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Abstract:
Nowadays oratory speeches are flooded with fallacious arguments the function of which predetermines the subject matter of this article. In the frame of this paper fallacies are examined through the prism of current multidisciplinary approaches; the concept of fallacy is studied both as a philosophical and as a linguistic notion in the context of argumentation. Secondly, is made an attempt to overall philosophical and linguistic analysis of fallacies in political discourse. This approach aims to focus on the pragmatic effect of implementing stylistic and rhetoric means, on the one hand, and the fallacious arguments, on the other hand, for understanding the persuasive techniques implemented in oratories bringing forth fallacious reasoning. The paper makes evident that the philosophical and linguistic study of fallacies in oratory speeches as errors in reasoning is one of the most vital factors in deploying the resources of inferential reasoning and demonstrating communicative competence.
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1. Introduction:
The effect of the flood of information and arguments on the reader, listener and viewer results not only in the informing and ideological moulding of the public, but also in the informing (e.g. in literary contributions of so called “language columns” on the radio, television and in the newspapers) and the systematic moulding as far as the language is concerned. The results of this effect of language on the public are not governed by intentions to rationalize nor by interference by linguists, but rather by the degree of intensity with which society follows or may follow publicist communication of its time, and further by the unity and concentration of that effect (Chloupek, 1993). The most vivid example of the heterogeneous nature of language function and expression is considered to be the publicistic style. The function of the publicistic style intends to inform, disseminate, propagate, and is, in fact, a function which is performed with greater intensity by publicist writing than by political literature, which is like an utterance of technical style intended primarily for communication itself. On the other hand, publicistic style merely “aids” the performing of the function of instructing and educating, and the function of aesthetic effect and special informing, although these should not be disregarded either (Simpson, 2004). There is another peculiarity of the publicistic style which is worth considering. The reasoning of the
publicist as a rule enriched by statements made by political figures, by idioms depicting the wisdom of people, by direct or loose quotes from the cultural heritage of mankind. Indeed, this diversity of sources of cognition is reflected in publicist style; it contributes to its multistratification and intensifies the immediate “didactic” function of publicist writing (Dirven, 1987).

The publicistic style has three varieties which in their turn have their distinctive features. Unlike other styles, the publicistic style has a spoken variety, namely, the oratorical substyle. The development of radio and television gave birth to another new spoken variety, namely, the radio and TV commentary. The other two substyles are the essay (moral, philosophical, literary) and journalistic articles (political, social, economic) in newspapers, journals and magazines. Book reviews in journals, newspapers and magazines and also pamphlets are generally included among essays (Galperin, 1971).

The oratorical style of language is the oral subdivision of the publicistic style. Persuasion is the most obvious purpose of oratory. Direct contact with the listeners permits a combination of the syntactical, lexical and phonetic peculiarities of both the written and spoken varieties of language. In its leading features, however, oratorical style belongs to the written variety of language, though it is modified by the oral form of the utterance and the use of gestures. Certain typical features of the spoken variety of speech present in this style are: direct address to the audience, sometimes contractions and the use of colloquial words. This style is evident in speeches on political and social problems of the day, in orations and addresses on solemn occasions, as public weddings, funerals and jubilees, in sermons and debates and also in the speeches of counsel and judges in courts of law (Galperin, 1971).

Thus, the publicistic style aims to exert an influence on public opinion, to convince the reader or the listener that the interpretation given by the writer or the speaker is correct and to make them accept his or her views through logical argumentation and emotional appeal.

To persuade a reader, invalid arguments, namely, fallacies are used. These are defective arguments that appear true on the surface, but are found to rest upon false or invalid assumptions and the substyle in which the greatest number of fallacies can operate is that of oratory speeches. To understand argument appraisal and to avoid fallacious reasoning, there is an urgent need to dwell on the notion of argument from both the philosophical and linguistic points of view.

Theoretical background is based on Galperin’s approach to style classification in present-day English taking into account the coordination of language means in the sphere of communication. The most fundamental approach to the study of fallacies is that of Whately, who made a detailed investigation of fallacies as errors of reasoning and revealed their types in accordance with previously examined data.

2. Fallacy in Philosophy and Linguistics

The concept of fallacy was first made the object of study, by Aristotle, in the context of argumentation. Not only arguments, but also inferences and hasty generalizations can be fallacious. A fallacy is any error in reasoning. Philosophers since antiquity have tried to identify and describe common failures in reasoning (Mey, 2009).

