Rhetorical Devices as a Political Tool for Manipulation

Asst. Lect. Nawar Basil Mahfoudh
College of Political Science, University of Mosul, Mosul, Iraq
Nawar.BasilMahfoudh@uomosul.edu.iq

Abstract:
   This study investigates the persuasive and manipulative power of rhetorical devices in political speeches, demonstrating how language is strategically employed to construct ideologies, evoke emotions, and influence public opinion. By analyzing 30 speeches from political leaders across diverse cultural and ideological contexts—including Martin Luther King Jr., Gamal Abdel Nasser, Nelson Mandela, and Donald Trump—the research identifies recurring patterns in metaphor, repetition, irony, alliteration, and hyperbole. The findings reveal that these devices transcend geographic and cultural boundaries, functioning as universal tools for political persuasion. However, its effectiveness is often dependent on sociohistorical contexts and audience receptivity. The study concludes by highlighting the ethical implications of rhetorical manipulation and calls for greater public awareness of linguistic strategies in political discourse.

Keywords: Rhetoric, political manipulation, language, persuasion tactics.

Introduction

   In politics, the power of words cannot be overstated. Words are the currency of political discourse, shaping the way we understand and engage with the world (Bataineh, 2019). Through careful selection and implementation of the language, political entities, governments, and leaders can influence the attitudes and behaviors of their constituents (Altikriti, 2016).

   The role of language in politics is particularly evident in political speeches and campaign rhetoric. As Noam Chomsky illustrated, the words used by politicians can significantly impact election outcomes, convincing voters, and shaping their beliefs (Fowobaje, 2022). This underscores the essential nature of speech and communication writing in the political process, where the ability to craft a compelling narrative can mean the difference between success and failure. Furthermore, the power of words extends beyond elections and into the broader arena of political discourse. Political interactions, whether

between governments and citizens or among political leaders, are facilitated through carefully constructed language (Benjamin, 2022).

Politics is inextricably linked to authority and power. Fairclough (1989) and Thomas and Wareing (1999) argued that politicians gain public consent by creating and propagating an ideology that the public willingly adopts as their own. In today's media-dominated society, linguistic manipulation has evolved, incorporating techniques such as press conferences, slogan updates, connotative word meanings, and a mix of verbal and visual imagery (Rozina & Karapetjana, 2009).

Although studies have analyzed various linguistic techniques in political rhetoric, it remains necessary to explore their function in different cultural and political contexts (David, 2014). Recent academic interest has focused on the oratory styles of specific political figures, such as Barack Obama, as well as the rhetorical devices used in political debates and propaganda language (Coe & Reitzes, 2010; Isaksen, 2011; Utley & Heyse, 2009). By investigating rhetorical methods as instruments of manipulation and persuasion in political speeches, this study underscores the lasting relevance of words in shaping public discourse and political identities.

The Aims

The main objective of this study is to achieve the following:

1- Evaluate how metaphor, repetition, irony, alliteration, and hyperbole are used in political speeches.

2- Compare their application in Western and non-Western political environments.

3- Assess the ethical consequences of using rhetorical manipulation.

Methodology

- Research design

A qualitative content analysis (including examining the text content and detecting themes, patterns, and meanings) was conducted on 30 speeches between 1942 and 2022. The sample included leaders from the United States, South Africa, the Arab world, and Europe, selected for their historical impact and rhetorical diversity.

-Model of analysis

● **Aristotelian Rhetoric:** Focus on ethos (credibility), pathos (emotion), and logos (logic).

● **Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA):** Examines how language reinforces power structures (Fairclough, 1989).

● **Cross-Cultural Rhetoric:** Consider contextual factors (eg, postcolonial identity in Mandela's speeches vs. American exceptionalism in Reagan's).

Procedure

● NVivo (Version 12, QSR International, 2020) was used to identify rhetorical devices using deductive (predefined categories) and inductive coding. The validity was confirmed through contextual triangulation and inter-coder reliability (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.80$).

● Contextual mapping: Each rhetorical technique was systematically linked to its socio-historical context (for example, MLK's repetition of 'I have a dream' corresponded to the 1963 Civil Rights March, while Nasser's Pan-Arab metaphors aligned with post-colonial unity efforts in the 1950s).

● Triangulation: The findings were cross-verified with secondary sources to mitigate cultural bias.

The limits

● Potential subjectivity in interpreting non-Western rhetorical traditions.

● Limited scope to written transcripts, excluding vocal delivery and audience reactions.

Analysis of Rhetorical Devices

1. *Metaphor*: Constructing Political Realities

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 59) define metaphor as "the comprehension or experience of one thing or concept in terms of another where there is some similarity". Metaphors translate abstract policies into tangible imagery, often moralizing political agendas.

Martin Luther King Jr.'s 'I Have a Dream' (1963): Framed racial equality as an unfulfilled financial promise, leveraging capitalist ethos to demand civil rights.

Gamal Abdel Nasser's "Arab Body" (1958) depicted the Arab nations as parts of a single organism, promoting pan-Arab unity against colonialism.

