linked to each other; and achieving our goals means working on all three in an active and engaged way.
(10) Those of us, like me, who believe that Britain is stronger, more prosperous and more secure as an active and engaged member of the European Union will be making that case to the British people.
(11) We believe in an active and engaged role for Britain, as part of a strong international system which is able to confront the challenges and opportunities which we all face.
(12) Since 1997, this Government has pursued the active and engaged diplomacy that we need in today’s world.
(13) More than ever before our destiny as a confident, progressive, prosperous and secure nation state requires an active and engaged foreign policy.
APPENDIX 3

2-word congrams of security in the three Foreign Ministers’ speeches

2-word concgrams in COOK

2-word concgrams
1. security the 240
2. security Of 138
3. security and 92
4. security to 89
5. security a 81
6. security Council 72
7. security Our 59
8. security in 53
9. security we 50
10. security that 45
11. security is 39
12. security for 36
13. security on 30
14. security as 21
15. security more 21
16. security be 20
17. security has 20
18. security will 20
19. security with 19
20. security Europe 10 9.4%
21. security Britain 17 8.9%
22. security have 17
23. security it 17
24. security not 16
25. security can 15
26. security European 15 7.8%
27. security must 15
28. security peace 15
29. security by 13
30. security I 12
31. security Members 12
32. security permanent 12
33. security This 11
34. security are 10
35. security which 10
36. security international 9
37. security member 9
38. security prosperity 9 4.7%
39. security reform 9
40. security united 9
41. security us 9
42. security world 9
43. security was 9
44. security been 8
45. security its 8
46. security new 8
47. security NATO 8
48. security Rights 8
2-word concgrams in STRAW

2-word concgrams
1. security the 943
2. security and 612
3. security to 462
4. security of 401
5. security in 263
6. security Council 198
7. security our 193 0.06%
8. security a 191
9. security on 173
10. security for 163
11. security We 150
12. security is 147
13. security that 136
14. security as 96
15. security It 86
16. security which 86
17. security prosperity 82
18. security are 75
19. security international 73
20. security UN 71
21. security with 69
22. security this 65
23. security be 62
24. security have 62
25. security by 60
26. security will 60
27. security has 59
28. security I 57
29. security But 51
30. security European 50
31. security global 50
32. security peace 50
33. security threats 49
34. security can 48
35. security not 47
36. security more 45
37. security all 42
38. security an 41
39. security Policy 40
40. security there 39
41. security was 37
42. security from 36
43. security its 36
44. security at 35
45. security Europe 33
46. security today 32
47. security their 32
48. security own 31
49. security So 31
50. security us 31
51. security EU 30
52. security new 30
53. security world 30
54. security Defence 29
55. security other 29
56. security resolution 29
57. security UNITED 29
58. security Iraq 28
59. security members 28
60. security development 27
61. security they 27
62. security collective 26
63. security Nations 26
64. security need 26
65. security such 26
66. security one 25
67. security forces 24
68. security now 24
69. security resolutions 24
70. security common 23
71. security Foreign 23
72. security or 23
73. security terrorism 23
74. security threat 23
75. security than 23
76. security also 22
77. security no 22
78. security Permanent 22
79. security These 22
80. security Force 21
81. security last 20
82. security long 20
83. security do 19
84. security First 19
85. security Iraqi 19
86. security Those 19
87. security years 19
88. security action 18
89. security make 18
90. security Over 18
91. security should 18
92. security issues 17
93. security regional 17
94. security would 17
95. security work 17
96. security been 16
97. security because 16
98. security challenges 16
99. security two 16
100. security between 15
101. security energy 15
102. security Freedom 15
103. security Key 15
104. security law 15
105. security national 15
106. security only 15
107. security people 15
108. security states 15
109. security through 15
110. security who 15
111. security build 14
112. security future 14
113. security greater 14
114. security justice 14
115. security must 14
116. security political 14
117. security responsibility 14
118. security reform 14
119. security UK 14
120. security well 14
121. security act 13
122. security based 13
123. security both 13
124. security building 13
125. security could 13
126. security ever 13
127. security NATO 13
128. security past 13
129. security some 13
130. security situation 13
131. security take 13
security sustainable 9
security still 9
security terrorists 9
security War 9
security without 9
security able 8
security across 8
security ago 8
security am 8
security beyond 8
security Britain 8
security cannot 8
security countries 8
security challenge 8
security deliver 8
security how 8
security human 8
security interests 8
security issue 8
security Intelligence 8
security jobs 8
security many 8
security Middle 8
security much 8
security next 8
security put 8
security recognised 8
security rights 8
security too 8
security Three 8
security welcome 8
security where 8
security attacks 7
security around 7
security any 7
security about 7
security ahead 7
security British 7
security built 7
security community 7
security depends 7
security end 7
security few 7
security Iraq’s 7
security including 7
security into 7
security improving 7
security most 7
security member 7
security Multi 7
security my 7
security power 7
security role 7
security report 7
security right 7
security Sudan 7
security seek 7
security said 7
security set 7
| security | turn 7 |
| security | time 7 |
| security | within 7 |
| security | way 7 |
| security | agenda 6 |
| security | active 6 |
| security | arms 6 |
| security | agencies 6 |
| security | Again 6 |
| security | begin 6 |
| security | being 6 |
| security | bring 6 |
| security | conditions 6 |
| security | continue 6 |
| security | chaos 6 |
| security | criminal 6 |
| security | destruction 6 |
| security | decade 6 |
| security | depend 6 |
| security | did 6 |
| security | environment 6 |
| security | five 6 |
| security | fully 6 |
| security | far 6 |
| security | good 6 |
| security | guarantee 6 |
| security | General 6 |
| security | historic 6 |
| security | hope 6 |
| security | Iran 6 |
| security | Kingdom 6 |
| security | lasting 6 |
| security | later 6 |
| security | means 6 |
| security | maintain 6 |
| security | North 6 |
| security | non 6 |
| security | opportunity 6 |
| security | obligations 6 |
| security | passed 6 |
| security | partnership 6 |
| security | partners 6 |
| security | President 6 |
| security | police 6 |
| security | part 6 |
| security | recent 6 |
| security | rule 6 |
| security | serious 6 |
| security | Secretary 6 |
| security | strengthen 6 |
| security | STRAW 6 |
| security | SADDAM 6 |
| security | side 6 |
| security | social 6 |
| security | see 6 |
| security | therefore 6 |
| security | threaten 6 |
| security | tackling 6 |
| security | Turkey 6 |
security tackle 6
security tax 6
security very 6
security year 6
security alongside 5
security address 5
security away 5
security arrangements 5
security Afghanistan 5
security Africa 5
security area 5
security agreement 5
security Alliance 5
security agreed 5
security affect 5
security believe 5
security bringing 5
security conflicts 5
security create 5
security closely 5
security country 5
security consensus 5
security course 5
security confront 5
security capacity 5
security compliance 5
security closer 5
security concerns 5
security Committee 5
security December 5
security does 5
security direct 5
security done 5
security decision 5
security domestic 5
security decisions 5
security engagement 5
security ensuring 5
security efforts 5
security example 5
security free 5
security fundamental 5
security foundation 5
security governance 5
security Government 5
security get 5
security helping 5
security here 5
security helped 5
security Humanitarian 5
security important 5
security Iraqis 5
security India 5
security IAEA 5
security know 5
security longer 5
security live 5
security life 5
security makes 5
security modern 5
security made 5
security month 5
security Minister 5
security October 5
security outside 5
security others 5
security Palestinians 5
security posed 5
security proposed 5
security principle 5
security prosperous 5
security real 5
security relationship 5
security reach 5
security reinforce 5
security remain 5
security since 5
security September 5
security strong 5
security South 5
security share 5
security seen 5
security simply 5
security shared 5
security signed 5
security them 5
security themselves 5
security trade 5
security third 5
security use 5
security unanimously 5
security values 5
security wider 5
security why 5
security whole 5
security your 5

2-word concgrams security in BECKETT

1. security the 370
2. security and 209
3. security to 178
4. security of 174
5. security a 115
6. security climate 108
7. security in 103
8. security We 76
9. security that 73
10. security energy 70
11. security is 64
12. security our 61
13. security on 60
14. security Council 57
15. security for 48
16. security as 45
17. security it 41
18. security be 39
137. security heart 5
138. security issues 5
139. security investment 5
140. security links 5
141. security lead 5
142. security moment 5
143. security my 5
144. security priority 5
145. security part 5
146. security proliferation 5
147. security role 5
148. security right 5
149. security strengthening 5
150. security strategic 5
151. security supplies 5
152. security stability 5
153. security table 5
154. security than 5
155. security terms 5
156. security up 5
157. security us 5
158. security want 5
159. security when 5
160. security wider 5
APPENDIX 4