However, the way that Aristotle thought of the combination and division fallacies differs significantly from modern treatments of composition and division. Aristotle’s fallacies are the combinations and divisions of words which alter meanings, e.g., "walk while sitting" vs. "walk-while-sitting." (i.e., to have the ability to walk while seated vs. being able to walk and sit at the same time). For division, double meaning is also possible with those words whose meanings depend on how they are pronounced, this is the fallacy of accent, but there were no accents in written Greek in Aristotle’s day; accordingly, this fallacy would be more likely in written work. Finally, the fallacy that Aristotle calls form of expression exploits the kind of ambiguity made possible by what we have come to call category mistakes, in this case, fitting words to the wrong categories. Aristotle’s example is the word ‘flourishing’ which may appear to be a verb because of its ‘ing’ ending (as in ‘cutting’ or ‘running’) and so belongs to the category of actions, whereas it really belongs to the category of quality (Parry, 1991).

Jeremy Bentham’s interest was in political argumentation, particularly in exposing the different means used by parliamentarians and law makers to defeat or delay reform legislation. He considered fallacies as being arguments or topics that would produce erroneous beliefs in people through the use of deception. He divided these tactics into four classes: fallacies of authority, of danger, of delay and of confusion. Most of Bentham’s fallacies have
not become staples of fallacy theory but many of them show interesting insights into the motives and techniques of debaters (Bowring, 1840). Richard Whately was instrumental in the revival of interest in logic at the beginning of the nineteenth century and, being committed to deductivism, he maintained that only valid deductive inferences counted as reasoning. Thus, he took every fallacy to belong either to the class of deductive failures (logical fallacies) or the class of non-logical failures (material fallacies).

By ‘fallacy’ Whately meant “any unsound mode of arguing, which appears to demand our conviction, and to be decisive of the question at hand, when in fairness it is not”. The logical fallacies are divided into the purely logical and the semi-logical fallacies. The purely logical fallacies are plain violations of syllogistic rules like undistributed middle and illicit process. The semi-logical fallacies mostly trade on ambiguous middle terms and are therefore also logical fallacies, but their detection requires extra- logical knowledge including that of the senses of terms and knowledge of the subject matter. They include, among others, the fallacies of ambiguity, and division and composition. The non-logical, material fallacies are also divided into two classes, the class of fallacies with premises ‘unduly assumed,’ and another class of fallacies of irrelevant conclusions (Whately, 1827).

John Stuart Mill placed the study of fallacies within his framework of inductive reasoning, a direct rejection of Whately’s deductivist approach to reasoning and fallacies. Mill held that only inductive reasoning counts as inferring and accordingly introduces new categories as well as a new classification scheme for fallacies (Miller, 1938).

Irving Copi’s ‘Introduction to Logic’, an influential text book from the mid-twentieth century defines a fallacy as “a form of argument that seems to be correct but which proves, upon examination, not to be so.” The term ‘correct’ is sufficiently broad to allow for both deductive invalidity, inductive weakness, as well as some other kinds of argument failure. Of the 18 informal fallacies Copi discusses, eleven can be traced back to the Aristotelian tradition, and the other seven to the post-Lockean fallacy tradition.

The main division in Copi’s classification is between formal and informal fallacies. Formal fallacies are invalid inferences which “bear a superficial resemblance” to valid forms of inference, so these we may think of as deductive fallacies. They include affirming the consequent, denying the antecedent, the fallacy of four terms, undistributed middle, and illicit major. Informal fallacies are not characterized as resembling formally valid arguments; they gain their allure some other way (Copi, 1961).

From these regards to fallacies the most fundamental one is that of Whately who made a huge contribution to the study of fallacies in philosophic and linguistic spheres. He thoroughly examined the previous theories concerning fallacious arguments and gave the classification of all types of fallacies, whereas others studied the errors in reasoning only partially. He generalized from all the given conceptions and theories thus creating one complete and widely accepted theory which later on helped to newly revive the previous interest in logic. As the current theories on fallacies are mostly based on his conception of failures in reasoning, it plays a crucial role in understanding and probing fallacies in the present research.

