Strategic Maneuvering with Speech Codes: The Rhetorical Use of Cultural Presumptions in Constructing Argumentative Discourse

MENNO H. REIJVEN
University of Massachusetts Amherst
mreijven@comm.umass.edu

Speech codes – the principles through which cultural beliefs, assumptions and values become encoded in speech – can be used for strategic maneuvering. Such codes inform the design of argumentative moves regarding topical potential, audience demands, and presentational devices. The code of dignity and of honor are identified in the discourse of then-presidential candidates Clinton and Trump during a debate in the 2016 elections. Their contributions are realizations of the code of dignity and of honor, respectively.

KEYWORDS: code of dignity, code of honor, cultural rhetoric, ethnography of communication, pragma-dialectics, presidential debate, speech codes, strategic maneuvering

1. INTRODUCTION

In social life, argumentation is often used to defend one's position. The protagonist can consider a wide variety of potential resources to craft a persuasive message. In the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation, this process is referred to as 'strategic maneuvering' (Van Eemeren, 2010, pp. 39-43). However, aiming for effectiveness can undermine the quality of argumentation. For this reason, it is important to survey the range of resources which can inform strategic maneuvering. Since the introduction of the concept of strategic maneuvering, a wide variety of possible resources for strategic maneuvering has already been studied.

Here I investigate the potential of speech codes – the implicit beliefs, norms and values of a particular community encoded into language use (Philipsen, 1997) – to be a source for strategic maneuvering. These speech codes specify what can and cannot be subject of persuasion as well as what is persuasive (Fitch, 2003). Thus, invoking certain cultural norms or beliefs can resonate so well with the members of a community that they automatically evoke supporting reasons (idem). The use of a particular code is a strategic consideration.

To show this, I analyze the first 2016 U.S. presidential debate at Hofstra University. A video and transcript[1] available online were used for analysis. In the next section, I introduce both pragma-dialectics and speech code theory and explain how they can be integrated through the concept of strategic maneuvering. In the subsequent sections, I address for each aspect of strategic maneuvering how speech codes theory can function as a resource for achieving effectiveness.

2. STRATEGIC MANEUVERING WITH SPEECH CODES

The pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation (e.g., Van Eemeren, 2010) is characterized by systematically integrating the normative and descriptive dimension of argumentation. The normative dimension is grounded in a set of rules which defines the ideal model of a critical discussion (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004, pp. 123ff) and concerns the preferred types and ideal sequencing of moves for reasonably resolving a dispute. Yet, this ideal model of a critical discussion is never observed in practice. An important reason why arguers may deviate is that, in social life, no one solely pursues the goal of being reasonable. People also attempt to be effective and win the argumentative interaction to realize their social goals (Van Eemeren, 2010). Yet, when this aiming at effectiveness starts to overshadow the ideal of reasonableness, the argumentation becomes fallacious. The balancing between reasonableness and effectiveness is referred to as 'strategic maneuvering' (idem).

Argumentation is shaped by strategic maneuvering through three inseparable aspects (idem, p. 95). First, regarding topical potential, arguers select their move from the set of possible alternatives. Second, through considering audience demands (idem, p. 94) – the audience's expectations and preferences – protagonists can determine effective content and frames which work particularly well for their audience. Third, presentational devices (idem, p. 94) – like certain stylistic choices and phrasings – can help to more convincingly convey the argument due to inserting emphasis and connotation. In successful argumentative strategies, strategic choices are aligned both within and among argumentative contributions.

Any discursive feature can be used as a source for strategic maneuvering: a protagonist can exploit argument schemes, topics, dissociation, jokes, starting points, accusations and so on. Here, I focus on speech codes (see Philipsen, 1997) as a source for strategic maneuvering. Grounded in Hymes' Ethnography of Communication

[1]https://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/full-transcript-first-2016-presidential-debate-228761

(1974), speech codes theory starts from the observation that members of a community share a conception regarding the appropriate conduct and interpretation of language, encoded into language through a 'speech code': "a system of socially constructed symbols and meanings, premises and rules, pertaining to communicative conduct (Philipsen, 1997, p. 126). Hence, through a speech code, cultural presumptions concerning beliefs about the world and norms to be followed are encoded into communication. Specifically, a speech code includes assumptions about human nature, relationships and strategic action (Philipsen, Coutu, Covarrubias, 2005, p. 61).

