STRONG MESSAGE HERE

A practical guide to political language

Redesigned for document comparison using Signal -> Mechanism -> Evidence -> Context

PURPOSE Use this guide as an analytical lens when a speech, press release, article or political statement is uploaded alongside it. The aim is to surface language worth a critical reader's attention, not to diagnose dishonesty or infer motives.

How to use this guide

- SIGNAL: the observable wording or structural feature that should make the scanner look more closely.
- MECHANISM: what the language is doing at text level. This describes the rhetorical operation, not the author's hidden intention.
- EVIDENCE: the minimum evidence needed before the pattern should be reported. Related words or topics alone are not enough.
- CONTEXT: the false-positive and counter-evidence check. Surrounding detail can weaken, qualify or overturn an apparent match.

Scanner rule: A signal is a reason to inspect, not a finding. Report a technique only when the evidence requirement is met after reading the surrounding context.

Reader rule: Prefer a small number of useful, well-supported observations to a complete checklist of absent techniques.

Intent rule: Do not convert a possible rhetorical effect into a claim about what the speaker intended. Describe observable language first.

Recommended finding labels

Label	Meaning
Supported pattern	The signal and mechanism are supported by the passage in context.
Possible pattern	The signal is meaningful and some mechanism is present, but an important element remains ambiguous.
Surface signal only	A phrase or feature resembles the guide, but the mechanism is not supported after context is read.
Checked, not found	The pattern was relevant enough to search for, but the required evidence was not found.
Not assessable	The uploaded material does not contain enough context to decide.

Primary-source corpus

This edition is built from the attached Strong Message Here transcript documents. They are treated as the primary source corpus for the guide. The short source anchors under each technique identify where the relevant discussion appears; they are not external verification of political claims mentioned within the programmes.

- Strong Message Here 1.docx
- Strong Message Here 2.docx
- Strong Message Here 3.docx
- Strong Message Here 4.docx
- Strong Message Here 5.docx
- Strong Message Here 6.docx
- Strong Message Here 7.docx
- Strong Message Here 9.docx
- Strong Message Here 10.docx
- Strong Message Here 11.docx
- Strong Message Here 12.docx
- Strong Message Here 13.docx

The analytical field guide

The techniques are grouped by reader question rather than by a rigid compliance taxonomy. This makes the guide easier to pair with a document-scanning template while preserving the source material's focus on everyday political language.

1. Political nicknames and identity labels

FRAMING & LABELLING

SIGNAL A person, faction or policy is repeatedly given a memorable nickname, compressed label or character tag.
MECHANISM The label reduces a larger argument to a short identity cue that can travel independently of the detailed case.
EVIDENCE Flag only when the target actually uses or repeats a label as a meaningful frame. Record the label, who or what it describes, and whether substantive reasoning accompanies it.
CONTEXT Do not flag ordinary names, formal titles, one-off jokes or neutral abbreviations. Check whether the label is quoted critically rather than adopted by the speaker.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can make a complex judgement easier to remember and can define an opponent before their argument is considered.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, around 00:00-00:12, discussion of political nicknames and the power of naming; Strong Message Here 7, around 00:42, later nickname discussion.*

2. Slogan compression and repetitive formulas

SLOGANS & COMPRESSION

SIGNAL A short phrase is repeated as a summary of a much larger political programme, problem or desired direction.
MECHANISM The phrase compresses complexity into a memorable formula. Repetition can make the frame familiar even where operational detail is limited.
EVIDENCE Record the slogan and the concrete proposition attached to it. Strong evidence requires repetition or clear use

as a programme-level shorthand, not merely a polished sentence.

CONTEXT A concise phrase is not automatically doublespeak. Check whether the surrounding material supplies clear policy, dates, responsibility, costs or measurable outcomes.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can improve clarity and recall, but may also allow a broad emotional proposition to stand in for a complicated case.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 2, opening discussion of Make America Great Again and slogan effectiveness; Strong Message Here 4, around 00:10, discussion of campaign promise presentation.*

3. The commitment ladder: pledge, promise, mission, target and aspiration

COMMITMENTS & EXPECTATIONS

SIGNAL Commitment words are used with different levels of precision or enforceability: pledge, promise, mission, target, ambition, intention, guarantee.