Relational column based on t-score calculation in the three foreign ministers’ speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>9,561</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>COUNCIL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>8,647</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WILL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WITH</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PERMANENT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,987</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>EUROPEAN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MUST</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>UNITED</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,881</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>BY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MORE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>PROSPERITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>WHICH</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>RESOLUTIONS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>9,017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>BEEN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,776</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,472</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>BRITAIN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>INITIATIVE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>DEFENCE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,946</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,568</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>NATIONS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,876</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>REFORM</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COOK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>19,005</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>12,289</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>11,258</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>9,059</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>8,921</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CLIMATE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>9,527</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,656</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>COUNCIL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>7,229</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,647</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,963</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,451</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ARE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,655</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,852</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WITH</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PROSPERITY</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>BETWEEN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>THREAT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>WILL</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>security</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>HARD</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AGENDA</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>IMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BECKETT
security/person

is what can we do as governments to improve the security of our people as individuals? All the assurances of Mr. Netanyahu’s promise to deliver peace with security. Most of the Israeli people, including many who supported the Israeli people’s right to security. And it is worth remembering that they voted on a commitment to peace with security. We have an opportunity to contribute to the five-power defence.

security/Britain

for crisis management the stronger will be the security of Britain. That is why the Government believes Security Council, Britain made its contribution to Security Council. Britain has a unique opportunity to build around the new proposals for a European people and world opinion. As a permanent member of the Commonwealth, and is a permanent member of the built around the new proposals for a European people and world opinion. As a permanent member of the Commonwealth, and is a permanent member of the
delivered a prolonged period of peace and prosperity to the EU. The Common Foreign and the Security Council, of the European Union, of the G8 and of the security of the whole of Europe and not just the security of the EU. The Common Foreign and the Security Council, of the European Union, of the G8 and of the

security/Europe(an)

at how we can improve the decision making on the important messages that vital to the freedom and life. Without close Russian involvement, no security system for Europe is credible. The NATO/Russia in NATO and NATO’s enlargement will deepen a number of the UN Permanent Membership of the been taken on the basis of how can we enhance the secure, with NATO as the foundation stone of our in international trade talks. Our defence and has delivered a prolonged period of peace and

security/peace

And both Hungary and Britain will have the security of being part of a Union that brings peace and Security Council Resolutions on the Middle East Peace security, which have been enjoyed by many of our Member Security Council Resolutions on the Middle East Peace and security capacity. Britain has been very much at the core of Security Council decisions. Britain has consistently security without peace. That is why Britain regards security forces of certain regimes. And Britain will continue as a leading partner in security, prosperity and strength. Which makes it hard to Britain also has a vital interest in peace and security in the Gulf. UK exports to the GCC states were security and our contribution to the five-power defence.

Security/peace

And both Hungary and Britain will have the security of being part of a Union that brings peace and Security Council Resolutions on the Middle East Peace security, which have been enjoyed by many of our Member Security Council Resolutions on the Middle East Peace and security capacity. Britain has been very much at the core of Security Council decisions. Britain has consistently security without peace. That is why Britain regards security forces of certain regimes. And Britain will continue as a leading partner in security, prosperity and strength. Which makes it hard to Britain also has a vital interest in peace and security in the Gulf. UK exports to the GCC states were security and our contribution to the five-power defence.
security/International

...solutions that recognize that national Security requires international alliances and that... 

security/prosperity

...Britain will reap the full benefits - security, prosperity and strength. Which makes it hard to... 

security/world

...skills and find jobs. Because the only real job security in the modern world comes from employability. Of... 

security/new

...as Permanent Members of the Security Council on international affairs, promising... 

Security/commitment

...the opening of the Gaza airport, and specific security commitments. * Second, practical assistance from...
Security/freedom

was revolutionary. That responsibility for security, freedom and development does not belong solely to
European integration has been a major force for security and freedom in Europe for the last fifty years.
which all its peoples can be united by the same security and freedom that I now call upon each of you to
in the EU to make Europe an area of freedom, security and justice. The more countries of Europe join
important message that vital to the freedom and security of Europe is the partnership between America and

security/Iraq

It was claimed that we vigorously pursued Security Council Resolutions against Iraq, but ignored the
community. We will support within the Security Council continuing sanctions against Iraq until
Council Resolutions against Iraq, but ignored Security Council Resolutions on the Middle East Peace
for Iraq. Once Saddam complies fully with the Security Council’s requirements on weapons of mass
Iraq and the international community. The UN Security Council was united in its demand that Saddam

security/threat(s)

form, but about the substance, threats to our security, concern about human rights, wars, famines and

security/global

organisation that can properly address global security and development issues and the range of new
countries in the global economy and in global security. Russia has ceased to be an opponent of the West

security/development

organisation that can properly address global security and development issues and the range of new
countries for security, freedom and development does not belong solely to
Kingdom. The most positive development for our security over the past year has been the strengthened
consult with Japan on developments within the Security Council and will continue to do so for as long a
of sustainable development, of opportunity, of security, and of rights. First, to create a Commonwealth
APPENDIX 6

security: 2-word concgrams – Straw

security/work

and political will to make collective
work. The United Kingdom is determined to play
based on a shared will to make collective
British contingent and as mandated by the UN
markets. We will use our Presidency of the
required to protect civilians and to provide a
integrated more closely into the UN's work on
in the world. Let me start with our work on
Fifth is the European Union's work on global
the transfer of power. We will work for a new UN
at the centre of EU development and
leadership. Our work on implementing the EU
oversaws some of this work. Let me now turn from
are those who work in our intelligence and
take forward work on the Common Foreign and
live, work, democracy, government, trade.
EU SECURITY STRATEGY was started to start
work alongside Iraqi forces in maintaining
security, while helping those forces to build the

security/people

I have discussed the link between climate and
make? What can we do - specifically what can the
security community, the people in this room do - to
to stretch them far beyond it. Take food
nations is to no small degree predicated on the
debate. Those decisions affect the fundamental
in particular to increase its ability to provide
extremists and lay the foundations of long-term
Security is seen as an imperative not an option. People
security, and governing in the interests of all the people
are most important to the British people; jobs; security; self-respect; a decent quality of life and a
want the best for their people; peace,
The first is that when people talk about
security, a stable and growing economy. And the vast
The first to mental, government and people too want
security problems they do so in terms which are
million people from the delta. What the precise
security ramifications of that kind of change would be ar

security/collective

and hope that the threats will go away. Global
security is our collective responsibility, and we must al
sensitive aspect of today's global debate on
the other was the conviction that our collective
security was being threatened in new ways, with an
I commend this Bill to the House, 'COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE' (09/07/02)
as we pursue the cause of freedom and collective
security in Europe. WHITE PAPER ON THE TREATY FOR A
collective security could be heard 'the throbbing of the engines:
collective security. It can no longer be acceptable to classify
for their twisted cause. And the collective
security which the people of Israel, the Occupied
the cause of international law and
and the proliferation of WMD, collective
security in Europe, the strengthening of the multilateral
commitment to the principle of
security and multilateralism. It was the appalling
collective security would have amounted to words without action. For
security and international law. In the past, these ideas
the continent's twin guarantors of
the will to back its commitment to
collective security within the borders of our own continent, we were
in 1945, So too have the threats to our
collective security and prosperity: NATO and the European Union. But
Speaker: Jack Straw The search for
of mass destruction threaten to make collective
security a redundant concept. How can multilateral
and political will to make
collective security work. The United Kingdom is determined to play
the best guarantor of collective prosperity and
security. "THE EUROPEAN RESPONSE TO GLOBALISATION" -
the EU has guaranteed collective prosperity and security for the past five decades. In an uncertain world
affect our collective security. We can't have
security without development, or development without
build collective responsibility for our global security. All countries have a stake in an international
security/development

integrated more closely into the UN's work on security and development, through the proposed Human security and development, on building a stronger security and development, building the security and sustainable development. Tony Blair has security and help to make development sustainable. They security, climate change, development and security. I'm security, climate change, development and security. I'm security, as ever, together. And in making the world less security plans of the Palestinian Authority. I also hope security and defence capability: * and we have champions security, governance and security. This work – development, governance and security of British and global energy supplies; * and to security, Others are new. But they all have one thing in security, without development, or development without security and development, governance, peace and without development, or development without security, or bilateral. As I have said, regional security, and in doing enhance regional security. But while there is progress in your north-west the most immediate: they are terrorism, regional security, to speak about is a personal match. Having dealt with terrorism and regional and specific challenges: terrorism, regional security, which helps us build global, not regional security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global peace – and with it Iranian threats.  We do not security, in the face of new threats. We do not security, from a regime which threatens regional or security. If such a virtuous circle can be created, security problems may demand more regional arms control.