Whether a message is intelligible to the audience, depends on whether they share the encoded speech code (idem, p. 63). Thus, the speech code determines the ultimate meanings of a communicative act. Yet, the rhetorical force of a speech code could be stronger. The use of the audience's preferred speech code may resonate so well that the sheer fact that this speech code is used in the communication persuades the audience to adopt the standpoint at hand (Fitch, 2003). Then, it may veil the unreasonableness of the argumentation used. This possibility fits well with the pragma-dialectical project on hidden fallaciousness (see Van Eemeren, Garssen & Meuffels, 2012).

In this paper, I consider two already investigated speech codes (of honor and of dignity). Philipsen (1986, p. 255) has shown that they were relevant regarding a political speech to different segments of the population in Chicago. A blue-collar neighborhood presumed the code of honor, whereas white-collar outsider used the code of dignity, leading to different appreciations of that speech. Below I claim that these codes can effectively make sense of different choices made by Clinton and Trump with regards to the three aspects of strategic maneuvering.

Philipsen (1986, p. 256) argues that these codes have two dimensions: an instrumental and an expressive one. The instrumental dimension focuses on values in politics and economics. The code of honor presumes that "persons are inextricably interconnected". Thus, an "ancestral voice", expressed through "precedence, piety, loyalty, and hierarchical institutions", grounds "the person in social life" (Carbaugh, 1993, p. 127). People should prioritize their community, and especially their close circle. They do not expect equality, but being treated as well as possible based on available resources, position and rank. In contrast, the code of dignity emphasizes "the intrinsic worth of persons, equality, rights, [and] negotiation" (idem, p. 128) presuming people to be "separate and extricable entities" whose "social [identities], positions and relations need to be built or worked upon" (idem, p. 127). Thus, central to this code is individual independence, valuing the individual over the group (Carbaugh, 1994). Everyone should be treated similarly, and on their merits.

Concerning the expressive dimension, in the code of honor, the community is again foregrounded. What is morally important is how one is perceived by others. Expression is a public affair (Carbaugh, 1993). A relevant emotion is, for instance, shame (based on social norms). Instead of shame, the code of dignity would emphasize guilt and conscience (Leung & Cohen, 2012): an individual's own feelings, unmediated by social demands, is what matters. Similarly, one should be evaluated based on skill and individual achievement, and not zeal to the community's standards. Thus, central are individuality and individual achievements.

To clarify the meaning of these codes, I posit them as opposite ends of a set of semantic dimensions (see Katriel & Philipsen, 1981). Starting with the two main dimensions identified above, there is first the instrumental dimension ranging from independence to dependence of a person. Second, the expressive dimension ranges from emotions, feelings and values having a public source to a private one. These semantic oppositions consist of an opposing set of terms, see tables 1 and 2 (based on Philipsen, 1986; Carbaugh, 1988; 1993; 1994).

Dependence ←→	Independence
Loyalty	Freedom of expression
Power	Negotiation / Shared power
Wealth	Equality of opportunity
Magnanimity	Fairness
Precedence	Fundamental right to well-being

Table 1 – Juxtaposition of the instrumental dimension of the code of honor and of dignity.

Public ←→	Private
Shame	Guilt/sincerity
Glory/fame/reputation	Sincerity/authenticity
Courage	Self-consciousness
Excellence	Intrinsic worth/skill
Piety	Uniqueness/Sacredness of individual

Table 2 – Juxtaposition of the expressive dimension of the code of honor and of dignity.

For the instrumental dimension, the code of honor concerns (inter)dependency: central are connections (loyalty and precedence) and hierarchy (power, wealth, magnanimity). In contrast, the code of dignity implies independence: separateness (freedom of expression and fundamental right to wellbeing) and equality (negotiation, sharing power, equality of opportunity, and fairness) are key. Similarly,

regarding the expressive dimension, the codes are opposites. The code of honor emphasizes displaying the appropriate values of the community. Shame, glory, courage, excellence and piety are all communal judgments. In contrast, guilt, authenticity, self-consciousness, skill and individuality all foreground an individual.

3. SPEECH CODES AS TOPICAL POTENTIAL

The topical potential of an issue concerns the different options regarding the content the arguer can choose from to defend a standpoint. Thus, below, I analyze the *content* of the argumentation advanced, and consider how the content is coherent under a speech code and how different content could have been used instead. I claim that the premises constituting Clinton's and Trump's argumentation are a meaningful set of premises within the code of dignity and of honor respectively. This suggests that each speech code provides a distinct way of defending a standpoint. Additionally, as speech codes are a set of ideas, they provide alternate defenses by themselves as well. Thus, speech codes offer protagonists two ways of defining the topical potential.