MECHANISM Different labels can make an undertaking sound firm while leaving the action, deadline, metric or responsibility more or less open.

EVIDENCE Identify the exact commitment word, action promised, responsible actor, deadline, metric, conditions and stated route to delivery. Compare strength of wording with strength of detail.

CONTEXT Do not assume one word is always stronger than another. The test is the full sentence and supporting detail. A mission with measurable milestones may be more concrete than a loosely worded promise.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can manage expectations by changing how an undertaking is framed without necessarily changing its political importance.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 13, around 00:56, contrast between vague missions and specific pledges; Strong Message Here 4, around 00:09-00:10, discussion of promises/manifesto presentation.*

4. Inflationary intensifiers and accelerator language

SLOGANS & COMPRESSION

SIGNAL Ordinary action is described with high-energy language such as turbo-charging, transforming, supercharging, driving forward or other conspicuous intensifiers.

MECHANISM The modifier increases the felt pace, scale or decisiveness of the action without itself adding measurable content.

EVIDENCE Record the intensified phrase and then identify what changes in practical terms: money, scope, timetable, legal power, output or measurable result.

CONTEXT Do not flag vivid language merely for being vivid. If clearly stated action and scale sit underneath it, report both the rhetoric and the substance.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can create a sense of momentum or potency disproportionate to the additional information conveyed by the phrase.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, 00:00:18, satirical use of turbo-charge alongside other political stock phrases; Strong Message Here 13, around 00:15, return of turbo-charge as a noted favourite.*

5. Voter archetypes and constituency shorthand

FRAMING & AUDIENCE

SIGNAL Broad groups are invoked through labels such as hardworking families, working people or comparable audience categories.

MECHANISM The label constructs a politically useful imagined constituency and can imply who deserves priority, protection or identification.

EVIDENCE Record the group label, the benefit/burden attached to it, and whether the group is defined. Note who falls outside the label if the text makes that distinction express.

CONTEXT Do not infer exclusion or prejudice just because a broad audience label is used. Check whether it is ordinary audience description or doing substantive argumentative work.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can simplify distributional choices by presenting them through a favourable social archetype.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, 00:00:18 and around 00:21; Strong Message Here 4, around 00:07; Strong Message Here 5, around 00:04, discussions using working-people/family language.*

6. Household-budget analogy

FRAMING & ANALOGY

SIGNAL Public finances are explained through domestic-finance language: household budgets, belts, credit cards, living within means or similar personal-finance analogies.

MECHANISM A macroeconomic choice is mapped onto familiar household behaviour, making one model of fiscal prudence feel intuitive.

EVIDENCE A genuine match requires an identifiable household or personal-finance analogy. Record the analogy and the fiscal conclusion drawn from it.

CONTEXT Do not flag discussion of borrowing, debt, affordability or savings by itself. Without the domestic analogy, this mechanism is not present.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can make public-finance arguments accessible, while potentially narrowing attention to the parts of government finance that resemble personal budgeting.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, around 00:22, explicit discussion of tightening belts and the household-budget metaphor.*

7. The tough-decisions shield

FRAMING & NECESSITY

SIGNAL A policy choice, cut, tax rise or other unpopular measure is pre-framed as tough, difficult, painful or necessary.

MECHANISM The description shifts attention from whether the choice is justified to the supposed seriousness or courage involved in making it.

EVIDENCE Record the decision, who bears the cost, alternatives acknowledged, and evidence offered for necessity. Strong evidence requires an actual contested or burdensome choice, not simply the word difficult.

