

A Semantic and Rhetorical Study of Manipulation in Two English and Arabic Political Speeches

Raid Muhammad Jasim

Department of English, College of Languages
University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

Sabah S. Mustafa

Department of English, College of Languages
University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq

Abstract

Manipulation is a discursive phenomenon used by speakers to affect the thoughts (and indirectly the actions) of the recipients. This study is concerned with manipulation in two political speeches; one in English delivered by the American President Donald J. Trump, while the other in Arabic delivered by the Iraqi President Barham Salih to be the study's data. Each one of these two speeches is divided into serial-numbered extracts(henceforth Ext.). The study aims at investigating the semantic and rhetorical devices utilized as manipulation strategies in these speeches. To this end, the qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis will be followed in this study. The significance of the study stems from how the ideological dimension based on bettering off the speaker's image and derogating others' image plays a vital role in the political speeches. This study draws on Van Dijk's ideological approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of political discourse, and accordingly, it is adopted as a model. Results revealed that both speakers use lexicalization, a list of three, repetition, and citing as effective techniques in their two speeches to affect their recipients' minds. The study concluded that the ideological framework of "positive self-presentation" and "negative other-presentation" is the central umbrella under which manipulation can exist and work freely. The findings might help linguists and political analysts to understand how politicians use the linguistic features in their discourse to affect the audience's thoughts and behaviors manipulatively.

Keywords: ideological dimension, manipulation, political speeches, rhetorical devices, semantic devices

Cite as: Jasim, R. M., & Mustafa. S.S.(2020). A Semantic and Rhetorical Study of Manipulation in Two English and Arabic Political Speeches. *Arab World English Journal*, 11 (4) 426 -444.
DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.27>

Introduction

Politicians, just like the rest of all human beings, need language and its communicative ways to do some actions which can fulfill their ends. They realize the significance of specific linguistic devices and means in achieving these goals, prominent of which is what is called manipulation. To this end, politicians exploit the linguistic features dexterously and use them for strategic functions with multiple meanings to be sent to different persons or groups of various political, social, religious, or educational propensities at certain times and places. In sum, politicians utilize language to modify people's ideas and understanding, and send upbeat messages about their agenda and actions and downbeat indications about their opponents' intentions and deeds. The study examines some influential strategies used in political discourse, particularly in political speeches. It also sheds some light on the ideological dimension based on positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation through which manipulation can flourish and exist. The present study, thus, attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the manipulation strategies used at the semantic and rhetorical levels of the two selected English-Arabic political speeches?
2. What is the effect of the positive-self/ negative-other ideological dimension in agitating a manipulative discourse for the political ends of the speaker?

Literature Review

Manipulation

Manipulation is a term that has received vast consideration in political discourse. According to Van Dijk (2006a), it has a deceptive, dark-sided nature utilized by dominant persons or groups who practice forms of "illegitimate domination, social power abuse, and cognitive mind control" (pp.359-360) in discursive interaction over dominated people. It is required to be considered within CDA because this approach has its own theoretical and analytical devices to view such a notion visibly, especially when there is a form of social inequality in the ideological discourse loaded with praising our good matters and dispraising others'. To this end, CDA is dedicated to investigate how "ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997 as cited in Paltridge, 2012, p.187). On the other hand, manipulation is considered from two points of view: one is paternalistic, and the other is not where the former is dedicated to people's interests, whereas the latter works as an influential device to subvert the target's interests and motivations for the manipulator's self-interests (Barnhill, 2014). However, for Blass (2005), manipulation is an act of deception dedicated to "affecting the target in such a way that his behavior/action is an instrument of attaining the goals of the manipulator who acts without using force but in such a way that the target does not know the goal of the manipulator's actions" (Blass, 2005, p.170). Handelman (2009) argues that manipulation is an elusive, indirect motivating action mixed up of other motivating actions as: coercion, persuasion, and deception, and is located in an area referred to as a gray area.