Below, I discuss the opening responses of Clinton and Trump to the first question in this debate: "why are you a better choice than your opponent to create the kinds of jobs that will put more money into the pockets of American workers?" Consequently, the standpoint Clinton and Trump can be presumed to defend is "I am the better candidate to create the kinds of jobs that puts more money into the pockets of American workers", albeit left implicit. By reconstructing the argumentation, I show that the premises of each candidate belong to their respective speech code. Let's first consider Clinton's turn (excerpt 1[2]).

(1) Hillary Clinton
1. The **central question** in this election is **really** *what kind of*
2. *country **we want** to be* and *what kind of future **we**'ll build*
3. ***together***. Today is **my granddaughter's** second birthday,
4. so I think **about this** a lot. First, **we** have <u>to build an</u>
5. <u>economy that *works for everyone*, *not **just** those at the top*</u>.
6. That means we need <u>*new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes*</u>.
7. <u>I want us to **invest** in you. I want us to **invest** in **your**</u>
8. <u>**future**</u>. That means <u>jobs in infrastructure, in advanced</u>
9. <u>Manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable</u>
10. <u>energy, and small business</u>, because most of the new jobs

[2] <u>Underlined</u> means that it is discussed for 'topical potential'; *italics* for 'audience demand'; **bold** for presentational devices.

11. will come from small business. **We** also **have to** make the
12. economy fairer. That **starts with** raising the national
13. national minimum wage and also **guarantee**, **finally** equal
14. pay for women's work. I also *want to see more companies*
15. *do profit-sharing*. If you help create the profits, you **should**
16. be able to share in them, not **just** the executives at the top.
17. And I want us to do more to support people who are
18. struggling to ***balance*** *family and work*. I've **heard from so**
19. **many of you** about the **difficult choices** you face and the
20. **stresses** that you're under. So **let's** have paid family leave,
21. earned sick days. **Let's** be sure we have affordable child
22. care and debt-free college. How are **we** going to do it?
23. **We**'re going to do it by *having the wealthy pay their fair*
24. *share* and close the corporate **loopholes**.

Clinton argues she is the better candidate because she wants "to build an economy that works for everyone" (1:4-5). As the previous utterances concern the election more generally, and not why Clinton is the better candidate, they are not reconstructed as part of the argument. Her desire "to build an economy that works for everyone" is based on two premises: she "wants to invest in [U.S. citizens]" (1:7-8) and "make the economy fairer" (1:11-12). Regarding the former, Clinton claims we need "new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes" (1:6) and provides a few concrete examples (1:8-10). She vocally emphasizes wanting to invest in U.S. Americans' lives.

Clinton pauses briefly, before claiming she wants to "make the economy fairer" (1:11), implying a second line of argumentation. The use of "also" (1:11) suggests coordinative reasoning. By stating "that starts with" (1:12), Clinton implies that what follows is not the only step to be taken in making the economy fairer (i.e. coordinative argumentation). This is suggested by her use of "also" in the following lines (1:13; 1:14) as well. The last element of this coordinative argument (1:12-20) is connected to the other elements by "and" (1:17), while the next premise is separated using "so" (1:20). At the end, Clinton poses the question of "how are we going to do it?" (1:22), thereafter justifying her previous reasoning as sufficient for her being able to "build an economy that works for everyone" (1:4-5). Reconstruction 1 reflects this discussion of the argumentation in excerpt 1.

(1) (I am the better candidate to create jobs to put money in Americans' pockets)
- (1).1 I want to build an economy that works for everyone
  - (1).1.1a I want us to invest in you/your future
    - (1).1.1a.1a We need new jobs, good jobs with rising incomes

(1).1.1a.1b We need jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business

(1).1.1b We need to make the economy fairer

(1).1.1b.1a Raising the national minimum wage

(1).1.1b.1b Guarantee equal pay for women

(1).1.1b.2 I want to see more companies do profit-sharing

(1).1.1b.2.1 If you help create profits, you should share in them

(1).1.1b.3 I want to support people who are struggling to balance family and work

(1).1.1b.3.1 Let's have paid family leave

(1).1.1b.3.2 Let's have earned sick days

(1).1.1b.3.3 Let's have affordable child care

(1).1.1b.3.4 Let's have debt-free college

((1).1.1a-b) (We can do this; it's not too expensive)

((1).1.1a-b).1 We will have the wealthy pay their fair share

((1).1.1a-b).2 We will close corporate loopholes

Reconstruction 1 – Argumentative reconstruction of Clinton's opening statement (excerpt 1).