3. Public Argumentation:

Usually any piece of writing concerning the public primarily contains chains of argumentation. Good writing consists of good arguments, bad writing contains bad arguments. The difference is not that good arguments have true conclusions and bad arguments have false ones. The whole point of making arguments is to establish whether or not some particular claim is true or false. An argument works by starting from some claims which everyone is willing to accept as true, and then showing something interesting, something new. It follows that there are the following reasonable ways to criticize an argument: the first is to question the truth of the premises; and the second is to question the claim, that is the premises are true then the conclusion is true as well. This is because each premise of the main argument will often be supported by sub-arguments, these in their turn might be defended by further arguments, and so on. Therefore, it is difficult to determine what argument is fallacious (https://en.wikipedia.org/).

Being a human process, some concept of audience is very essential for argumentation. The quality of an argument is as good as the quality of audience that gives its adherence whose membership is constituted by all reasonable and competent people. The way people perceive the given argument determines their ability to differentiate bad and good arguments.
A good argument is one that is validated by the public or some part of public. Public grounding of argument is quite important. The public possesses a core of principles and knowledge which constrain, supply and validate the best rhetoric. Good public argumentation draws on those fundamentals to maintain and advance the community’s store of ideas. A good argument draws on public knowledge and moves in a publicly acceptable form towards conclusions which are therefore convincing the community in question (Benoit, 1992).

**Good arguments are then defined as those that are deductively valid or inductively strong, and that contain only true, well-established premises, but are not question-begging.**

**A bad, or fallacious argument is a misleading one.** It leads to a conclusion, often very persuasively, by illicit steps of argumentation. **Three types of fallacious argument are as follows: those that depend on dubious premise, those weakened by irrelevance, those that draw hasty conclusions.** Dubious premises needn't be obviously false, but are nonetheless unacceptable. They are often deployed in the hope that the audience will misunderstand or completely fail to understand the argument, or to benefit from them in a particular context. A fallacy may often arise from equivocation, ambiguity or vagueness in the premises, making it impossible for the audience to accept them. A fallacy might also occur when the argument **begs the question**, i.e. where the argument’s conclusion supports the premises, or when the conclusion merely restates the premises (Bickenbach, 1997).

**Arguments often bring in irrelevant information**, intended to divert the audience’s attention from the argument, and often particular dubious parts of an argument. Fallacies of irrelevance are also used to illegitimately strengthen or weaken arguments. Often an argument will employ entthymematic premises that are suppressed deliberately or accidentally overlooked, and that are dubious. An argument may also appeal to ignorance to support a conclusion, by trying to suggest that because something hasn't been true, it must be false (Slob, 2013).

**4. Fallacy Detection in Oratory Speeches:**

If one thinks of politics, politicians and their language there is one opinion; there is a special political language used by the politicians to follow certain aims in order to be persuasive or most convincing. Politicians are somewhat dependent on the mass as without the public there would be no need for politicians. The main reason for every politician to lie or to use special vocabulary is for the purpose of being convincing. Therefore, they use various linguistic and rhetorical strategies aimed at on the one side to waken attention and on the other side to avoid taking a stand, to remain obscure. This is how fallacies are brought forth.

The present research seeks to analyze selected speeches by certain political figures, namely, Hillary Clinton’s Super Tuesday victory speech, Donald Trump’s presidential candidacy announcement speech.

Most people can talk and give a speech but fewer become good or great communicators. As Rodenburg explains, all can strike the keys of the piano, but not all of them can play a tune. Learning to play superbly, movingly takes choice, practice and desire. A great musician makes with his or her score. Likewise, the way people use words can and should reflect what and who they are. It should also connect with the clear process of thought. Finally, it should signal variety and a facility with words. All of these connections with words are aspects of voice and speech that each one can master. (Rodenburg, 1993:4)

The comprehension of fallacy and the aim of its practical use in oratory speeches point out a wide range of aspects, which are important to understand whether a given use of language can be regarded as a fallacy. It serves as a perspective to the possible persuasiveness of the analyzed parts and an ability to differentiate good arguments from bad ones.

Hillary Clinton served as the secretary of state of the United States of America from January 21, 2009, to February 1, 2013, and as a senator from New York from 2001 to 2009. She lost the democratic presidential primary nomination to Barack Obama in 2008. (www.biography.com/.../hillary-clinton)

Her speech was most influential constantly analyzed by the critics who found it though well-constructed and well-addressed but, in fact, lacking in relevance and credibility. Though her accounts concerning the 2016 presidential candidacy are unique, they are not dissimilar to the struggles of other candidates. Furthermore, many of her communication techniques are derived from the preceded presidents.