Political Discourse

The relation of politics and language cannot be easily divorced because one depends on the other. Political discourse, thus, reflects sociopolitical text/talk action and interaction of experienced politicians in specific contextual circumstances, and covers several genres, namely: partisan programs, political slogans, political speeches, etc. (Van Dijk, 1997). Moreover, politics

is seen from two opposite angles: one is positive because of its denotative meaning, which is associated with politicians who run their countries, and the other is negative due to its connotative meaning, which is related to deceptive, evil practices of politicians who do "nothing but corruption" (Beard, 2000, pp. 3-5). In a broad sense, politics is seen by numerous scholars as to study "political language" (Claeys, 2013, p. 776). According to Goshgarian, who goes further identifying the political language, sees it as "a language of power, which influences government policy and actions, identifies the dominant values of the moment, and wins votes. Likewise, "it is a language that is capable of making war, establishing the needs of its users at a particular time". Thus, "it has a reputation for being flexible and ambiguous or, worse" (2011, p. 426). Political language is one of the main targets to be studied by critical discourse analysts because they realize language itself has no enough power. Still, it is the political actors who use it and make it powerful to meet the needs of effect on their recipients (Wodak, 2001). Moreover, Fairclough (1992) argues that politicians' selected words or constructions may sustain ideological stands reflected in their political communication. According to Van Dijk (1997), the political discourse has specific structural levels, which start from topics (or issues under consideration), overall semantic framework, lexical selection, syntactic constructions, rhetorical ability, paralinguistic features as expressive structures, and finally pragmatic effects of the implicit meaning. He also adds that ideological polarization is the main criterion of doing discourse. In sum, political discourse presents two opposite perceptions; firstly, it is the reflection of a never-ending struggle between the dominating elite who fight to preserve power, and those dominated people who confront it. Secondly, it is "as a cooperation, as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money influence liberty and the like" (Chilton, 2004, p. 3).

Political Speeches

Political speeches, as stated by Schaffner, are characterized by functional and thematic features. They fulfill various functions due to various political activities and hold topics related to politics. She also adds that political speeches are often delivered in different settings. Politicians, for example, when addressing other politicians of the same political or ideological background, are involved in internal political communication. However, they are engaged in external political communication when addressing their nation publicly (1996). Due to their non-homogenous and communicative nature, political speeches can be analyzed pragmatically, semantically, syntactically, and phonologically (Schaffner, 1996, p. 3). The significance of political speech is that it goes side by side with rhetoric. As Klein (1995) believes, modern political communication is an extension of the classic political rhetoric features. It is, thus, commonly known that the political speech shows a tendency in using rhetorical language, which is described by Woodward and Denton Jr (2009) as a form of communication in which the politician's values, attitudes, and beliefs are defended. Besides, David (2014) states that numerous scholars conceive rhetorical language as a form of linguistic manipulation followed by politicians who utilize the persuasion techniques to persuade people and make them take specific actions for political ends. Thus, the political speech, being the prominent form of political discourse, is not randomly written or spoken. Rather, it is a well-organized, recipient-oriented, and functional-aimed communicative process acted by politicians who employ every possible linguistic feature to turn it into a powerful manipulation strategy within specific contextual situations.

Features Shared by English and Arabic Political Discourse

To enforce their ideological dimension in the recipients and to fulfill particular aims, politicians strategically use multiple language techniques in their political communication. After examining various political discourses, Van Dijk observed that politicians resort to using significant linguistic features to draw and hold the attention of people, and convince them of their views (Van Dijk, 1997). Among these features noticed in both English and Arabic political discourse are *lexicalization*, *nominalization*, *pronouns*, *metaphors*, and *repetition*. Lexicalization is a visible way of how politicians see and describe themselves and others. It is a process of selecting words through which politicians can positively depict themselves, and show others negatively (Van Dijk, 2000). According to Nordlund, politicians make use of the positive/negative connotation of the selected words that reflect ideologically-loaded views. Hence, when politicians use "terror, terrorist, or terrorism" in their speech, they try to trigger a negative connotation in association with those with whom they are associated (Nordlund, 2003, p. 13). Nominalization is an aspect of linguistic transformation. Politicians utilize this feature to keep some relevant information from the eye of the masses. Modality, actions, the doer of the actions, and timing could be kept hidden through nominalized structures, which in turn add more mystification (Fowler, 1991, p.79). The third important feature of political discourse is pronouns. They are defined as "groups of words that are able to appear in the place of other words, most often nouns, other pronouns or noun phrase" (Håkansson, 2012, p. 5). Pronouns are the most salient manipulation tools in political discourse since they are used to reflect the politicians' ideopolitical stands (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002, p. 30). Bramley, however, explores pronouns in detail, stating that using the pronouns in the political discourse does not only reflect the traditional linguistic functions of person, number, and gender. Instead, they are involved in what is called "identity work" of presenting the "self" and the "other" (Bramley, 2001, p. V). No political discourse is considered powerful without using metaphors. Metaphors are defined as the "figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them" (Merriam-Webster, 2014). In metaphorical communications, abstract ideas are given concrete labels (Kulo, 2009, p. 3). Metaphor in the political discourse is an imperative device of persuasion and an essential factor affecting the recipients' consciousness (Stepanyan, 2015, p. 371). Beard, however, states that politicians heavily rely on war and sport terminology as a source of metaphor. Thus, politicians might give the impression that they are in a fight when they "take flak" from their opponents (Beard, 2000, p. 18). Another feature politicians often utilize in their discourse is repetition. Repetition is generally defined as "doing, saying or writing the same thing more than once" (McArthur, 1992, p. 861). But in politics, repetition may hold a rhetorical dimension since it is used to enhance the process of perceiving the discourse and to draw the recipients' attention. Besides, it is a strategic tool that manipulates the recipients to make up an "ideology" and convince them of its credibility (David, 2014, p. 167). Regardless of its simplicity, repetition can hold a long political speech together and keep its underlying points focused on through uttering some words, nouns, or even presuppositions many times (Beard, 2000, p. 39).