In this analysis, I exclude policies to not conflate political ideology with the speech codes used. In principle, any policy can be presented through different speech codes. For example, "earned sick days" can be placed in a dignity framework, but could also, in contrast to Clinton's argumentation, be defended by referring to generosity to suppliants.

The overall claim of Clinton ("to build an economy that works for everyone" ((1).1)) is an acceptable statement in the code of dignity. The focus on "for everyone" steers away from social connections among people. This premise presupposes that people should not be part of a hierarchical system but should be able to participate as equals. The rest of the argumentation consists likewise of statements part of the discursive web grounding the code of dignity. First, Clinton wants to "invest in [U.S. citizens]" ((1).1.1a), presuming everyone is worthy of being invested in and thus should get the chance to improve themselves. The code is reiterated by stating that the focus of the "investment" is on "your future" (1:6). The focus is on what individuals want to achieve themselves, instead of realizing some communal standard.

Clinton's second argument is defending "making the economy fairer" ((1).1.1b). Fairness, rather than magnanimity, is central to the code of dignity. Clinton pursues her policies based on people's fundamental self-worth. This focus continues in the subargumentation. For example, "If you help create profits, you should share in them" ((1).1.1b.2.1) foregrounds rewards based on individual achievements instead of connections. Claiming that people who struggle to "balance family and work" ((1).1.1b.3) deserve help implies that she does not want to reward loyalty but favors unconditional support for people to act upon their own priorities. Lastly, stressing that "the wealthy" should "pay their fair share" (((1).1.1a-b).1) implies that magnanimity and generosity are not the central principles for redistributing wealth, while equality is.

Overall, Clinton mainly uses the instrumental dimension of the code of dignity – most important being fairness, equality and shared power. Thus, the code could sustain alternate defenses as well. For example, Clinton could have formulated the necessity of her proposals as companies overshadow the individual (i.e. emphasize the sacredness of the individual).

To conclude, Clinton's argument is grounded in the code of dignity as the primacy of the individual is continuously presumed. Through this code, the premises are coherently integrated into an argument defending that Clinton is the better candidate. Without the code of dignity, the premises would form a disconnected set of statements, thereby losing argumentative strength due to a lack of coordination of strategic maneuvering.

(2) Donald Trump

1. *Our jobs are **fleeing** the country*. They're going to Mexico.
2. They're *going to many other countries*. You **look at** what
3. China *is **doing** to our country* in terms of making our
4. product. *They're devaluing their currency*, and there's
5. nobody in our government to ***fight** them*. And we have a
6. very good **fight**. And we have a ***winning fight***. Because
7. *they're **using** our country as a **piggy bank*** to rebuild China,
8. and *many other countries are doing the same thing*. So we're
9. losing our good jobs, so many of them. When you **look at**
10. what's happening in Mexico, a ***friend** of mine* who *builds*
11. *plants said it's the **eighth wonder of the world**. They're*
12. *building some of the **biggest** plants anywhere in the world,*
13. *some of the **most sophisticated**, some of the **best** plants.*
14. *With the United States, as he said, not so much*. So Ford is
15. leaving. You see that their small car division leaving.
16. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're
17. all leaving. And *we can't allow it to happen anymore*.

18. (…)
19. But we have to stop *our jobs from being **stolen** from us*. We
20. have to stop our companies from leaving the United States
12. and, with it, firing all of their people. All you have to do is
22. take a **look at** Carrier air conditioning in Indianapolis.
23. They left -- fired 1,400 people. They're going to Mexico. So
24. many hundreds and hundreds of companies are doing this.
25. We cannot let it happen. Under my plan, I'll be reducing
26. taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for
27. companies, small and big businesses. That's going to be a
28. **job creator** like we haven't seen since Ronald Reagan. It's
29. going to be **a beautiful thing to watch**. Companies will
30. come. They will build. They will expand. New companies
31. will start. And I **look very, very much forward** to doing it.
32. We have to renegotiate our trade deals, and we have to
33. stop these countries from **stealing** our companies and our
34. jobs.

As Trump responds to the same question, his standpoint is the same as well. In his turn (see excerpt 2), Trump first analyzes the basic problem: "our jobs are fleeing the country" (2:1). He justifies this with examples, signified by "you look at" (2:2; 2:9): China is "devaluing their currency" (2:4); in Mexico, businessmen can build "sophisticated plants" (2:8), inconceivable in the U.S. (2:12). Next, he starts analyzing the U.S.: we do not "fight them" (2:5). He implies that as it is a "winning fight" (2:6), there is good reason to complain that the government is not fighting, especially as the U.S. is just used as a "piggy bank" (2:7). Lastly, Trump concludes that "we cannot allow it to happen anymore" (2:17), implying that it is possible to "stop companies from leaving" (2:20) and that he can do this by taking up this fight. Specifically, he proposes to "reduce taxes tremendously" to bring back companies (and jobs) (2:25-27), and to "renegotiate trade deals" (2:32). Reconstruction 2 shows the argumentative structure.