security/regional

is this; what would you do to protect global security? Generate in turn reinforce regional security. The modern regional security agenda demands new and wide-ranging forms of security in the face of new threats. We do not security being threatened in new ways, with an Security Council Resolution to strengthen the UN's role in Security Council Resolution 1733 creating new obligations Security and Defence Policy – built on a new relationship Security Council last Thursday [3 June] in New York. New Security Council agenda demands new and Security and Defence Policy (EDDP) – built on a new Security to build the full potential of regional cooperation and for regional peace – and with it Iranian threats. Others are new. But they all have one thing in security, in the face of new threats. We do not security, or bilateral. As I have said, regional security, and in doing enhance regional security. But while there is progress in your north-west the most immediate: they are terrorism, regional security, to speak about is a personal match. Having dealt with terrorism and regional and specific challenges: terrorism, regional security, which helps us build global, not regional security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global peace – and with it Iranian threats. We do not security, in the face of new threats. We do not security, from a regime which threatens regional or security. If such a virtuous circle can be created, security problems may demand more regional arms control.

security/new

for Europe. It will promote jobs, wealth and reduction and development, governance, peace and sustainable global security. The modern security agenda demands new and wide-ranging forms of security in the face of new threats. We do not security being threatened in new ways, with an Security Council Resolution to strengthen the UN's role in Security Council Resolution 1733 creating new obligations Security and Defence Policy – built on a new relationship Security Council last Thursday [3 June] in New York. New Security Council agenda demands new and Security and Defence Policy (EDDP) – built on a new Security to build the full potential of regional cooperation and for regional peace – and with it Iranian threats. Others are new. But they all have one thing in security, in the face of new threats. We do not security, or bilateral. As I have said, regional security, and in doing enhance regional security. But while there is progress in your north-west the most immediate: they are terrorism, regional security, to speak about is a personal match. Having dealt with terrorism and regional and specific challenges: terrorism, regional security, which helps us build global, not regional security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global security. And from regional to global peace – and with it Iranian threats. We do not security, in the face of new threats. We do not security, from a regime which threatens regional or security. If such a virtuous circle can be created, security problems may demand more regional arms control.
security/world

not in Europe, but in the challenges of global security and the threats to global peace and security around the world. Today's threats affect us all, the UK and the world community face three risks.

The world's greatest threat to our national security is the proliferation of WMD, collective security, and to the world's security and balance of power, the creation of a world of a better, safer, more prosperous world.

This is because, in an interdependent world, our security is linked to the fact that the threats to world peace and security today are as likely to come from non-state groups as they are from national States. I am greatly security today as one of our most important responsibilities to the world – and a priority of our foreign policy.

I commend this Bill to the House. 'COLLECTIVE SECURITY. We have trade and growth reinforced by our enemies can security and prosperity of Europe itself. We cannot afford security of energy supplies to Europe. Despite these security frameworks between the European Union and the US, the European security is in the interest of European and America security. And they include a common European arrest warrant and a programme of collective security. Therefore, that the Alliance's very success in guaranteeing security and prosperity depends on more than sound bilateral relations. Security, as well as more.

It is one upon which stands the security and prosperity our families and communities. Our ability to influence the course of events, our ability to manage our own futures, our ability to govern ourselves, to manage their own affairs and to prove to the world that they can lay the foundation for the better in an era of global order. It has delivered peace and security. That is why we invest so much in it.

It is our permanent membership of the UN Security Council which reflects today's world and the world's security and freedom, of a world which is governed by security and prosperity. That is why we invest so much in security today as one of our most important responsibilities to the world – and a priority of our foreign policy.

The Balkans, you are well aware of how security and prosperity directly affect our own, far more than the military needs of European and the world stage. The EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy has been a reality for a long time. But, the world, because it directly affects our own security. Decisions by states which fifty years ago would have been so much in two particular areas: first, the creation of a prosperous EU, and second, the creation of a prosperous EU.

security/Europe(an)

develop tools to help maintain global peace and as we pursue the cause of freedom and collective security. EUROPEAN DEFENCE Three years ago, Tony Blair an security in Europe. WHITE PAPER ON THE TREATY FOR A security of Europe as a whole. Turkey's economy is one of the best examples of collective prosperity and security in Europe. In this context, the breakdown of the Yugoslav security to the European continent and beyond. In recent years, the European Union and Iran, international security policy makers have been active around the world.

security and prosperity. That is why we invest so much in security today as one of our most important responsibilities to the world – and a priority of our foreign policy.

It is one upon which stands the security and prosperity our families and communities. Our ability to influence the course of events, our ability to manage our own futures, our ability to govern ourselves, to manage their own affairs and to prove to the world that they can lay the foundation for the better in an era of global order. It has delivered peace and security. That is why we invest so much in it.

It is our permanent membership of the UN Security Council which reflects today's world and the world's security and freedom, of a world which is governed by security and prosperity. That is why we invest so much in security today as one of our most important responsibilities to the world – and a priority of our foreign policy.

The Balkans, you are well aware of how security and prosperity directly affect our own, far more than the military needs of European and the world stage. The EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy has been a reality for a long time. But, the world, because it directly affects our own security. Decisions by states which fifty years ago would have been so much in two particular areas: first, the creation of a prosperous EU, and second, the creation of a prosperous EU.
two states, Israel and Palestine, co-existing in security/peace, for so long a threat to international security. Europe must take its place as a leader in a world where political leadership matters. The Security and Defence Policy is an expression of this security and the chance to prosper in a peaceful region. Security Council against threats to international peace and security. We can build there on the growing understanding of security. It offers the Palestinians the opportunity to security for Israelis any more than it can for security. If we are to convince them then we will need a security. Terrorism requires a firm security response. It is not only terrorism within one state which terrorism, because insecurity and tension, are new. But they all have one thing in security. We have first of all to deliver better access security, the UN and the world community face three rising security in Europe, reduced national rivalries and balance in the European Union. And our thoughts and prayers are with the defence, and to the European continent and beyond. In recent security. The principle of non-interference has to be security. Last year they agreed a joint declaration which security based on freedom and the rule of law. It offers the Security Council's attention; and we must act quickly and security, and the US working with Europe and security; and we have championed security is becoming an ever more important issue for the American soldiers'. The European Union's Security and Defence Policy is an expression of the security and prosperity in the region. Let us also become serious partners common aims: stability, security, and to the European continent and beyond. In recent security, peace and prosperity in the region. Let us also become serious partners common aims: stability, security, and to the European continent and beyond. In recent security. The principle of non-interference has to be security. Last year they agreed a joint declaration which security based on freedom and the rule of law. These two security to the European continent and beyond. In recent security. The principle of non-interference has to be security. Last year they agreed a joint declaration which security based on freedom and the rule of law.
There are two great modern threats to global security - international terrorism and unstable or rogue states. In the past, these ideas were interdependent. So it was clear that international terrorists despise it so much security council, International Criminal Court is pursuing security and prosperity for the world community.

In the wake of the September 11th attacks, the new threat to the US, and to Europe can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level. That was the source of the Security Council against threats to international peace and security. M.KARSHIMER A few months ago, the international Community and put global security at risk. This was never an easy task. And now Security Council will respond. I am confident that all Security Council’s attention. But no Secretary-General can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level. That was the source of the Security Council against threats to international peace and security. M.KARSHIMER A few months ago, the international Community and put global security at risk. This was never an easy task. And now Security Council will respond. I am confident that all Security Council’s attention. But no Secretary-General can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level. That was the source of the Security Council against threats to international peace and security. M.KARSHIMER A few months ago, the international Community and put global security at risk. This was never an easy task. And now Security Council will respond. I am confident that all Security Council’s attention. But no Secretary-General can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level. That was the source of the Security Council against threats to international peace and security. M.KARSHIMER A few months ago, the international Community and put global security at risk. This was never an easy task. And now Security Council will respond. I am confident that all Security Council’s attention. But no Secretary-General can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level. That was the source of the Security Council against threats to international peace and security. M.KARSHIMER A few months ago, the international Community and put global security at risk. This was never an easy task. And now Security Council will respond. I am confident that all Security Council’s attention. But no Secretary-General can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level. That was the source of the Security Council against threats to international peace and security. M.KARSHIMER A few months ago, the international Community and put global security at risk. This was never an easy task. And now Security Council will respond. I am confident that all Security Council’s attention. But no Secretary-General can and should tackle international terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the threat to collective security, including tackling emerging threats at an international level.
security/Britain

security/UK

to live under the rule of gangs without the security and freedoms which we all should be able to take
negation of war, but the creation of a world of security and freedom, of a world which is governed by
paralyze and impoverish the world, so that our security, our freedoms and our prosperity decline
of common commitment to prosperity, peace and security based on freedom and the rule of law. These two
turning Europe into an area of freedom, security and justice; acting against terrorism; launching
no other reason than that only freedom can make security secure.' But we do not need to look to the
as we pursue the cause of freedom and collective
1945, 'We must plan for freedom and not only for
Operation Enduring Freedom and the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, 75% of the
freedom and the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, 75% of the
security, or what President Roosevelt called the 'freedom
to ensure freedom and their duty to provide security. Without security, no rights can be fully
or freedom from tyranny and repression. Second, security - or freedom from fear. And third, the fight
security/Iraq(i)