Previous Research

Several studies have dealt with manipulation as a process of pragmatic criteria because it is considered "a type of language in use or a talk-in-interaction of a pragmatic approach" (Blass, 2005,

p.171; Danler,2005, p.46; De Saussure,2005, p.117), which uses most of the linguistic features to achieve specific functions for the speaker's pre-determined ends in certain contexts. In a more recent contrastive study executed by Al-Hindawi and Kamil (2017) on British and American political debates done by the British Prime Minister nominees Clegg, Brown, and Cameron on the one hand, and the American Presidential candidates Biden-Ryan and Bush-Kerry on the other hand, the researchers concluded that manipulation is a process consists of three stages namely; "inauguration, argumentation, and conclusion," follows four significant criteria which are "distortion, fabrication, equivocation, and concealment," is achieved by pragmatic strategies including, personal deixis, (im)politeness, speech acts, violating conversational maxims, strategic maneuvering and finally pragmatic moves related to Relevance Theory. They also noticed that the politicians in these debates executed seven types of manipulation, namely volitional, deceptive, rational, submissive, social, emotional, and speaker/hearer-oriented type. They also observed that the highest pragmatic strategy used in these debates is "Manipulative Speech Acts".

Although manipulation in political discourse has widely been discussed pragmatically, the researchers of the current study found it necessary to explore some manipulation strategies at the semantic and rhetorical levels of the political speech and how the ideological polarization in this type of discourse plays a crucial role in enhancing manipulation.

Methods

Van Dijk's (1995,2006b) theoretical and analytical views are adopted to explore the manipulation strategies of two political speeches delivered by two veteran politicians. The ideological influence exerted on the speech may control its nature, and hence, gives the impression that this communicative process is based on bettering off the speaker's image and derogating other's one. Before starting up with analyzing the data, it is necessary to take into account the contextual information that surrounds the speech, namely who is the speaker?, what are the general topics included in the speech?, what are the situations associated with the speech?, etc. to help take a general contextual overview. The next step is to deal with the semantic and rhetorical levels of the two speeches, and see how the speakers respectively employ the strategies of lexicalization, a list of three, repetition, and citing. Lexicalization is a process of selecting words(verbs, nouns, adjective or adverbs) or expressions based on their connotative ideologically-loaded meaning, whether being positive or negative (Van Dijk, 2000), while the other semantic move is called "a list of three," defined by Beard (2000) as a group of three words of a similar form and meaning, or different forms and related meaning, that is used strategically to enhance specific meaning dedicated for the sake of the speaker. Repetition is a rhetorical device by which the speaker reflects his stylistic command and, more importantly, seeks to create an immediate rhetorical influence on his recipients by repeating some lexical items, phrases, or clauses (Johnstone,1994). Citing is the second rhetorical strategy utilized by speakers for their audience to be more affected emotionally and more inclined to their arguments, and usually cite from religious, historical texts, academic sources, etc. (Van Dijk,2006b). For the economy of space, only (13) examples out of the representative examples of these devices manifested in the two speeches are to be analyzed

qualitatively, whereas the quantitative method of analysis is manifested by the frequency and percentage of the occurrence of manipulation strategies in numbered tables. Besides, the selected Arabic examples will be translated into English by the authors.