(2) (I am the better candidate to create jobs to put money in the pockets of American workers)
- (2).1a The U.S. loses its jobs to other countries
  - (2).1a.1 China is devaluing their currency
  - (2).1a.2a In Mexico, businessmen can build plants which are sophisticated
  - (2).1a.2b In the U.S., this is not possible
- (2).1b Nobody in our government fights the other countries
- (2).1c This is a winning fight
  - (2).1c.1 The U.S. is just used as a piggy bank by other countries
- ((2).1a-c) (Trump will fight those other countries)
  - ((2).1a-c).1a Trump will reduce taxes tremendously

((2).1a-c).1b	Reducing taxes will bring companies to the U.S.
((2).1a-c).2	Trump will renegotiate trade deals.

Reconstruction 2 – Argumentative reconstruction of Trump's opening statement (excerpt 2).

The first premise that jobs are lost to other countries ((2).1a) has a focus on the U.S. as a community, which is losing wealth to others. The second premise ((2).1b) implies this as well: the politicians of our community have to "fight them" but are accused that they do not. Key is that these politicians are not enacting precedence and will not be able to be magnanimous. They do not take on their responsibilities as leaders of the community: in the code of honor, they should try to maximize power and wealth for the community. This invocation of the code of honor is strengthened by the subsequent defense: the fight is a "winning fight" ((2).1c). Trump also claims that the U.S. is being used by others ((2).1c.1). Given that the U.S. is portrayed as passive, actually fighting back will make a difference according to the beliefs in the code of honor. Politicians should not refuse to participate in such a fight as it is valued to make visible one's power. It is about setting a reputation, showing courage and achieving excellence. Trump is shaming the current political elite by not taking up the fight. This argumentation, critical of U.S. politicians, implies a bridging premise (((2).1a-c)). Trump implies that he believes the U.S. should be first and that he will do this. He shows that he respects his community and will act upon this through mentioning his proposed policies.

Thus, to connect his policies to the standpoint that he is the better candidate, Trump advances premises through the code of honor. To make his case, he implies that he will pursue the primacy of the community. Only through the code of honor, the premises appear as a coherent argument together. Instrumental values prevail, with expressive values being implied.

In sum, speech codes provide protagonists with topical potential. To defend their position, the disagreement space can be defined by speech codes. First, one should select one from many available speech codes (e.g. code of honor versus of dignity). Second, within the chosen speech code, multiple propositions are available to be used as premise (e.g. within the code of honor, a standpoint can be defended through the value of glory or of power). Thus, the topical potential seen from the perspective of speech codes can be specified on two levels.

4. SPEECH CODES AND AUDIENCE DEMANDS

Speech codes also play a central role in responding to audience demands. As speech codes are used by a community of speakers (Philipsen, Coutu & Covarrubias, 2005), when using a speech code, one appeals to certain social values regarding communication of that community. Choosing the right speech code is a way to incorporate the rhetorical demands of one's audience. These demands first guide the selection from the topical potential (i.e. one's audience leads to the speech code which is most effective). Additionally, they affect the larger *framing* of the argumentation through the depiction and representation of the world. Namely, as a speech code is grounded in beliefs, assumptions and values about the world (Philipsen, 1997; Philipsen, Coutu & Covarrubias, 2005), it is deeply connected to a particular worldview. Thus, in these two ways – selecting from the topical potential and framing the larger argumentative discourse – the protagonist can address the expectations and preferences of the audience through exploiting speech codes. I use the two excerpts introduced above to study how Clinton and Trump discursively portray the world in their argumentative discourse. Instead of looking at the premises, we look at what is presumed about the world in the discourse as a whole.

The framing of Clinton's turn is aligned with the selected topical potential through using the code of dignity. Clinton (excerpt 1) claims that "this election" is about finding out what "kind of country" "*we* want" (1:1-2) and subsequently "building" this desired country "together" (1:2-3). Society is sketched as constituted of equal individuals, each counting as much as anyone else in the decision-making process. Clinton avoids implying a hierarchical organization. Through using "want" (1:2) and "build together" (1:2-3) in conjunction with "we", there is no distinction between leaders and their suppliants. People have a choice and voice themselves.