At the very beginning of her speech she addresses all the New Yorkers and B. Obama, B. Clinton inspired by Roosevelt’s four freedoms:
"It is wonderful to be here with all of you. To be in New York with my family, with so many friends, including many New Yorkers who gave me the honor of serving them in the Senate for eight years.

To be right across the water from the headquarters of the United Nations, where I represented our country many times.

To be here in this beautiful park dedicated to Franklin Roosevelt’s enduring vision of America, the nation we want to be.

And in a place... with absolutely no ceilings.

You know, President Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms are a testament to our nation’s unmatched aspirations and a reminder of our unfinished work at home and abroad. His legacy lifted up a nation and inspired presidents who followed. One is the man I served as Secretary of State, Barack Obama, and another is my husband, Bill Clinton.

Two Democrats guided by the -- Oh, that will make him so happy. They were and are two Democrats guided by the fundamental American belief that real and lasting prosperity must be built by all and shared by all.

President Roosevelt called on every American to do his or her part, and every American answered. He said there’s no mystery about what it takes to build a strong and prosperous America: "Equality of opportunity... Jobs for those who can work... Security for those who need it... The ending of special privilege for the few... The preservation of civil liberties for all... a wider and constantly rising standard of living."

That sounds good to me."

Despite her consistent endeavour to appear neutral as regards her political views, her strong expression of gratitude to the central representatives of the Democratic party predetermines the obvious orientation of her speech towards her and her supporters’ policy. She makes an allusion to President Roosevelt stressing the equality of opportunity for all but if there are “unmatched aspirations”, consciously or unconsciously the opportunities will work only for those who are for her way of governing the nation. This fallacious reasoning gives birth to a fallacy of conclusion with the obvious expression of the two Democrats guided by the fundamental American belief that all the people should be given opportunities equally. When arguments are arranged in this way, the concept of irrelevance appears at the centre of attention. The succession of thoughts brought forth by Clinton are less productive lines of reasoning that makes the audience’s scope of mind limited, focused on values of one political party.

In the continuation of her speech we see further development of her potentially fallacious line of argument:

"We're still working our way back from a crisis that happened because time-tested values were replaced by false promises. Instead of an economy built by every American, for every American, we were told that if we let those at the top pay lower taxes and bend the rules, their success would trickle down to everyone else.

What happened?

Well, instead of a balanced budget with surpluses that could have eventually paid off our
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national debt, the Republicans twice cut taxes for the wealthiest, borrowed money from other countries to pay for two wars, and family incomes dropped. You know where we ended up. Except it wasn't the end.

As we have since our founding, Americans made a new beginning.

You worked extra shifts, took second jobs, postponed home repairs... you figured out how to make it work. And now people are beginning to think about their future again -- going to college, starting a business, buying a house, finally being able to put away something for retirement.

So we're standing again.”

The first thing to be noted here is again the orientation of public attention towards the Democratic party by means of showing unreasonable actions taken by the Republicans to save the current grave state of the country. She blames the Republicans’ actions for the country’s ongoing crisis leaving unnoticed the fact that all these activities and everything have been performed under the permission of the head of state, namely Barack Obama who certainly negotiated with the representatives of both parties. The apparent employment of fallacy of composition in the present passage together with the ample use of stylistic devices, namely metaphors (time-tested values were replaced by false promises, ...their success would trickle down to everyone else.), parallel construction (by every American, for every American), rhetorical question (What happened?), , pun (You know where we ended up, Except it wasn't the end.), enumerations (the Republicans twice cut taxes for the wealthiest, borrowed money from other countries to pay for two wars, and family incomes dropped. ... You worked extra shifts, took second jobs, postponed home repairs... you figured out how to make it work. ... going to college, starting a business, buying a house, finally being able to put away something for retirement.), gradation and detached construction (And now people are beginning to think about their future again -- going to college, starting a business, buying a house, finally being able to put away something for retirement. So we're standing again.) makes it convincing for the target audience. Moreover, she makes them believe that she is the only candidate that doesn’t evade the problems but faces them and appreciates everything her nation has done for the country (You worked extra shifts, took second jobs, postponed home repairs). This is a strong emotional appeal to the audience, namely pathos that uses the manipulation of the emotions rather than valid logic to win her argument.

Some latitude and judgment of her speech will allow the observer to notice that still Hillary Clinton continues to use the tactic of irrelevance to prove her point as a true and trustworthy candidate for the president’s office:

“Now, there may be some new voices in the presidential Republican choir, but they're all singing the same old song...

A song called "Yesterday."