Data of the Study

The selected data for analysis were two political speeches: the first was an English political speech delivered by President Trump on February 4, 2020. The second was an Arabic political speech delivered by President Salih on October 7, 2019. Each speech was divided into serially-numbered extracts. The Arabic extracts were translated into English by the researchers. Then we analyzed the data in the light of Van Dijk's theoretical views, which stressed the importance of taking a contextual overview before applying the practical side. However, for the economy of space, only thirteen examples of the manipulation strategies were selected and analyzed qualitatively. The quantitative method of analysis, on the other hand, was followed by the frequency of the occurrence and the percentages of each strategy utilized in both speeches.

Following Van Dijk's (1995,2006b) views of presenting the self positively and the other negatively as a theoretical background for ideological discourse, the researchers identified the linguistic devices affecting the audience's thoughts and feelings as manipulation strategies. The analysis started with a contextual overview in brief about the main issues and the circumstances surrounding each speech.

Results

Analysis of President Trump's Speech

A Contextual Overview

President Trump made his third State of the Union speech on February 4, 2020. This speech was considered essential to him due to the problems and challenges he faced, namely the impeachment trial by which he has been accused of abusing power and obstructing the U.S. Congress. Hence, he aroused various topics to enhance his picture publicly, including the American economy and the economic challenges with China, internal and external security, healthcare, education, military forces, immigration, terrorism, etc. The speech was employed to show Trump's positive image through emphasizing his outstanding achievements done in just three years since taking office in 2017 and the well-planned future vision for the American nation, in comparison with the failures, weaknesses, and inactivity of the previous administrations, particularly the Democratic ones. Thus, the speaker intended to make his recipients make sense that he is, unlike others, a man of actions and achievements, and a national leader who could face the internal and external risks and challenges represented, for example, by the "illegal criminal immigrants," "China's massive theft of America's jobs" to name but a few.

Manipulation Strategies at the Semantic Level

Lexicalization: Words/Expressions of Ideologically-positive Connotation

Example One:

The vision I will lay out this evening demonstrates how we are building *the world's most prosperous and inclusive society* — one where every citizen can join in *America's*

unparalleled success and where every community can take part in *America's extraordinary rise*. (Trump, 2020, Ext.5)

From the beginning of the speech, which was delivered in the chamber of Congress, President Trump intended strategically to create a general meaning net or framework aimed at serving his ideopolitical ends outlined in his speech. This meaning net draws mainly upon emphasizing his internal/external policy, achievements, and future vision, and de-emphasizing the previous administrations' administrative and economic policies. In this example, President Trump addressed the American people selecting words of positively-loaded connotation. He addressed the Americans' mentality and feelings. He somehow sent forward a form of assurance that his future vision was widely different and deeply dedicated to building a prosperous society enjoying success at all levels and living in good conditions which were missing under the previous presidents' failed policies and visions.

Lexicalization: Words/Expressions of Ideologically-negative Connotation

Example Two:

“In sanctuary cities, local officials order police to release *dangerous criminal aliens to prey upon* the public, instead of handing them over to ICE to be *safely removed*.” (Trump, 2020, Ext.83)

This example involves lexicalized nouns, which hold a sense of negativeness against those who cross the American borders illegally. Associating the immigrants with words of ideologically-negative connotation in such a setting illustrates clearly that President Trump wants to stimulate the audience to share his sense of hatred and non-acceptance towards the immigrants who are metaphorically depicted as dangerous animals through uttering '*to prey upon*'. That is why he indirectly urges the agency of ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) to remove those dangerous criminal immigrants from the country. In addition to this sense of hatred, there is also some sense of criticizing and derogating others, particularly the local officials of some states, including New York City, who provided the illegal immigrants with a safe sanctuary where they can live, work and take advantage of the benefits of education, health, and social support.

A list of Three

Example Three:

“The Iranian regime must abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons; stop spreading *terror*, *death*, and *destruction*.” (Trump, 2020, Ext.110)

This example manifests how President Trump reflects his external policy and aggressive orientations towards Iran and its nuclear program. He tried to make the audience visualize that Iran is a source of danger via making a list of ideologically-negative words '*terror, death, and destruction*'. This strategy was utilized to manipulate American people's thoughts, plant a gloomy picture about Iran in their minds, and prepare the favorable conditions for any action against it. On the other hand, one can understand that President Trump, by this strategy, intended indirectly to present the policies of the previous administrations, particularly President Obama's administration,

negatively due to his tolerant orientations towards the Middle East, especially Iran. Thus, Trump managed to create a completely gloomy picture of the Iranian regime by associating it with acts of terror, death, and destruction. The American people might show an acceptance of any future severe action taken by him.