Donald Trump's 'American Carnage' (2017): The national decline is depicted as physical violence, justifying radical policy changes.

Function: Metaphors simplify complexity, evoke shared cultural symbols, and moralize positions (for example, 'justice' as a debt to be paid).

2. *Repetition*: Anchoring Ideologies

Repetition transforms slogans into ideological anchors:

Nelson Mandela's "Rainbow Nation" (1994): Repeated to normalize post-apartheid multiculturalism as inevitable and natural.

Barack Obama's "Yes, We Can" (2008): Turned a phrase into a movement, emphasizing collective agency.

Saddam Hussein's "Mother of All Battles" (1991): Mythologized the Gulf War as a historical turning point.

Function: Repetition enhances recall, fosters group identity, and creates an illusion of consensus (Gaspar, 2011).

3. *Irony*: Masking Critique

Irony allows indirect criticism while maintaining plausible deniability:

Ronald Reagan's "Youth and Inexperience" (1984): Mocked opponent Walter Mondale's age while deflecting attention from his policies.

Anwar Sadat's "Wall of Fear" (1977): Highlighted the absurdity of Arab-Israeli hostility while advocating peace.

Hillary Clinton's "Already Great" (2016): Countered Trump's narrative by ironically reappropriating his slogan.

Function: Irony disarms opposition by framing critique as humor or wisdom (Gornostaeva, 2013).

4. *Alliteration*: Engineering Memorability

Alliteration's phonetic rhythm enhances message retention:

John F. Kennedy's "Let Us Go Forth" (1961): The /l/ sound evoked forward momentum and optimism.

Donald Trump's "Poverty and Violence" (2016): Paired words amplified perceptions of domestic chaos.

Winston Churchill's "Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat" (1940): The /t/ sound underscored wartime sacrifice.

Function: Alliteration creates auditory "stickiness," making slogans memorable even when divorced from context (Otieno, 2015).

5. *Hyperbole*: Amplifying Crises

Exaggeration magnifies threats or triumphs to justify action:

Hassan Nasrallah's "Defeat of Superpowers" (2006): Framed Hezbollah's actions as a global turning point to legitimize resistance.

George W. Bush's "Axis of Evil" (2002): Exaggerated threats to justify military intervention.

Hugo Chávez's "Imperialist Vampires" (2006): Demonized opponents to rally anti-Western sentiment.

Function: Hyperbole polarizes audiences, creating urgency and legitimizing extreme measures (Claridge, 2011).

Discussion

The analysis revealed three overarching themes:

1. Universality vs. Contextuality: Metaphors and repetition are commonly used, although their interpretation varies between cultures. Mandela's "Rainbow Nation" foregrounded South Africa's multicultural character, whereas Nasser's "Arab Body" emphasized anti-colonial solidarity.

2. Emotional Manipulation: Devices such as hyperbole and irony can avoid rational scrutiny by appealing to fear, pride, or amusement.

3. Ethical Ambiguity: Rhetorical skill can either educate (e.g., MLK's justice analogies) or deceive (e.g., Trump's "carnage" hyperbole), creating concerns about political orators' accountability.

Implications:

o **Media Literacy:** In today's digital world, citizens must be educated to understand rhetorical manipulation.

o **Ethical Rhetoric:** To avoid demagoguery, political language must strike a balance between persuasiveness and accuracy.

Conclusion

This study has systematically established that rhetorical elements such as metaphor, repetition, irony, alliteration, and hyperbole are universal instruments for political persuasion across cultural, ideological, and geographical borders. The study examines speeches from leaders as disparate as Martin Luther King Jr., Gamal Abdel Nasser, and Donald Trump, and finds a startling similarity in how these methods are used to manipulate public perception, heighten emotional resonance, and establish political identities. Three main conclusions arise, each of which reinforces the fundamental assumptions of the study:

1. Universality of Rhetorical Strategies

Despite their cultural background or political viewpoints, leaders use the same rhetorical strategies to achieve their objectives. Metaphors such as Mandela's "Rainbow Nation" and Nasser's "Arab Body" help simplify complex philosophies into understandable narratives.

• Repeating slogans (e.g., Obama's "Yes We Can" and Saddam Hussein's "Mother of All Battles") helps them become a part of communal memory.

• Hyperbole is used to justify action, such as Trump's "American Carnage" and Nasrallah's "Defeat of Superpowers".

This universality emphasizes the fundamental function of rhetoric in political communication, implying that these methods are built into the mechanics of power.

2. Contextual Adaptation

While the instruments themselves are ubiquitous, their use is highly suited to socio-historical contexts.

• The King's "Check of Justice" metaphor used capitalism to advocate for civil rights, while Sadat's "Wall of Fear" used regional anxieties to promote Arab-Israeli dialogue.

• Irony, such as Reagan's mockery of his opponent's "youth," can be risky in high-stakes diplomatic situations due to cultural familiarity with the subtext.

• Arabic's phonetic richness enhances the power of alliteration in speeches by leaders such as Nasrallah.