Yet, the code of dignity is not fully realized. By observing the economy should work for "not just those at the top" but for "everyone" (1:5), Clinton suggests that currently in the U.S., not individuals' skills are valued, but some other (inegalitarian) quality (which, she implies, is undesirable) – which is problematic. Similarly, as she "wants" the wealthy to do "profit-sharing", Clinton suggests that she wants to avoid reliance on magnanimity and generosity. Currently, the wealthy do not "pay their fair share" by using "corporate loopholes" (1:24), undermining fundamental equality of individuals. Thus, Clinton is criticizing various ways of social organization which are currently undermining the foregrounding of the individual. She presumes as

common-sense that the economy should be fair to give everyone equal opportunities.

The ideal of cherishing the individual is key when presenting her policies. When talking about needing "new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes" (1:6), she presumes that the "economy" is centered around "jobs". Specifically, people deserve "good jobs" and deserve "rising incomes" through working their "good jobs". Thus, as "jobs" are held by individuals, she is presuming that the economy should be a place where the individual can thrive in order to have equal access to material well-being. Similarly, that she "wants us to invest in you" and "your future" (1:7-8) implies the U.S. government should help everyone equally by focusing on their future and make them better at what they want to do. There is no suggestion that this "investing" is done because of magnanimity, loyalty or precedence – the investment has nothing to do with communal ideals. Additionally, the observation of "balancing family and work" (1:18) only makes sense within the code of dignity, as it implies some freedom instead of duty.

Clinton describes a world where the individual is central. Everyone shares in decision-making and should have equal opportunities. Specifically, one ought to combat the unfair wealth accumulation of those at the top. Individuals should be helped to get the most out of themselves. By invoking the worldview of the code of dignity, implicitly, Clinton posits herself as someone who cares about power-sharing and considering everyone's needs and interests.

Trump (excerpt 2) frames the world differently: the world is filled with hostile others, who are against the U.S. Courage, shame and glory are central moral themes; precedence, loyalty and power are central political symbols which pervade his discourse.

Trump starts with noticing that "our jobs are fleeing the country" (2:1) to other countries who are actively working against the U.S. (2:1-2). China is "devaluing their currency" (2:4) and is "using our country as a piggy bank" (2:7), like "many other countries" (2:8). Hence, Trump concludes, "our jobs are stolen from us" (2:19). Thus, the world is engaged in a hostile zero-sum game over jobs, wealth and power. Moreover, as China and Mexico are pursuing policies which take these jobs away, an out-group is attacking the in-group. Therefore, we should "fight them" (2:5) – be courageous.

This is framed through the code of honor. First, it is a bad thing that other countries are better off. Trump cares about the group's comparative stance. Second, in this "winning fight" (2:6), the government should visibly gain wealth and power for its community. As this winning fight should be fought by people's representatives, and not by the people themselves, hierarchical relations within the U.S. are implied. In this frame, the fact that the U.S. is not doing as well as other

countries can be blamed on to the elite, as Trump notes that "we can't allow it to happen anymore" (2:17). The ties among people are neglected.

Trump continues talking about his "friend" building "some of the most sophisticated plants" in "Mexico" (2:10-14). This reinforces a frame of needing to gain grandeur and glory. In Mexico, currently, someone, his friend, is building a plant which will be "the eighth wonder of the world" (2:11). At this point, achieving this excellence in the U.S. is virtually impossible (2:14). Trump wants to be associated with people portraying this value, and thus introduces "his friend".

Thus, Trump sketches a world with hostile outsiders trying to harm the group. The commonsensical norms are loyalty as well as precedence of the group. The community as a whole should thrive. Implicitly, Trump presents himself as a strong and courageous leader with the skill to take on the challenge of hostile outsiders in order to fulfill his duty to his community to get the jobs back the people deserve. He is ready to act upon the requirements of the social hierarchy and pursue magnanimity.

To conclude, as each speech code is not just a set of propositions, but an encoded set of beliefs and norms about the world, this ideology can be used to frame the argumentative turn at talk. Clinton framed reality in her turn through the code of dignity, sketching a world which consists of equals who make up their own mind and pursue their own wealth. In contrast, Trump framed his turn through the code of honor, sketching a world based on precedence of one's own community. In this world, one has to fight for their place. For an audience, if the frame of what the world is like resonates with them, this will enhance the understanding and convincingness of the argumentation.