Manipulation Strategies at the Rhetorical Level

Repetition of a Lexical Item

This strategy was highly used by President Trump in his speech where the pronouns *We* and *I* and their derivative forms *Our* and *My*, and the words *American*, *America*, *first*, *always*, etc., were repeated many times. The following is an example of such a device.

Example Four:

In just three short years, we have shattered the mentality of American decline, and we have rejected the downsizing of America's destiny. We have totally rejected the downsizing. We are moving forward at a pace that was unimaginable just a short time ago, and we are never, ever going back. (Trump, 2020, Ext.3)

We was repeated several times in President Trump's speech. He aimed at creating an impact on the audience and establishing a stylistic command. The intended aim of using *We* in such a context is to make the recipients understand that he is taking direct personal responsibility for all the actions and reform steps that have been taken, are being taken, or will be taken in the future. Hence, he could utilize the inclusiveness of *We* to turn it into a reference to his personality and direct responsibility. The ideological polarization is also noticed between lines when he refers to one of his primary achievements in just three years of his presidency. This achievement is represented by terminating the '*American decline*' due to the previous policies and turning it into overall prosperity that no one thought was possible to happen.

Repetition of a Phrase

This type of repetition is also used throughout the speech to send purposeful messages strategically decoded by the American audience. Many examples of phrases repeated in the speech, including '*My administration*,' '*Health care system/reform*,' '*Criminal aliens*,' '*Our economy*' and others. Here is an example of phrasal repetition:

Example Five:

“Since my election, we have created seven million new jobs...” (Trump, 2020, Ext.8)

“Since my election, the net worth of the bottom half of wage earners has increased by 47 percent..., we have seen a 16 percent pay increase since my election” (Trump, 2020, Ext.16)

“Since my election, U.S. stock markets have soared 70 percent,...” (Trump, 2020, Ext.18)

The above extracts represent a good example of repetition by which the phrase '*Since my election*' has been said four times. The intended influence of this repeated phrase on the audience

is observed clearly. President Trump wants to reflect his positive image by stating some of his achievements that are concerned to the American citizens, and indirectly emphasize the previous administrations' negative image and failed policies. Thus, he utilized this rhetorical device to affect the audience's mind for his ideopolitical ends and agenda.

Repetition of a Clause

The repetition of specific clauses many times is also established manipulatively by President Trump. '*We will always protect ...*', '*We have rejected the downsizing...*', '*My administration is also defending...*' are some examples of this type of repetition by which he also intended to exert some influence over the audience.

Example Six:

"I've also made an ironclad pledge to American families: *We will always protect* patients with pre-existing conditions. (Applause). And *we will always protect* your Medicare and *we will always protect* your Social Security. Always." (Trump, 2020, Ext.54)

This example shows how the speaker repeated the same clause three times. He was metaphorically depicted as a loyal fighter or a brave soldier who expressed a future commitment to fight and protect the interests of his people. The effect of this strategy was noticeable, and the audience acted in response to this repeated commitment by a round of warm applause as a sign of this influential rhetorical device.

Citing

President Trump used the strategy of citing to stimulate the American people's emotions for specifically intended aims. He quoted from private letters of some people whose cases were employed to take critical actions against some persons. Thus, it had the same rhetorical effect on the audience as repetition did. Here is an example of citing strategy:

Example Seven:

...their beautiful daughter Kayla became a humanitarian aid worker. She once wrote, "*Some people find God in church. Some people find God in nature. Some people find God in love. I find God in suffering. I've known for some time what my life's work is, using my hands as tools to relieve suffering.*" (Trump, 2020, Ext.103)

Here, President Trump cited from a private letter written by a girl called Kayla Mueller to her parents when she worked in Syria within a humanitarian mission. She was kidnapped, tortured, and killed by al-Baghdadi, the leader of the terrorist ISIS. President Trump aimed at agitating a sense of sympathy with Kayla, and manipulatively creating the suitable environment and the emotional effect to justify the revenge and ending al-Baghdadi's life.