This dichotomy—universal tools versus culturally specialized applications—highlights the necessity for audiences to critically examine speech within its contextual framework.

3. Ethical Implications and Societal Responsibility

This study highlights the fine line between persuasion and manipulation. Metaphors and hyperboles can either enlighten (King's vision of equality) or deceive (Bush's "Axis of Evil"). This dichotomy poses important problems, including:

• When rhetorical skills become tools for demagoguery.

• How can society promote media literacy to avoid deceptive language?

The solutions lie in education and transparency. Citizens must be able to decipher rhetorical methods and leaders must be held accountable for using language ethically.

To summarize, our study emphasizes that rhetoric is not only a facet of political speech but also an essential foundation. By shedding light on the mechanics of linguistic manipulation, this study enables audiences to engage critically with political speech, an essential ability in an age when words continue to impact the world.

References

Altikriti, S. (2016). Persuasive speech acts in Barack Obama's inaugural speeches (2009, 2013) and the last State of the Union address (2016). *International Journal of Linguistics*, *8*(2), 47-66.

Bataineh, M. T. (2019). Linguistic and pragmatic devices in King Abdullah's speech: A political discourse analysis. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature,* 8(2), 40-44.

Benjamin, S. E. (2022). *Politics and the power of words*. Meer. Retrieved from https://www.meer.com/en/71417-politics-and-the-power-of-words.

Claridge, C. (2011). *Hyperbole in English: A Corpus-based Study of Exaggeration*. Cambridge University Press.

Coe, K. Reitzes, M. (2010). Obama on the stump: Features and determinants of a rhetorical approach. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 40, 391-413.

David, M. K. (2014). Language, power, and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164-170.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fowobaje, K. R., Mashood, L. O., Ekholuenetale, M., & Ibidoja, O. J. (2022). Qualitative content analysis of Nigerian heads-of-state and presidents' inaugural addresses: text mining, topic modeling, and sentiment analysis. *SN Social Sciences*, 2(12), 279.

Gaspar, B. (2011). *The power of repetition as a rhetorical device in a speech concerning Obama's speech at UI Jakarta*. Unpublished manuscript. In *National Conference Language in the Online and Offline World*, May 31 & June 1, 2011, Petra Christian University, Surabaya.

Gornostaeva, A. (2013). Irony as a component of English style of communication (In Russian), *Maska, Moscow*.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.　Otieno, T. M. (2015). Linguistic description of the rhetoric: Barack Obama's political speeches. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *20*(9).

Otieno, T. M. (2015). Linguistic description of the rhetoric: Barack Obama's political speeches. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *20*(9).

QSR International. (2020). *NVivo* (Version 12) [Computer software]. Retrieved from https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software

Rozina, G., & Karapetjana, I. (2009). "The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation". *SDU Faculty of Science Journal of Social Sciences,* May 2009, 111-122.

Thomas, L. Wareing, S. (1999). *Language, Society, and Power*. London, Routledge.

Utley, E. Heyse, A. (2009). Barack Obama's (I'm)perfect union. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 33, 153-163.

الأساليب البلاغية كأداة سياسية للتلاعب

م.م. نوار باسل محفوظ

مدرس مساعد / كلية العلوم السياسية / جامعة الموصل

Nawar.BasilMahfoudh@uomosul.edu.iq

المستخلص

تبحـث هـذه الدراسـة فـي القـوة الإقناعيـة والتلاعبيـة لـلأدوات البلاغيـة فـي الخطـب السياسـية، موضـحة كيـف يـتم توظيـف اللغـة بشـكل اسـتراتيجي لبنـاء الأيـديولوجيات، وإثـارة المشـاعر، والتـأثير فـي الـرأي العـام. مـن خـلال تحليـل 30 خطابًا لزعمـاء سياسـيين مـن سياقات ثقافيـة وأيديولوجيـة متنوعـة، بمـا فـي ذلـك مـارتن لـوثر كينـغ جونيـور، وجمـال عبـد الناصـر، ونيلسـون مانـديلا، ودونالـد ترامـب، يحـدد البحـث الأنمـاط المتكـررة فـي اسـتخدام الاسـتعارة، والتكـرار، والسـخرية، والجنـاس، والمبالغـة. وتكشـف النتـائج أن هـذه الأدوات تتجـاوز الحـدود الجغرافيـة والثقافيـة، حيـث تعمـل كوسـائل عالميـة للإقنـاع السياسـي. ومـع ذلـك، فـإن فعاليتها غالبًـا مـا تعتمـد علـى السـياقات الاجتماعيـة والتاريخيـة ومـدى تقبّـل الجمهـور. وتختـتم الدراسـة بتسـليط الضـوء علـى الأبعـاد الأخلاقيـة للتلاعب البلاغـي، داعيـة إلـى زيـادة الـوعي العـام بالاستراتيجيات اللغوية المستخدمة في الخطاب السياسي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: البلاغة، التلاعب السياسي، اللغة، أساليب الإقناع