5. SPEECH CODES AND PRESENTATIONAL DEVICES

Next to offering potential moves and frames for the argumentation, speech codes can also affect strategic maneuvering by informing which presentational devices to use. Such devices do not alter the content or the frame, but only concern the specific presentation of the discourse. This can be done through using voice and bodily movements on stage but also through verbal devices as diverse as metaphors, synonyms and alliterations. In this project, I only consider verbal devices. Through these devices, candidates can highlight certain elements relative to others. Speech codes provide words with positive (or negative) associations, but also suggest which words should receive favorable predication. Trump uses various stylistic devices to reinforce the code

of honor, while Clinton does the same with regards to the code of dignity.

Using verbal presentational devices, Clinton is able to foreground the premises and frames of the code of dignity (excerpt 1). Central, as noted above, is the discussion of "what kind of country we want to be" (1:1) and "what kind of future we'll build together" (1:2-3). This invocation of the code of dignity is highlighted by Clinton by referring to it "really" being "the central question in this election" (1:1) as well as claiming that "today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about [these questions] a lot" (1:3-4). Thus, this emphasizes that it entices her to think about changing the future, rather than fitting her granddaughter into the community's traditions. Thus, through these verbal moves, the central values of the code of dignity stand out even more in her first few lines.

Also noted above, Clinton marks the current state of affairs as undesirable. Arguing for an "economy that works for everyone" (1:5), Clinton contrasts this with "not *just* those at the top" (1:5). This use of "just" emphasizes the negative stance towards the status quo, which should be changed into one more aligned with the code of dignity. This is reinforced by referring to "loopholes" (1:24), a term carrying negative connotations. This denouncing of the top foregrounds the code of dignity. More of such small words which do this highlighting of the speech code appear throughout. Later, when talking about "making the economy fairer" (1:11-12), Clinton expresses that it "starts with" (1:12) her proposed policies, which "we have to" (1:11) "finally" (1:13) realize. Each of these terms expresses some urgency in changing the current world. Additionally, Clinton formulates a moral imperative ("should", 1:15) to emphasize her stance.

Her use of "invest" (1:7) shows a second way to utilize presentational devices. This term is a concept central to the code of dignity by focusing on improvement and individual needs. Instead, and still advancing the same proposition and frame, Clinton could have talked about "enabling" people. Yet, the word "invest" has symbolic meaning within the code of dignity and its use helps to foreground this code. Earlier, we discussed the significance of using "want" (1:2), with its connotation to choice. Other words with strong resonance within this code are "guarantee" (1:13) and "balance" (1:18) as they implicate individual concerns; "difficult choices" (1:19) and "stresses" (1:20) are private experiences, not public. Notice, in addition, how Clinton claims that people "help create" (1:15) profits (and thus sketches people as an equal).

Through these verbal devices, Clinton posits herself as focusing on equality and collective-decision-making. Her frequent use of "we" helps doing this work; she also introduces some policies through the

inclusive "let's" (1:20-21). Lastly, as she "has heard from so many of you" (1:18-19) about the hurdles they face in life, she positions herself as believing the electorate gives valuable input.

In contrast, Trump's turn is filled with strategic word choices that reinforce the code of honor. He uses "fleeing" metaphorically to talk about jobs leaving the US (2:1), which has a negative connotation. It supports the code of honor by implying that something in the U.S. itself is done which causes those jobs to leave (i.e. politicians are not doing their job). Namely, fleeing implies that they are being pushed away, instead of pulled towards something. Yet, later on, Trump uses "stealing" (2:19; 2:33) instead, which implies that other countries are doing something to take something away stuff that belongs to the U.S. The loss of jobs to other countries is thereby characterized as illegitimate. It suggests that the U.S. did not do anything to prevent this theft; it also implies hostility by the other countries, reinforcing an us-them relationship. The use of the metaphor "piggy bank" (2:7) also suggests that the U.S. is passive and under control of other communities. The use of these words support his code of honor-based critique of U.S. politics: the country is unnecessarily weak.

The code of honor is reiterated using various key terms. China is "doing" (2:3) things which should be "fought" (2:5-6). "Fighting" has strong resonance within the code of honor as it is public display of strength, courage and, if won, excellence. Thus, predicating "winning" (2:6) of the fight is significant. Another key term used to reinforce the code are "friend" (i.e. someone socially close, 2:10).

To show the state of the U.S. is bad, Trump compares it to Mexico. Specifically, he references observable reputation: "the eighth wonder in the world" (2:11) and the use of superlatives (2:12-13). He uses this criterion of observable reputation and excellence also when he introduces his proposed policy: "it's going to be a beautiful thing to watch" (2:29). In a similar vein, Trump, generally, seems to emphasize observable evidence. When he considers the "stealing" by other countries, he asks the audience to "look" (2:2; 2:9; 2:22). He also "looks forward" to see the effects of his own proposed policies (2:31): it will be "a beautiful thing to watch" (2:29).