Mr Dimitrakopolous said that ensuring security in Iraq means giving the responsibility for it to
their country on the principles of justice and security. IRAQ: Mr President: What makes Iraq so
key point was the need to hand responsibility on security back to the Iraqis. On this, he and I are in
Those disputed attacks showed again that the security situation in Iraq is serious, and the past weeks
Coalition will of course help with appropriate
South Asia and the war against terrorism, to UN Security Council deliberations on Iraq are reflected at
you during our Presidency towards that goal. 'SECURITY IS THE KEY TO THE FUTURE OF IRAQ!' - JACK STRAN
community much sooner to the emerging security threats. The same applies to Iraq, where
made in his opening remarks. He said that security was the key to the future of Iraq. He was right.
maintain and to restore international peace and security. Over the past 12 years, the Iraqi regime has
background, and working for the best possible security environment. At the Conference, Iraq's
Multi-National Force who helped to main security around the polling stations across Iraq. Several
an exchange of letters to the President of the
importance to our permanent membership of the
UN British government and as mandated by the UN is
are already 168 000 individuals in the Iraq
We continue to equip and train the Iraqi forces and their
villages and small towns have been locked away by the Iraqi
is vital. Already there are over 220,000 Iraqis
there are serious challenges ahead for Iraq – on
the bravery and effectiveness of Iraq’s own
between the Multi National Forces and Iraq’s own
Transition Team. Iraq’s own police
for the multi-national force in Iraq is on
conflicts for ensuring that Iraq’s immediate
as the restoration of Iraq’s sovereignty;
The tragedy for the Iraqi people is that
the political process in Iraq based on UN
the key to the future of Iraq. He was right. The
the new Government of Iraq will face is to build
the rebuilding of Iraq. Despite the difficult
The quicker the Iraqis take responsibility for
We must let Iraq go on defining itself for a decade of
of Iraq. We will be seeking new UN
and ISAF. During the negotiations over
help the Iraqi people achieve for themselves
in Iraq, particularly the need to ensure
Iraqi Interim Government and the Iraqi
Iraqi compliance with UN resolutions. The UN
Iraqi forces in maintaining
Iraqi Security Forces all the support we can.
Security Council from the Prime Minister of Iraq and the
Security Council. Despite our differences on Iraq, on
the security council, UN Security Council, UN Security
Forces. The capacity of these forces is
Security Forces. The Multi-National Force is helping the
security forces that has been in place for the
security forces – it was they who were in the front line.
security forces, and state the need to reach agreement on
UN Security Council Resolution 1546. That mandate comes to a
security forces, with the help of the Multinational Force
Security Council Resolution 1546, and specifically for
security: economic revival; national unity; and preparing
Security Council resolutions have always held out the
Security Council Resolution 1546: the drafting of a
security situation is serious. There is no disguising the
Security Council finally recognised that the world could
security. There will be those who will continue to seek
Security Council resolutions to affirm Iraq’s territorial
Iraqi forces - it was they who were in the front line.
security, that helping those forces to build the Iraqi
security situation reconstruction continues. Electricity
security the better – and the quicker the multi-national
Security Council resolutions. If we do, we will find that
Security Council supports this goal, and in October voted in
Iraqi forces - it was they who were in the front line.
security forces and mentoring the future leaders of
Security is vital. Already there are over 220,000 Iraqis

Security/global

is the three great threats to international
and specific challenges: terrorism, regional
the immediate threats they are terrorism, regional and
tackling threats to international peace and
for Africa’s development; * to bolster the
ravages of war. But today, we can maintain our
of India gaining a permanent seat on the UN
the key to the future of Iraq. He was right. The
the new Government of Iraq will face is to build
the rebuilding of Iraq. Despite the difficult
We must let Iraq go on defining itself for a decade of
of Iraq. We will be seeking new UN
and ISAF. During the negotiations over
help the Iraqi people achieve for themselves
in Iraq, particularly the need to ensure
Iraqi Interim Government and the Iraqi
Iraqi compliance with UN resolutions. The UN
Iraqi forces in maintaining
Iraqi Security Forces all the support we can.
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
Security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction,
security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader
Security/terrorism

who want nothing more than to live in peace and security. Terrorism requires a firm security response. security by terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. security from terrorism, state failure and WMD, and the security - from terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, security - from aspects of proliferation and international security: global terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, security. FIGHTING TERRORISM So I warmly welcome the security - international terrorism and unstable or rogue security issues such as terrorism and the proliferation of most serious threats to international peace and security. It is in our common interests to tackle the grave new threats to our security today. That is why fighting terrorism and turning security into an area of freedom, power and prosperity, today's threats to our South Asia and the war against terrorism, to UN and specific challenges: terrorism, regional and global security, with terrorism and regional and global security issues to match its economic weight in the world. Launched security come from outside the EU's borders: terrorism, Security Council deliberations on Iraq are reflected at the most immediate: they are terrorism, regional security and globalisation. First terrorism. Since we security and globalisation, have to be set in a broader match. Having dealt with terrorism and regional and national security, let me come onto the third immediate challenge for terrorism breeds. This can be done by firm security action and a political agenda. In Northern

Security/issue(s)

...and our co-operation on so-called 'hard' issues such as terrorism and the proliferation of security issues at Seville. Following the latest terrorism security issues of mutual interest. The EU and Iran would be are terrorism, regional security and arms trade, bringing together such issues as terrorism, security issues at Seville. Following the latest terrorism security issues of mutual interest. The EU and Iran would be are terrorism, regional security and arms trade, bringing together such issues as terrorism, security issues at Seville. Following the latest terrorism security issues of mutual interest. The EU and Iran would...
The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

Security/challenge(s)

1. Mr President, More than ever, global threats should not blind us to the real issues such as defence, tax, EU finance, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

2. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

3. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

4. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

Security/responsibility

1. Mr President, More than ever, global threats should not blind us to the real issues such as defence, tax, EU finance, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

2. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

3. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

4. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

Security/energy

1. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

2. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

3. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.

4. The global arms trade, bringing together security and development, is just the kind of issue for which the Security Council itself has not addressed the issue for SECURITY COUNCIL 50 Security Council involvement does not extend to another issue which undermines the final warning issued unanimously by the Security Council in Resolution 1441. I am in no doubt that vetoes of the seller, fundamental to the cause of international law and collective security, are still confronting us closer to home. The literal chill over many parts of Europe. Energy and climate, food, healthcare, social security and criminal law; changes on energy, civil society, is becoming an ever more important issue for the security and development, is just the kind of issue.
APPENDIX 7

security: 2-word concgrams – Beckett

security/work
1 that we had no option but to return to the Security Council to resume the work on a Security Council resolution, which was suspended two and
2 that, to help Afghans to improve the security situation. This is not about imposing a

security/prosperity
1 on a path that will continue to deliver security/prosperity and justice to an ever wider circle
2 European Union – one which delivers security/prosperity to its citizens. And we are
3 security/prosperity in a crowded and interdependent
4 once again face an increasing danger to our security/prosperity, and growing calls for early and
5 security/prosperity here at home. We will have a
6 we really want to define our future security/prosperity and
7 Do we really want to define our future security/prosperity in terms solely of artificial or
8 undermining the very basis of the security/prosperity and
9 as they seek to bring peace, security/prosperity and
10 that any government can provide security/prosperity and
11 the very basis of our future security/prosperity and
12 not at the expense of our future security/prosperity and

security/people
1 I have discussed the link between climate and security with many people. Some of them are sceptical.
2 nations is to no small degree predicated on the security of individuals. When people are exposed to the
3 in particular to increase its ability to provide
4 extremists and lay the foundations of long-term security. The challenge faced by the Iraqi people in
5 different from any other type of problem. Security is seen as an imperative not an option. People
6 taking complete responsibility for providing security, and governing in the interests of all the people
7 are most important to the British people: jobs, security, self-respect, a decent quality of life and a
8 want the best for their people: peace, security, a stable and growing economy. And the vast
9 The Afghan government and people too want security, development and good governance. The UK and the
10 million people from the delta. What the precise security ramifications of that kind of change would be

security/development
1 The Afghan government and people too want security, development and good governance. The UK and the
2 Global issues - terrorism, climate and energy security, sustainable development - need common, global
3 cooperation in four areas: * international security, * climate change, * international development,

security/collective
1 at stake is not the relatively narrow national security of individual states but our collective security
2 fairly basic needs that underpin our collective security - as much within communities and societies as a
3 effect on our collective and individual security. There are some consequences of climate change
4 we form a collective effort to achieve climate security. Consumers, politicians, NGOs, media,
security/new

to this threat - I call it achieving climate security - a new strategic international priority for the month, I was on the cusp of launching Climate Security as a new international strategic priority for the a direct threat to our individual and collective in this room do - to reinforce that climate spotlight: during our Presidency of the UN they themselves potentially damaging to global security. And then we have these new areas of practical security. I believe that it requires a whole new approach Security Council, for example, I hosted a meeting in New and bolster our climate security and energy security. China is already a pioneer in building this new interest in the implications of the new Baghdad day, Friday 10th November; In New York the Security Council was meeting to discuss the killing of organised crime, the new economic and financial forces assuming a new responsibility for their own security. We share his determination: as, I have no choice in this room - schooled in the world of hard security - in getting involved in discussions about carbon in countries across their world over energy security. Using energy more efficiently means that we can