CONTEXT Do not flag every reference to difficulty. Distinguish practical difficulty from moral/political framing of a choice as proof of responsibility.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can confer seriousness on the decision-maker and make opposition easier to portray as avoiding reality.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, around 00:19-00:22, episode discussion of tough decisions; Strong Message Here 3, around 00:32, later use/discussion of the phrase.*

8. Choreographed authenticity

AUTHENTICITY & PERFORMANCE

SIGNAL The communication highlights spontaneity, plain-speaking, informality, personal disclosure or an apparently unscripted moment while still operating in a managed political setting.
MECHANISM Authenticity itself becomes part of the presentation: the audience is encouraged to notice the speaker as natural, unfiltered or unlike conventional politicians.
EVIDENCE Record observable signals of spontaneity or authenticity and any evidence in the target showing staging or scripting. Do not infer staging simply because the communication is professional.
CONTEXT A personal anecdote or informal tone is not enough. Flag the mechanism only where authenticity is foregrounded or the text contrasts itself with managed political speech.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can make a speaker feel direct or trustworthy, while the performance of authenticity may itself be carefully managed.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, around 00:00:37, autocue mishap used to discuss authenticity and choreography; recurring authenticity discussion across Strong Message Here 10-13.*

9. The weave: disjointed topic-shifting

STRUCTURE & ATTENTION

SIGNAL The speaker moves rapidly between substantially disconnected subjects, anecdotes or tangents in a way that makes a single line of argument hard to follow.
MECHANISM Attention is continually reset, so individual claims may receive less sustained scrutiny and the overall message is carried by performance or recurring themes rather than linear argument.
EVIDENCE A genuine match requires demonstrably disjointed transitions or tangents. Identify at least two transitions and explain why the connection is weak or absent.
CONTEXT Do not flag a long speech merely because it covers many policy areas. A conference speech with distinct, coherent sections is breadth, not necessarily a weave.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can overwhelm linear fact-checking or create an energetic, improvisational style, but intention should not be inferred from structure alone.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 1, around 00:16-00:18, discussion of the weave and extended tangents; later references in Strong Message Here 10 and 12.*

10. Political-speak blandness and answer avoidance

EVASION & SUBSTANCE

SIGNAL The response is highly cautious, generic or formulaic, or it speaks around a question without supplying the requested substantive proposition.
MECHANISM Risk avoidance produces language that is difficult to challenge but may also be difficult to learn anything from.
EVIDENCE Identify the issue or question, the answer actually given, and what substantive information remains unanswered. Prefer observable absence over judging tone alone.
CONTEXT Do not treat careful wording as evasion when the response directly answers the issue. A disliked or incomplete answer is not automatically a non-answer.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can reduce exposure to error or controversy at the cost of directness and informational value.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 9, around 00:16, discussion of bland/anodyne political speech; Strong Message Here 11, around 00:45, discussion of politicians answering or not answering questions.*

11. Vague ambition versus testable specificity

EVASION & SUBSTANCE

SIGNAL A broad desired outcome is stated without enough information to know what action, metric, deadline or threshold would count as delivery.
MECHANISM The communication gains the appeal of a positive goal while preserving flexibility over how or when success is judged.
EVIDENCE Record the aspiration and search the surrounding document for action, owner, timetable, baseline and success measure. Report which of those are present or absent.
CONTEXT Do not mark a statement vague merely because it is high-level if the document later operationalises it. Conversely, a number alone does not make a claim testable without context.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can broaden agreement around a goal while postponing disagreement about delivery and measurement.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 13, around 00:56, explicit contrast between a vague NHS mission and a specific waiting-time pledge; vague-language discussions also appear in Strong Message Here 3-5, 10 and 11.*

12. Process language versus outcome

PROCESS & RESPONSIBILITY

SIGNAL Reviews, commissions, consultations, plans, summits, procedures, rules or reports are presented as the response to a substantive problem.
MECHANISM Activity and procedure can occupy the rhetorical space where a decision, responsibility or outcome might otherwise be expected.
EVIDENCE Record the process and the substantive decision/action stated alongside it. Strong evidence of shielding requires the process to substitute for the outcome, not merely support implementation.
CONTEXT Do not flag a review or commission automatically. If the communication also states what will happen, who owns it and by when, report the process as part of delivery rather than as evasion.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can create an impression of action while leaving the decisive choice open, but can also be a legitimate part of policymaking.