Thus, using metaphors and key terms from the code of honor, this code is reinforced. Trump qualifies other countries as hostile and U.S. politicians as lacking moral virtues. He also suggests that his policies will be "a job creator" (2:28) – something observable to the public and thus a future public portrayal of excellence.

In sum, this section has shown that regarding presentational devices, speech codes can fulfill two roles. One, language use should highlight central elements of a speech code. Second, single words, like

metaphors and key words from a speech code, can foreground the code by themselves.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I outlined how speech codes can be studied as a source for strategic maneuvering within the pragma-dialectical framework. It is one among the many features of human communication protagonists could exploit to make their argumentation more effective at realizing their social goals. Besides enhancing the intelligibility of a message, as speech codes are also regarded as commonsensical, they could be readily accepted. Thus, using speech codes for strategic maneuvering can be fully legitimate by just improving intelligibility, but can also result in derailing the strategic maneuvering if undermining the dialectical standard of reasonableness central to the pragma-dialectical theory.

For each of the three aspects of strategic maneuvering, speech codes can function as a resource. First, regarding topical potential, not only provides each existing speech code a unique source for the topics of argumentation, as each speech code is a cluster of belief, assumptions and values, a speech code also signifies different possible defenses on its own. Second, concerning audience demands, considering one's audience can not only help the protagonist select from topical potential, but also determine the framing of the turn at talk. Third, as to presentational devices, a speech code provides key terms and metaphors, but also signifies which elements deserve extra emphasis. This has shown that both Trump and Clinton have coordinated argumentative strategies: both within and among moves they exploit the same speech code.

As I decided to select two codes to understand the differences between the argumentative contributions of Trump and Clinton, instead of discovering them ethnographically, this study has limitations. First, I cannot claim anything about the deliberate use of these codes to achieve effective reasoning, or that the codes used to analyze the discourse are the primary speech code used by the protagonist. Second, I cannot claim anything about the ultimate effectiveness of the use of a particular code in convincing the audience. However, these limitations do not prevent to achieve the aim of this paper: to study speech codes as a resource for strategic maneuvering. These two codes enabled to account for strategic variability in argumentative discourse.

This study contributes to the integration of knowledge on cultural communication and persuasive speech. The integration of cultural communication and pragma-dialectics enables to make better sense of argumentative discourses where different speech communities have to interact, like politics. Including insights from cultural

communication may be essential to the study of fallacious reasoning and deception in democratic discourses. Specifically, future studies should investigate in detail all semantic dimensions which contrast Trump and Clinton's speech. When this research is extended to other political discourses, these dimensions can be related to political ideologies. Then, broadcast organizations should be investigated as well, as Fox News, CNN and MSNBC can be expected to employ different speech codes due to being linked to different ideologies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: I want to thank Frans van Eemeren, Gonen Dori-Hacohen, and Donal Carbaugh for their helpful, constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper.

REFERENCES

Carbaugh, D. (1988). *Talking American: Cultural discourses on Donahue*. Ablex.

Carbaugh, D. (1993). Cultural pragmatics and intercultural competence. *The Competent Intercultural Communicator Yearbook*, 51, 117-129.

Carbaugh, D. (1994). Personhood, positioning, and cultural pragmatics: American dignity in cross-cultural perspective. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *17*(1), 159-186.

Eemeren, F. H. van (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse: Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eemeren, F. H. van, Garssen, B. & Meuffels, B. (2012). The disguised abusive ad hominem empirically investigated: Strategic manoeuvring with direct personal attacks. *Thinking & Reasoning*, *18*(3), 344-364.

Eemeren, F. H. van & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation. The pragma-dialectical approach.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fitch, K. L. (2003). Cultural persuadables. *Communication Theory*, *13*(1), 100-123.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Katriel, T., & Philipsen, G. (1981). "What we need is communication": "Communication" as a cultural category in some American speech. *Communication Monographs*, *48*(4), 301-317.

Leung, A. K.-Y. & Cohen, D. (2012). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(3), 507-526.

Philipsen, G. (1986). Mayor Daley's council speech: A cultural analysis. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *72*(3), 247-260.

Philipsen, G. (1997). A theory of speech codes. In: G. Philipsen & T. Albrecht (Eds.), *Developing theories in communication* (pp.119-156). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Philipsen, G., Coutu, L. M. & Covarrubias, P. (2005). Speech codes theory. Restatement, revisions, and response to criticisms. In: W. B. Gudykunst

(Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp.55-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.