security/world

our shared goals on energy security and climate security. The world needs China to make that transition security challenges the world faces are real. As an all his responsibility. Madame President: The better off concentrating instead on the 'real' security problems in the world. They could not be more security crises around the world. The agreement for a security, of individual states but our collective need more together to meet our shared goals on energy security and climate security. The world needs China to security challenges presented by the world’s changing twin imperatives of energy security and climate and the role of the UN in dealing with the world's problems. These were the twin imperatives of energy security and climate security are factored into energy policy across the world in this room - schooled in the world of hard security - in getting involved in discussions about carbon in countries across their world over energy security. Using energy more efficiently means that we can

security/responsibility

of these provinces - Basra - to the point where security responsibility can be handed over there too. At rapid progress towards the Iraqi government and security forces assuming responsibility for their own that he expected that lead responsibility for security in all 18 provinces of Iraq would be handed back has been able to hand over responsibility for security to the Iraqi authorities in three of the four organized crime, and a bridge to the rest of the Muslim world. security is at ease with the forces of security, of individual states but our collective need more together to meet our shared goals on energy security and climate security. The world needs China to security challenges presented by the world’s changing twin imperatives of energy security and climate security are factored into energy policy across the world in this room - schooled in the world of hard security - in getting involved in discussions about carbon in countries across their world over energy security. Using energy more efficiently means that we can

security/Europe(an)

the threat that defines our generation, climate security; a Europe that is at ease with the forces of well-being, from jobs and health to growth and security. We in Europe should be in no doubt that how of carbon capture and storage. And the energy security papers that the UK and other European countries of the links between climate security and the security of our energy supplies. The forthcoming European decisions on Europe’s policy towards energy security and climate security. This is a major event, a European Union - one which delivers security and prosperity to its citizens. And we are Europe’s borders. And in so doing can enhance security and stability within those borders. Much of

security/peace

some progress on the international stage. The UN Security Council has passed a resolution on Women, Peace want the best for their people: peace, security, a stable and growing economy. And the vast has passed a resolution on Women, Peace and Security. And in the Beijing Platform we set out a gender and climate security - the international fight against crime - the member states have benefited too. Our peace and security has been enhanced by spreading stability and the
security/international

It goes to the heart of our economic, energy security and international security agendas. Japan has

- that the threat to international peace and security - the international fight against crime - the
- peace in the region and with it the wider security of the international community as a whole. What
- a month. I was on the cusp of launching Climate
to this threat - I call it achieving climate
- an understanding that the global
- these countries to be fully reflected in the UN
- of that country, right for wider international
- us with an ever-growing threat to international
- areas in particular. First, international security. We have enjoyed unprecedented cooperation with
- cooperation in four areas: *international security, * climate change, * international development,
- are still necessary to guarantee international security. So it should not be controversial to suggest
- our economic, energy security and international security agendas. Japan has always been our closest
- change is a serious threat to international security. So achieving climate security must be at the
- - that the threat to international peace and security was very real and very grave. Madame Deputy
- the UN Security Council had passed a resolution on Women, Peace
- counter-terrorism, international crime, energy
- security. Climate Change And nowhere is the need for
- new international strategic priority for climate security that looks at what we can do now to slow global
- international community with huge and pressing security challenges, but, of course, we face other such

security/UK

of carbon capture and storage. And the energy

The Afghan government and people too want
also plays an integral part in the area of 'hard security' with the most direct impact here in the UK - th

diplomacy which is helping to safeguard the UK's
this year, we used the UK Presidency of the
We in the UK are clear that without climate
New York. The UK had taken the issue of climate
put in on the agenda of the Security Council tomorrow and why, shortly after I return
of the UK. And can I say that, given Climate
UK to put climate change on the agenda of the UN Security Council last month. Even then, we were surprised

security/world

the current challenges in the area of freedom, security and justice. On migration we agreed that we nee

security/Iraq(i)

been able to hand over responsibility for
security to the Iraqi authorities in three of the four
that he expected that lead responsibility for in all 18 provinces of Iraq would be handed back
security responsibilities to the Iraqi security forces is
in particular to increase its ability to provide security and basic services to the Iraqi people. The
extremists and lay the foundations of long-term
months launched a major fresh effort to restore
interest in the implications of the new Baghdad
security responsibilities to the Iraqi security forces is well underway. Prime Minister Maliki i
of governance and the capacity of the Iraqi security forces to and to reduce crime and the role of the
it too is ready to be handed over to Iraqi lead
rapid progress towards the Iraqi government and security forces assuming responsibility for their own
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security/threat(s)

organised crime, the new economic and security threat from our changing climate, the rise of security threat to the global economy, the threat of climate change. Nowhere is the threat of climate change more apparent than in the Middle East, where the threat of climate change poses a serious threat to our security, our borders, and our energy supplies. It security threat comes not from the outside, but from within our security. The threat to our climate change is a direct threat to our security: but it is not one that can be met by bullets and the threat to our climate change is a direct threat to our individual and collective security - was a fairly new one for many in this audience. The threat to our climate change is a direct threat to international security - a new strategic international priority for the threat that defines our generation: climate change - a Europe that is at war with the forces of the threat we face is still not there. Bringing the security community into this debate has two distinct

security/terrorism

The four cross-cutting PSA targets - climate, migration, counter-terrorism and conflict - are not at the expense of our future prosperity and security. So far so good. Global issues - terrorism, energy security, jobs and growth. Get our response right to security, counter-terrorism and energy security, sustainable development - need common, global threats. And it demonstrated the vast majority of security and terrorism, but also the need for and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1 security/issue(s)

carries both to the capital. It is the joint judgement of the community faces up to the big ticket global security issues, the things that hit the headlines - anyone who doesn't see climate change as a security issue today will, in my view, be treading in the recognition of climate change as a core security issue. And it demonstrated the vast majority of I simply do not believe that we will solve the security issues of the day unless we address the global Middle East as an example - a classic hard security issue, and one that occupies a great deal of my the recognition of climate change as a core security issue. It and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1 security/issue(s)

security/challenge(s)

international community with huge and pressing security challenge, but, of course, we face other such all his responsibility. Madam President. The security challenges the world faces are real. As an international community with huge and pressing security challenges, the world faces are real. As an

1. To go to war in Iraq. And the Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction -
2. vessel in Iraq: territorial waters in support of Security Council Resolution 1723 and of the Government of Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
3. and Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
4. Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

12        to go to war in Iraq. And the Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction -
13        vessel in Iraq: territorial waters in support of Security Council Resolution 1723 and of the Government of Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
14        and Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
15        Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1
16

security/threat(s)

- an understanding that the global must tackle the greatest new challenge to global security, the threat of climate change. Nowhere is the threat to our climate security more apparent than in the Middle East, where the threat of climate change poses a serious threat to our security, our borders, and our energy supplies. It security threat comes not from the outside, but from within our security. The threat to our climate change is a direct threat to our security: but it is not one that can be met by bullets and the threat to our climate change is a direct threat to our individual and collective security - was a fairly new one for many in this audience. The threat to our climate change is a direct threat to international security - a new strategic international priority for the threat that defines our generation: climate change - a Europe that is at war with the forces of the threat we face is still not there. Bringing the security community into this debate has two distinct

security/terrorism

The four cross-cutting PSA targets - climate, migration, counter-terrorism and conflict - are not at the expense of our future prosperity and security. So far so good. Global issues - terrorism, energy security, jobs and growth. Get our response right to security, counter-terrorism and energy security, sustainable development - need common, global threats. And it demonstrated the vast majority of security and terrorism, but also the need for and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

security/issue(s)

community faces up to the big ticket global security issues, the things that hit the headlines - anyone who doesn't see climate change as a security issue today will, in my view, be treading in the recognition of climate change as a core security issue. And it demonstrated the vast majority of I simply do not believe that we will solve the security issues of the day unless we address the global Middle East as an example - a classic hard security issue, and one that occupies a great deal of my the recognition of climate change as a core security issue. It and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

security/challenge(s)

international community with huge and pressing security challenge, but, of course, we face other such all his responsibility. Madam President. The security challenges the world faces are real. As an international community with huge and pressing security challenges, the world faces are real. As an

1. To go to war in Iraq. And the Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction -
2. vessel in Iraq: territorial waters in support of Security Council Resolution 1723 and of the Government of Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
3. and Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
4. Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

12        to go to war in Iraq. And the Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction -
13        vessel in Iraq: territorial waters in support of Security Council Resolution 1723 and of the Government of Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
14        and Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
15        Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1
16

security/threat(s)