Primary-source basis: *Primary corpus contains recurring discussion of reviews and commissions, including Strong Message Here 4 around 00:33/00:49, Strong Message Here 7 around 00:50, Strong Message Here 9 around 01:23 and Strong Message Here 10 around 00:27.*

13. Crisis inflation

FRAMING & ESCALATION

SIGNAL A problem is labelled a crisis, emergency, catastrophe or equivalent high-severity term.
MECHANISM The severity label can compress argument about scale and urgency into one emotionally powerful word.
EVIDENCE Record the crisis label and the evidence in the target about scale, trend, immediacy and consequences. The guide is checking framing, not independently verifying whether the crisis is real.

CONTEXT Do not conclude that crisis language is exaggerated without evidence in the uploaded material. Some situations are genuinely described as crises; the useful question is what evidence accompanies the label.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can accelerate attention, justify urgency and raise the perceived cost of inaction.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 4, around 01:30, listener discussion of overuse of crisis language; crisis terminology also appears across Strong Message Here 5, 9, 10, 12 and 13.*

14. Manifesto and policy-brand packaging

BRANDING & DOCUMENTS

SIGNAL A package of commitments is presented through a manifesto, plan, named programme, card, mission set or branded policy identity.

MECHANISM Packaging turns multiple proposals into a recognisable object that audiences and media can refer to quickly.

EVIDENCE Record the brand/name and identify the actual commitments underneath it. Check whether the package adds structure or substitutes for detail.

CONTEXT Do not flag the mere existence of a manifesto or plan as doublespeak. The analytical question is whether the branding clarifies or obscures the underlying propositions.

Possible rhetorical effect: Can make policy easier to communicate and remember, while encouraging the brand to become a proxy for the content.

Primary-source basis: *Strong Message Here 4, around 00:09-00:10, manifesto/promise presentation; manifesto discussion also appears in Strong Message Here 5, 7 and 10.*

15. Rhetoric backed by substance

READER SAFEGUARD

SIGNAL A conspicuously rhetorical, emotional or promotional passage is immediately or subsequently accompanied by concrete action, ownership, dates, figures, mechanisms or acknowledged trade-offs.

MECHANISM The surrounding substance materially limits the risk that the rhetoric is standing in for an answer.

EVIDENCE Record both sides: the rhetorical signal and the concrete supporting detail. Treat this as a counter-signal that may downgrade an apparent doublespeak match.

CONTEXT Do not assume rhetoric is suspect merely because it is vivid. The guide should reward specificity where it exists rather than search only for negatives.

Possible rhetorical effect: Helps distinguish political style from actual evasion and keeps the analysis balanced and useful to readers.

Primary-source basis: *This is a synthesis rule derived from the corpus emphasis on language plus underlying proposition, including Strong Message Here 13 around 00:56 and Strong Message Here 2 opening discussion of simple messages and what sits behind them.*

Cross-cutting substance check

Whenever the scanner finds a rhetorical signal, it should also ask what sits underneath it. The following items are counter-evidence, not automatic proof of good communication:

- a named decision-maker or responsible body
- a concrete action rather than a desired direction

- a date or defined timeframe
- a quantified claim with enough context to understand the number
- a measurable target or success condition
- a delivery mechanism or legal/administrative route
- a stated cost, burden, beneficiary or trade-off
- an acknowledgement of uncertainty or limits

Key distinction: The presence of detail does not make a political claim true; it makes the claim more specific and therefore more open to scrutiny.

Suggested output for a document scan

- What language most deserves attention? Report the strongest supported patterns only.
- What does the wording actually commit to? Separate firm action, target, forecast and aspiration.
- What substance sits underneath the rhetoric? Record dates, figures, owners, mechanisms and trade-offs where present.
- Which apparent signals disappear when context is read? Include the most instructive false positives.
- What was checked but not found? Give a short assurance line, not a long negative catalogue.
- What should a critical reader notice overall? End with a concise, balanced synthesis rather than a doublespeak score.

Guide boundaries

- This is a rhetorical document-screening guide, not a truth checker.
- It should not label a speaker dishonest or deceptive from language alone.
- It should not infer motive, emotion or intention unless expressly established in the uploaded material.
- It should distinguish quotation, paraphrase, claim, opinion and established information within the target where possible.
- It should not force every passage into a named technique. “No material pattern identified” is a valid outcome.
- Examples in the source corpus illustrate analytical concepts; they are not mandatory keywords for matching.