These Republicans trip over themselves promising lower taxes for the wealthy and fewer rules for the biggest corporations without regard for how that will make income inequality even worse.

We've heard this tune before. And we know how it turns out. Ask many of these candidates about climate change, one of the defining threats of our time, and they'll say: "I'm not a scientist." Well, then, why don't they start listening to those who are?

They want to take away health insurance from more than 16 million Americans without offering any credible alternative.

They want to put immigrants, who work hard and pay taxes, at risk of deportation.

And they turn their backs on gay people who love each other.

Fundamentally, they reject what it takes to build an inclusive economy. It takes an inclusive society. What I once called "a village" that has a place for everyone.”

The passage obviously has a number of stylistic devices and expressive means such as metaphor (Now, there may be some new voices in the presidential Republican choir, but they're all singing the same old song...), metonymy (there may be some new voices in the presidential Republican choir), anadiplosis and ellipsis (...the same old song. A song called "Yesterday."), rhetorical question (Well, then, why don't they start listening to those who are?), anaphoric repetition (They want to take away health insurance from 16 million Americans... They want to put immigrants at risk of deportation) which successfully manage to formulate its persuasive side. As to its truthful nature, the speech contains sentences that prove themselves to be irrelevant, less precise and less strictly enforced from the linguistic point of view. Only the sentence “A song called "Yesterday."” is
enough to determine that she rejects and equally makes her audience to reject any further interpretation of the Republicans’ public activities. Generally, relevance fulfills what can be called a gatekeeping or exclusionary function in argumentation. She establishes a legitimate connection between the previously performed actions of the Republicans and the current state of the country, but it should not be included in her speech as in actual case, this is the question that the current president should have determined who is a Democrat and under whose permission everything took place. This, therefore, does not provide a good basis for the relevant consideration on the issue. It gets sidetracked and spends too much time on one narrow side issue, than other, perhaps even more important considerations may not be taken into account. Too much concentration on one limited side issue blocks off the possibility of presenting her main intentions regarding the improvement of the current state of the country. Philosophically, this presents a semi-logical fallacy of composition whose false or irrelevant premises make the conclusion irrelevant too.

Furthermore, she commits a fallacy as her speech fails to meet the requirement of providing evidence capable of establishing the truth of the conclusion to be proved:

“And today’s families face new and unique pressures. Parents need more support and flexibility to do their job at work and at home. I believe you should have the right to earn paid sick days. I believe you should receive your work schedule with enough notice to arrange childcare or take college courses to get ahead. I believe you should look forward to retirement with confidence, not anxiety. That you should have the peace of mind that your health care will be there when you need it, without breaking the bank. I believe we should offer paid family leave so no one has to choose between keeping a paycheck and caring for a new baby or a sick relative. And it is way past time to end the outrage of so many women still earning less than men on the job and women of color often making even less. This isn’t a women’s issue. It’s a family issue. Just like raising the minimum wage is a family issue. Expanding childcare is a family issue. Declining marriage rates is a family issue. Helping more people with an addiction or a mental health problem get help is a family issue. In America, every family should feel like they belong. So we should offer hard-working, law-abiding immigrant families a path to citizenship. Not second-class status.”

Racial discrimination and family issues are central in her speech and particularly in the passage under discussion. The reason the argument in this case is said to be a linguistic fallacy of irrelevance is that H. Clinton should be confining her arguments to matters that are relevant to the presidential candidacy under consideration. Instead, she argues in a rhetorically rousing manner for the proposition “And today’s families face new and unique pressures. Parents need more support and flexibility to do their job at work and at home.” But this general proposition is something that everyone accepts and realizes. Nobody can dispute the issue that each and every family in the world not only in America needs support. The danger is that her crowd-pleasing speech rising to the degree of rhetoric flourish on how all the people especially women as the result of gender discrimination deserve decent living conditions, though materially irrelevant, might be psychologically successful in persuading the audience to believe her worthwhile devotion to the country as the next president. The implementation of such stylistic devices as anaphoric repetition (I believe you should have the right to earn paid sick days. I believe you should receive your work schedule with enough notice to arrange childcare or take college courses to get ahead. I believe you should look forward to retirement with confidence, not anxiety.), context driven antonyms (with confidence, not anxiety), parallel construction (…women still earning less than men on the job and women of color often making even less.), epiphora (It’s a family issue. Just like raising the minimum wage is a family issue. Expanding childcare is a family issue. Declining marriage rates is a family issue. The unequal rates of incarceration is a family issue. Helping more people with an addiction or a mental health problem get help is a family issue.), ellipsis and parcellation (So we should offer hard-working, law-abiding immigrant families a path to citizenship. Not second-class status.) together with the constant repetition of the modal verb “should” as a means to express obligation support her argument. The danger is associated with what some might call the prejudicial power of the argument.
The argument could appear to be relevant to an uncritical audience, even though it is logically and materially irrelevant.