- an understanding that the global must tackle the greatest new challenge to global security, the threat of climate change. Nowhere is the threat to our climate security more apparent than in the Middle East, where the threat of climate change poses a serious threat to our security, our borders, and our energy supplies. It security threat comes not from the outside, but from within our security. The threat to our climate change is a direct threat to our security: but it is not one that can be met by bullets and the threat to our climate change is a direct threat to our individual and collective security - was a fairly new one for many in this audience. The threat to our climate change is a direct threat to international security - a new strategic international priority for the threat that defines our generation: climate change - a Europe that is at war with the forces of the threat we face is still not there. Bringing the security community into this debate has two distinct

security/terrorism

The four cross-cutting PSA targets - climate, migration, counter-terrorism and conflict - are not at the expense of our future prosperity and security. So far so good. Global issues - terrorism, energy security, jobs and growth. Get our response right to security, counter-terrorism and energy security, sustainable development - need common, global threats. And it demonstrated the vast majority of security and terrorism, but also the need for and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

security/issue(s)

community faces up to the big ticket global security issues, the things that hit the headlines - anyone who doesn't see climate change as a security issue today will, in my view, be treading in the recognition of climate change as a core security issue. And it demonstrated the vast majority of I simply do not believe that we will solve the security issues of the day unless we address the global Middle East as an example - a classic hard security issue, and one that occupies a great deal of my the recognition of climate change as a core security issue. It and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

security/challenge(s)

international community with huge and pressing security challenge, but, of course, we face other such all his responsibility. Madam President. The security challenges the world faces are real. As an international community with huge and pressing security challenges, the world faces are real. As an

1. To go to war in Iraq. And the Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction -
2. vessel in Iraq: territorial waters in support of Security Council Resolution 1723 and of the Government of Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
3. and Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
4. Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1

12        to go to war in Iraq. And the Intelligence and Security Committee on Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction -
13        vessel in Iraq: territorial waters in support of Security Council Resolution 1723 and of the Government of Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
14        and Iraq - all countries pivotal to the regional security agenda will see some of the biggest reductions in
15        Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which 1
16
security/energy

be it global trade and investment flows, climate pillars of global security: food security, water security, energy security, cross-border crime, illegal security. The challenge faced by the Iraqi people in Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which an must tackle the greatest new challenge to global security, the threat of climate change. Nowhere is the two of the greatest challenges we face - energy security and climate security - both demand the same energy security and climate security - both demand the same solution. So what's security/energy

be it global trade and investment flows, climate pillars of global security: food security, water security, energy security, cross-border crime, illegal security. The challenge faced by the Iraqi people in Iraq still faces a daunting array of political, security and economic challenges, of a kind with which an must tackle the greatest new challenge to global security, the threat of climate change. Nowhere is the two of the greatest challenges we face - energy security and climate security - both demand the same energy security and climate security - both demand the same solution. So what's
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Concordance: we want to - COOK

| 1 | within the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. We want to bring together that responsibility, and all training centre is being established in Martinique. We want to build on this work, both in the Caribbean, in a positive debate about the sort of Europe we want to build. We had a lot of ground to make up, today. BRITAIN'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE US We want to build on a success story which has seen |
| 2 | We do not want to cling to a Little England. We want to build a Global Britain. A country which |
| 3 | This will be a demonstration of the inclusive Europe we want to build. We want it to be a substantive us how effective international cooperation can be. If we want to catch them, we will have to match them. Paper describing in full the modernised partnership we want to create, and the action we need to take to create jobs, fight crime and protect the environment. We want to create a European Union that secures |
| 4 | We also pursued outreach to communities where we want to discuss and meet with leaders of the market rules applied quickly and enforced better. We want to engage the Commission and the interest in any debts taken on by British territories. We want to ensure that our position is defensible to horrific massacres at Rafine and Siddi Hammed. We want to find out how we can help. We have seen will of the people finds its most expressive voice. If we want to find ways of making sure that Europe's Data. 16/11/03 Speaker: Robin Cook Today, if we want to have a successful foreign policy at all if Economic and Monetary Union and Enlargement. We want to help make a Union that responds to the partnership to the Palestinian people, which is why we want to help the Palestinian people develop the |
| 5 | that are democratic, free and broadly tolerant. If we want to keep them that way we must constantly |
| 6 | crucial that we keep thinking about the kind of world we want to live in tomorrow. THE SIZE OF THE forward on work on jobs, crime and the environment. We want to make the Union efficient, so we will focus |
| 7 | for the challenges of the next century. And we want to make it a more effective voice in the if any less worthwhile. TORTURE One area where we want to make a difference is to stop torture. That example by providing equipment for Gaza Airport. We want to play a full role in the talks on these is one of the greatest threats to the environment. If we want to preserve the planet for future generations, |
| 8 | cooperate across borders. We must do the same if we want to put them behind bars. * And we must |
| 9 | Parliament in producing better, simpler legislation. We want to remove barriers so that Europe can but to cooperate in their common interests. We want to see a Europe with a genuine single supporter of Czech membership for NATO. Because we want to see you inside the Alliance. We want you within a wider Europe. There are some limits where we want to see majority voting, because in those forward the debate about the shape of Europe we want to see, and helping to forge a new and important step towards building the sort of Europe we want to see by 2010. The Nice Summit is good |
| 10 | single market that is open to the rest of the world. We want to see a Europe in which war is unthinkable and America each year. But we cannot stand still - we want to see the trade and investment grow. We recently, and gave them a very clear message. That we want to see all of them inside the Union, just as |
| 11 | it is because we support the European Union that we want to see it modernised and reformed. THE about, whether they live in Edinburgh or Prague. We want to see the European Union become more of with Hong Kong. We also have a vision for Europe. We want to see a free association of member states the number of documents by 25 per cent next year. We want to see an end to the duplication between |
| 12 | real concerns of the European people. That is why we want to take forward work on jobs, crime and the unequivocal stand against the death penalty. But we want to take this further. We need to use our of European cooperation more compelling than ever. We want to use the British Presidency to create an |
Cook – I want to

N Concor dance
1 CURBING SMALL ARMS The second task I want to address is curbing the volume of arms in
2 the last action from which happened to be, which I want to address, and that is the very powerful
3 The last important aspect of our partnership that I want to address is human rights. We respect the
4 police force to keep civil order. Today, therefore, I want to announce that Britain will follow up our
5 gives us in our conduct of business with others. I want to argue the case why we can be confident
6 Before I turn to those European matters there, I want to begin by providing a rather wider context
7 the myth that Brussels is Them. Brussels is us. I want to bury the myth that Britain can only win
8 country. A debate based on facts, not myths. I want to bury the myth of a superstate – national
9 a superstate – national identities are too strong. I want to bury the myth that Brussels is Them.
10 Date 19/06/01 Speaker Robin Cook Tonight I want to celebrate Britishness. As Foreign
11 there is also an argument of human decency. I want to close by sharing with you what for me
12 representative of every community. That is why I want to end by asking for your help in getting me
13 for the next year. This morning, though, I want to focus my remarks on the urgent
14 avoided a world with too much war. That is why I want to focus my remarks today on what we
15 also requires changes of substance. So now I want to focus on two issues of substance, two
16 the future of Britain and Britishness. Indeed, I want to go further and argue that in each of the
17 form, but as a foundation on which to build. I want to identify four directions for the building of
18 STRENGTHENING OUR DIALOGUE Today I want to launch that new dialogue with initiatives
19 relationships – and we hope they do too. But I want to make sure that small and medium
20 been receiving from the CBI has been first class. I want to make sure that the Foreign Office is
21 can make and are sensitive to their concerns. I want to make the FCO’s commitment to human
22 companies trying to break into those markets. I want to make sure you have access to it. That is
23 on exports for at least a quarter of their turnover. I want to make sure we are doing all we can to
24 we must first traverse the foreground. Today I want to present the good news story that an
25 and trust we so urgently need. Today I want to propose we begin a proper dialogue
26 by accepting the American package as a whole. I want to put on record my respect for his courage
27 have ever been. That is the principal message I want to put across today – that Britain and the
28 to throw the opportunity of Europe away. I want to re-cast the debate about Europe in this
29 partnership based on long understanding. And I want to reach out beyond the diplomats and
30 law and crimes against humanity. In doing so, I want to reinforce the Security Council’s ability to
31 final objective of our mission statement on which I want to report to the House is the commitment
32 and asked him, “Could I get up and say what I want to say?”, to which I got the blunt and
33 of Cabinet Minister, so I can get up and say what I want to say. I am not sure that you have quite
34 We must right the wrongs of the past century. I want to see a zone of peace, prosperity, stability
35 soon as possible. During the British Presidency, I want to see this taken forward across the whole
36 that the European Union is relevant to their lives. I want to see a European Union that is focused on
37 forward across the whole of Central Europe. I want to see each applicant state with quality.
38 The European Union does a great deal, but I want to see that effort have more of an impact.
39 Speaker Robin Cook The sort of Europe I want to see in 2000 is a Europe with which
40 of their crimes anywhere in Europe. And I want to see a Europe of strength in the world. It
41 a step to the break-up of the UK. This evening, I want to set out the reasons for being optimistic.
42 That it is too diverse to be meaningful. Tonight, I want to set out why I believe they are wrong,
43 Israelis - because we are friend to peace. Tonight I want to share with you three messages about
44 by the international community. Today, I want to share with you six of the principles on
45 EUROPE FOR A STRONG BRITAIN So with that I want to share with you the principles which guide
46 And that brings me to the second message I want to share with you. We can overcome the
47 for the Palestinian refugees. And that is why I want to speak to you tonight about what is
48 stretching well into the future. This is why I want to spell out Britain’s Commitment to Hong
49 is to sell the Foreign Office in Britain to you. I want to start by stressing why it is important to
50 in a wide and generous interpretation. But I want to start our discussion by sharing with you
51 next five years, and then make it happen. Today, I want to suggest three areas where we might
Straw – we want to

In Concordeance
1. Its importance, there is much more which we want to achieve at this autumn's
2. similarity is no accident. Much of what we want to achieve in Britain is dependent,
3. wider world. And much of what we want to achieve here at home depends
4. to almost every aspect of what we want to achieve. For a long time, the
5. and seeds to grow alternative crops. We want to As part of encouraging the
6. global as much as they are national. If we want to avoid future summits being held
7. it to a choice of what kind of Europe we want to be in. If we approve this
8. there is a further point I want to make. If we want to be seen to deliver justice and
9. which is, after all, the world's biggest. We want to bring it up to the level of the
10. connected with energy production. We want to build on that. This Strategy will
11. decisions about the kind of Europe which we want to create. Is it a Europe turned
12. be no military action. The choice is his. We want to deal with Iraq by the force of
13. a matter of enlightened self-interest. If we want to deliver economic prosperity, a
14. a matter of enlightened self-interest. If we want to deliver economic prosperity, a
15. leave - it is essential to almost everything we want to deliver for our own citizens.
16. former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. We want to halt and deepen this
17. former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. We want to halt and deepen this
18. the EU emissions trading scheme, which we want to extend to apparel emissions.
19. participation in the global economy. If we want to fight global inequality, we
20. by 19 per cent between 1992 and 2000. We want to go further still. So this March,
21. more reliable at getting us to where we want to go. But it does still seem to
22. the UK is playing in that work, and how we want to intensify it in the years ahead.
23. some extent, on being active abroad. If we want to keep drugs off British streets,
24. reform, as Gordon Brown did yesterday. We want to lower prices for consumers
25. should they come into compliance. Third, we want to maintain the strongest possible
26. global defence market – a strength which we want to maintain – brings with it a
27. shows what can be achieved. And if we want to maintain and increase Europe's
28. give our firms cheaper access to finance. We want to make Europe the world's most
29. centres here in Bosnia and in Morocco. We want to make further progress at the
30. to opt in to those measures in which we want to participate, and stay out of
31. They have been destroying Afghanistan, we want to rebuild it. There are those who
32. families increases here at home, we want to reinforce and to raise
33. integral part of the development agenda. We want to reinvigorate international
34. to the Agenda 2000 agreement. We want to restart the World Trade Round.
35. and 'Why are you going slow on this?' We want to restore a service that quickly so
36. measurable steps along that path. Now we want to secure a fair budget. In the
37. with every single faith in the world. We want to see them fully realised
38. the course you have set for yourselves. We want to see the development of an ever
39. 1,500 and withdraw from Lebanon. We want to see a new government chosen
40. anywhere in the world; second, because we want to see others enjoy the same
41. it is in our national interest. We want to see more liberalisation, in
42. is centrally a matter of human rights. We want to see the values of liberal
43. patents and intellectual property rights. We want to see air services to India
44. human rights machinery in long overdue; we want to see human rights integrated
45. 2012. The second emphasis which we want to see at the September summit
46. member of the international community. We want to see a sovereign, independent
47. coherent and better-coordinated way. We want to see a modernised and
48. – I reaffirm that support today – because we want to see India taking on global
49. event. Like those Heads of State, we want to see resumption of dialogue
50. UN's development machinery. Meanwhile, we want to see a Security Council which
51. letter of that warrant. In the coming year we want to see further progress for
52. two stand reasons one another. If we want to show people the importance of
53. greatly value this partnership and we want to strengthen it. But history
54. migration and combat illegal immigration. We want to sustain and develop this, and
55. others in civil society. We want to use this Strategy to build
56. that is potentially rich and successful. We want to welcome it back into the
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1. case for the amendment now before the House, I want to answer four key questions. They are:
2. of the intelligence to the ISC, and I duly did so. I want to answer some of the other points that
3. the skills of the most proficient administrator I want to applaud the progress you have made so
4. of troops, FUTURE PROSPERITY Today I want to assure all the Iraqi people that our belief
5. and hence Members whose speeches I missed, I want to begin this winding up by paying tributes to
6. has moved on to a far broader footing. I want to build on this co-operation and ensure that
7. asylum and immigration, and on Council reforms. I want to concentrate my remarks today on these
8. build the safer, better world on which we all rely. I want to conclude by suggesting that we can only
9. as we seek to tackle injustice in the world. So I want to conclude by saying how glad I am to be
10. I recognise that these concerns exist. So today I want to deal directly with those anxieties, and
11. unlike many of the self-proclaimed Eurosceptics, I want to deal with those doubts by making five
12. year, is tackling the threat from climate change. I want to deal first with two misconceptions. The
13. poverty – freedom from want – is the third theme I want to discuss today. It is a poetic
14. But there is another myth about diplomacy which I want to dispel. Von Clausewitz’s maxim that,
15. You don’t want too long a speech, but what I want to do is just to offer you my thoughts on
16. Union but rather absolutely opposed to it. What I want to do today is reach out to the genuine
17. economic and political reform. In doing so, I want to draw some parallels with the UK’s
18. partnerships will play an important role. But I want to emphasise again that our most important
19. between Britain and the Czech Republic – and I want to end on the same theme. We may not
20. Government’s role in the fight against terrorism: I want to endorse that message. Russia has been
21. about the prospect of military action. Today I want to examine six of the most commonly
22. action by the whole international community. I want to explain today the part which the UK is
23. Government’s position on the draft Treaty. And I want to explode some of the myths it has
24. which I asked at the beginning of this speech, I want to explore each of them in turn, and offer
25. Let me now come to the second issue on which I want to focus today – reaffirming shared values
26. in the EU’s future direction – the theme on which I want to focus my remarks today. Only four
27. of state failure. In my remarks today, I want to focus on a state which has utterly failed
28. Britain and China can do together in the world. I want to focus on that theme today. But let me
29. UK-Pakistan relationship can play in that. And I want to focus especially on the importance of
30. the Muslim world as a whole and the West. I want to focus on that question today. I know it is
31. environment to peacekeeping, science and law. I want to galvanise UK-Chinese co-operation in
32. wherever they arise. The third theme which I want to highlight is the importance of building the
33. more to help deliver that. The third issue which I want to highlight today, and also a priority of
34. efforts and programmes. The second area which I want to highlight is the need to develop more
35. and this continent over the coming decade. I want to identify how we can meet those
36. – and maybe apocryphally – once asked, ‘If I want to know what Europe thinks, who do I
37. need to take into account in the coming years? I want to look at the impact these trends may have
38. and influential diplomatic and political role, I want to look ahead and map out the strategy that
39. The home of optimism, here in Nigeria. Today I want to look forward with you and see if that
40. on everything we believe in. There are five points I want to make about the principles on which I
41. today to resurrect the ideas of the 1920s. Rather, I want to make the case for a pragmatic, common
42. and even conflict in Europe. So this evening I want to make the case for an agenda to
43. with their aims. But there is a further point I want to make. If we want to be seen to deliver
44. should be solved by new means. Today I want to make the case for co-operation between
45. terrorists spread division. The crucial point which I want to make today is this: we must stay
46. to those whose speeches I do not mention, I want to mention particularly those of the right hon
47. issues. CLOSING REMARKS Before I close, I want to offer a personal thank-you to all members
48. powerlessness in the face of global capital. Today I want to offer some answers to these questions
49. to thank you for your commitment and effort. And I want to particularly highlight the personal
50. or killed by their own Governments. So, tonight I want to pay tribute to the media professionals.
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61 rebuild a better Iraq. The second group to whom I want to pay tribute are those who work in our
62 Tessa Stirling and Denis Naylor. And I want to pay a special tribute to the Committee’s
63 affairs organisation in the United States. I want to pay tribute to the work of two of the
64 to go there will be plenty more on the way. Today I want to report back on the outcome of the
65 to animal rights extremists — a point to which I want to return later in this speech. The links
66 which the new Europe of 28 will offer us all. I want to return to that theme in a moment. It’s a
67 Ladies and Gentlemen, the first thing I want to say is simply welcome to everybody
68 will think again about this decision. And overall I want to say this — that good governance, respect
69 warmly to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. I want to say a particular welcome to those
70 I turn to my main theme today, global science, I want to say something about Iraq. IRAQ Just
71 whole make year on year to our country. Tonight I want to say a little about why that second layer
72 Nillett, for their hospitality and welcome today. I want to say at the start how delighted I am to be
73 left after two years. If I may, before I conclude, I want to say something about the work which all
74 effectively on asylum and illegal immigration. I want to note these agreed in a new constitutional
75 and the Occupied Territories for over two years. I want to see UN Security Council Resolutions —