In the last part of her speech, in her closing remarks the mention of her specified policies she would push for is made without any detail of how she would achieve these policies or address their costs:

"So I’m looking forward to a great debate among Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. I’m not running to be a President only for those Americans who already agree with me. I want to be a President for all Americans.

And along the way, I’ll just let you in on this little secret. I won’t get everything right. Lord knows I’ve made my share of mistakes. Well, there’s no shortage of people pointing them out!

And I certainly haven’t won every battle I’ve fought. But leadership means perseverance and hard choices. You have to push through the setbacks and disappointments and keep at it.

I think you know by now that I’ve been called many things by many people - "quitter" is not one of them.

The story of America is a story of hard-fought, hard-won progress. And it continues today. New chapters are being written by men and women who believe that all of us -- not just some, but all -- should have the chance to live up to our God-given potential.

Not only because we’re a tolerant country, or a generous country, or a compassionate country, but because we’re a better, stronger, more prosperous country when we harness the talent, hard work, and ingenuity of every single American.

I wish my mother could have been with us longer. I wish she could have seen Chelsea become a mother herself. I wish she could have met Charlotte.

I wish she could have seen the America we’re going to build together.

An America, where if you do your part, you reap the rewards."

To grasp the irrelevance, one has to understand how it is codified in rules of evidence and how the rules relate to fallacious arguments they are not supposed to be based on. Again her opponents’ positions are distorted and exaggerated by diverting the line to irrelevant issues. One might naturally enough diagnose the fault of Clinton’s argument as a failure of relevance because she is sure she will build prosperous America where everyone will have an opportunity to get the rewards of his/her hard work, but evidently she condemns the Republicans and speaks against them which is a mere proof of her attempt to take us away from the real issue. Even more, by calling herself “not a quitter” she strives to convince that the fact she will not give up easily and will struggle hard is very beneficial from the standpoint of her audience. She regrets that her mother couldn’t see her only child Chelsea, her granddaughter Charlotte and the America she will built in the future.

Thus, she focuses on two propositions which are opposed to each other and do not have any correspondence in the above given passage. Her argument is based on the premises that do not represent the commitments of the other party and where her argument used a distorted version of these commitments with an attempt to justify her view that the best way to improve the country’s alarming situation is to make her the president of the state. However, the stylistic devices including pleonasm (the setbacks and disappointments), detached constructions (I’ve been called many things by many people - "quitter" is not one of them. New chapters are being written by men and women who believe that all of us -- not just some, but all -- should have the chance to live up to our God-given potential.), metaphor (New chapters are being written by men and women who believe that all of us -- not just some, but all -- should have the chance to live up to our God-given potential.), parallel construction (Not only because we’re a tolerant country, or a generous country, or a compassionate country, but because we’re a better, stronger, more prosperous country), anaphora (I wish my mother could have been with us longer. I wish she could have seen Chelsea become a mother herself. I wish she could have met Charlotte. I wish she could have seen the America we’re going to build together.), ellipsis (An America, where if you do your part, you reap the rewards.") influence listener’s disposition towards her presidency and invite them to agree with her position.

5. Conclusion:

The analysis of the selected speech by famous American political figure, known as a brilliant orator, shows us that even famous rhetoricians can fail to deliver a trustworthy speech. Some public figures have the view that if they tell the truth, they will be attacked by their audience because they may fail to be persuasive. It is a common knowledge that a speech is an ordinary form of addressing an
assembly, being somewhat more elaborated, grand, complete and elevated in style than common conversation. But this does not necessarily mean that the speech should be fallacious to provide the persuasive side. It can convince the audience by telling the truth as well. The problem is that each orator should study his own capabilities and peculiarities and adopt that mode which best suits him. When this is not encountered, they commit fallacies not only with the intent to deceive, but also as a result of their carelessness. Since they are not valid, however, the consequences of persuading the listeners based on them can be harmful. They can even destroy the validity of good arguments. Thus, to be ethical, as well as effective orators should avoid fallacious reasoning in their speeches.
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