76 yet to realise its full potential as a global actor. I want to see the EU pull up its weight in the world.
77 in a speech in The Hague three months ago. I want to see an EU which delivers real benefits to
78 own interests to do so. So the partnership which I want to develop between South Africa and
79 our relationship to a new level. Tony Blair and I want to see it develop into a strategic partnership
80 is also crucial to a more prosperous world. I want to see progress, for more than we have
81 be limited to the Council. As I said earlier, I want to see all the institutions strengthened.
82 been partners in pushing this forward. Today I want to set out my vision of the course the EU
83 we practice what we preach. So, I want to see this out as plainly as possible. This
84 common values and our shared future. Today I want to set out how our response must match
85 in the United Kingdom will play our part. Today I want to set out how I believe Britain can offer
86 of the violent events of 11th September. Today I want to set out my thinking on the consequences
87 your biggest centre anywhere in the world. I want to set out today the case for the new EU
88 THE UK AND THE MUSLIM WORLD Today I want to share with you my thoughts on how the
89 with you and see if that optimism is justified. I want to sketch out what I see as the biggest
90 to an issue I know is of some sensitivity but one I want to speak about – that of terrorism
91 them utterly and as one. The second challenge I want to speak about is regional security. It would
92 available and supported them once deployed. But I want to start by paying tribute to the many
93 Speaker, Jack Straw. Thank you all for coming. I want to start by thanking Victoria Turner and
94 strength of the international system. Throughout I want to stress how closely they are linked to
95 of the Afghan people, to formulate it. Today I want to suggest four principles on which I believe
96 in Africa, in Asia or in Afghanistan. This morning I want to suggest four principles which should
97 That shows what can be achieved. So today I want to suggest six points to guide our work for a
98 international security and the rule of law. And I want to suggest three challenges for our
99 as one who has watched Islam for many years, I want to suggest this evening that all of us have
100 role played by Javier Solana and Chris Patten. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to
101 to exploit the benefits of global science. I want to take those themes in turn, beginning with
102 this first conference of the Civility Programme. I want to talk today about why modernisation and
103 nation in the world. Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to talk today about Africa, and what Britain
104 from security to the second area of work which I want to talk about today — sustainable
105 inviting me to speak here at Fasham University. I want to talk today about the need for an active
106 for offering this venue. Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to talk today about the surge of
107 to speak to such a distinguished audience. I want to talk today about the Strategy for the
108 for me to address this, my third Easter Bonsaet. I want to talk this evening about two issues which
109 modern British society. Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to thank all those of you, from within and
110 links with other young people across the UK. I want to thank the UN Youth and Students’
111 Tatsuya Sato, and Dr David Griggs. Lastly I want to thank the team at the British Embassy
112 then address the parties themselves. Dr Salim, I want to thank you and the African Union, the
113 on a happier note – the one with which I began — I want to thank you for helping to create an
114 to commit to new ways of thinking and working. I want to thank you for your commitment and
115 honour to receive this award from you. And I want to thank the President of the High Advisory
116 introduction and your kind invitation this evening. I want to thank the Lord Mayor and the
117 towards solving the problem once and for all. I want to thank you all again for coming and I wish
118 for the Prevention of Violent Conflicts. I want to thank the Chairman today for her
119 has made an important contribution to ISAF and I want to thank the Chairman today for her staunch
120 that say in a referendum. POLITICAL REFORM I want to turn now to the case for political reform in
121 Kingdom and international law. In this context, I want to underline the enormous importance to us
122 new challenges we face in international affairs. I want to use my speech to focus on the strategic
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1. at the G8 summit in Heiligendamm we want to give political momentum to
2. the difference this time around is that we want to - indeed we must - plan this
3. foundation of it. Our position is clear. We want to see universal suffrage
4. dependence on imported oil and gas; we want to diversify our supply, including
5. and consume energy more efficiently; we want to lessen our dependence on
6. We have the same interests: we want to produce and consume energy
7. world and in the markets where we want to invest. And there is another
8. and foreign affairs. However much we want to remove ourselves from the
9. dependence on imported oil and gas; we want to diversify our supply, including
10. and consume energy more efficiently; we want to lessen our dependence on
11. because we share the same interests: we want to produce and consume energy
12. capture and storage. In other words, we want to build a zero emissions power
13. and Intellectual Property Rights. And we want to ensure that the action that
14. more competitive place to do business. We want to see a modern and adaptable
15. Council will have something to say. We want to agree principles to guide the
16. reduction in energy use by 2020. And we want to make a stated ambition that
17. on our word. For other countries, if we want to encourage them down the
18. to those visitors and migrants that we want to attract to the UK, while
19. had a clear vision of the future of Iraq. We want to see a fully sovereign
20. will, I have no doubt, come a time when we want to look at the lessons we
21. And that has implications for everything we want to achieve from conflict
22. is an arduous and lengthy struggle. We want to be your partners in that
23. wish a modern nuclear power industry. We want to be able to resume
Concordance
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1 has gone, others have followed. I want to talk today about one of the
2 maintain an open tracing system. And I want to end by talking about one of the
3 a pivotal part in rising to the challenge I want to talk about today: how, together,
4 to talk about the threat of globalisation. I want to talk instead about the threat to
5 and Response’. That is the framework I want to use tonight. I will begin by laying
6 I want to do even more. In particular I want to push the agenda on climate
7 and instability. In the next six months I want to do even more. In particular I want
8 those problems. So one of the things that I want to do is to develop further the
9 The third and last of the three challenges I want to mention tonight is the challenge
10 innocent civilians. And here, if I may, I want to mention an area of work to which
11 the world we live in a little better. What I want to touch on this evening is how that
12 in praising the work of this department, I want to be absolutely clear that I am
13 everything that my department does. I want to end on a topic which is bound to
14 going to go about that task. But today I want to end by putting out a challenge to
15 remains serious and is increasing. Today I want to talk about how we as a
16 2003 and in its aftermath. The question I want to put to the House is not so much
17 making this speech here today because I want to lay down that challenge to three
18 for two reasons. The first reason is that I want to talk today about the changing
19 about why we promote human rights. I want to end by looking to the future and
20 world - just 34 years. The second area I want to mention might surprise some of
21 is so vital. It goes to the heart of what I want to achieve as Foreign Secretary. In
22 the FCO and trade unions. And so I want to end on this point. I hope you will
23 the moment, as I have already said that I want to make some progress. The
24 a little more about that, if I may, later. I want to begin, however, by reminding us
25 33. And there’s just one other thing I want to say about this aspect of the
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1 run with it. Only last week, for example, I know that the German embassy was
2 is to keep pushing further up it yourself. I know that Japanese business has
3 Having come through Guangzhou, I know that those are very real problems
4 to the Hong Kong people. As I said, I know that it has not always been an
5 let me address China’s development. I know that outside interest in China’s
6 offered them over the last year. And I know that there are many British
7 make a positive difference in the world. I know that there are many
8 much you have delivered for Britain. I know that the stance we took over the
9 that. The working time directive – and I know that there are some differences
10 which he would find it easy to accept. I know that because I’ve asked him –
11 - is the best way to achieve that goal. I know that this House has shown great
12 for more than any other audience, I know that business people are always
13 case for Turkish membership: a case I know that is strongly supported across
14 to understand, most hazardous. And I know that this comes at a cost – in the
15 your loss, must be difficult ones. But I know that none of you would ever want
16 and mothers in India – every year. I know that the people in this room and
17 Noon and Nat Puri are old friends. But I know that there are many others in this
18 the Hamas-run finance ministry. I know that some elements of Britain’s
19 to come out of your twin presidencies. I know that you are keen to do
20 partners in achieving these objectives. I know that Ian with his usual
21 they are mutually reinforcing. I know that from my own experience as
22 fishing and agriculture will be disrupted. I know that how China performs over the
23 council now meets three times a year. I know that both sides find these
24 support. As I said at the beginning, I know that this is what the trade union
25 with the Chinese Government. I know that there are things that we do
26 to make the operation run smoothly. I know that the House is likely to
27 grateful to him for that intervention. I know that what he says is true, and
28 is the history of all such events. I know that many anger and anxieties
29 for Sunderland, South (Mr. Mullan) I know that he will accept my assurance,
30 on the basis of many conversations, I know that everyone wishes to see the
31 of the issue. One of the things which I know that generations of scientists in
32 of the Middle East to take place. I know that many members of the House