Analysis of President Salih's Speech

A Contextual Overview

The Iraqi President Barham Salih addressed the Iraqi people in general, the young demonstrators in particular, on October 7, 2019, after six days of the demonstration kick off in Baghdad and other cities. After years of deterioration of public services, rising unemployment, fragile economy, and other motives that had been the main reasons for these demonstrations, this

speech at such a contextual situation had an importance for the speaker. He tried to calm down the demonstrators' intension. Therefore, a commissive, emotional language was used. Moreover, the language was utilized to urge a sense of nationalism and inclusiveness among the Iraqi people. A sense of fatherhood was also noticed to gain the satisfaction of the youth. Besides, President Salih indirectly criticized those involved in financial and administrative corruption and patrician quotas spread throughout the country. Finally, he talked about the steps of reform to meet the young demonstrators' demands and, more importantly, to touch upon their minds and feelings for calming down the critical situation.

Manipulation Strategies at the Semantic Level

Lexicalization: Words/Expressions of Ideologically-positive Connotation

Example Eight:

الصرار حقة لا تخفي أي جب انتتبعها خطوات جادة وليس شعارات و وعودا وتبنيات إلشعب يطلب ال عملة
اتما عجة وال سجا قال لفرقة وال حرية و ا من فرص ال عمل وال خدمات ا ية ."

(Salih, 2019, Ext.17)

"The real honesty must be followed by serious steps, not slogans, promises, and wishes. The people demand social justice, free, dignified life, freedom, security, job opportunities, and basic services."

The lexicalized words and expressions of ideologically-positive connotation in the above extract represented an excellent example of how the semantic net was conducted to be in favor of the speaker who tried to gain the demonstrators' trust and absorb the public anger. He realizes that expressions and words like *الصرار حقة* – *the real honesty*, *الخطوات الجادة* – *serious steps*, *الحرية* – *freedom*, etc., have intended impact and purposeful effect on the minds of the hearers. Using this well-ordered meaning framework in such a setting, brings President Salih closer to a more positive picture. At the same time, the negative image is indirectly associated with those who are inclined to say just *شعارات* *slogans*, *وعدودا* *promises*, and *تبنيات* *wishes*. And this is the primary purpose of this strategy.

Lexicalization: Words/Expressions of Ideologically-negative Connotation

Example Nine:

"ما حدث من استهداف لمتظاهرين السلميين والقوات ا بي تبال رص اص لا حي , و من استهداف
هين غير قهول في العراق."

"Targeting the peaceful demonstrators and security forces by live bullets, and targeting the media and journalists is unacceptable in Iraq."

President Salih, in the extract above, used some lexicalized words of negative connotation. He sent a somehow double-aimed message by uttering *الاستهداف* *targeting*. One is dedicated to addressing the angry young demonstrators, some of whom had been fallen dead or injured during the events. The second message is aimed at criticizing and derogating indirectly those involved in targeting the demonstrators, without naming or referring to them directly. That is why the nominalized form of *استهداف* was in favor of the speaker who preferred not to provide enough information to state clearly who did that action. President Salih, thus, managed to show his political

implicitly throughout the speech employing them to indicate the Iraqi people, and hence, to send the message of collectivity and nationalism. Therefore, he utilized the sense of collective identity agitated by these pronouns to speak on behalf of the Iraqi people and, more importantly, of the young demonstrators. Thus, repeating this item many times is in the speaker's interest, who followed the policy of positive self-presentation and native other-presentation. Unlike other political partners, President Salih talked about how he and the rest of the Iraqi people should have worked together to heal and relieve Iraq's wounds and pains, and to move forward, etc.

Repetition of a Phrase

للحظاظ شرشي شرشي بال حاكم *good governance*, حوار بناء - *a constructive dialogue*, الرصاص لاجي - *live bullets*, صراحة حقيقية - *real honesty* are some examples of phrasal repetition by which the speaker intended to arouse an impact in the mind of the recipients for his ideopolitical agenda. The following example will make the point clear.

Example 12:

(Salih, 2019, Ext.14) “المحاصصة الحزبية والقياسية ترفض مغادرة واقعنا...”

“Partisan and factional quotas refuse to leave our reality...”

(Salih, 2019, Ext.15). “عندما تحل المحاصصة الحزبية محل اداة الوطنية...”

“When partisan interests and quotas replace the national will...”

The rhetorical effect of repeating the phrase *المحاصصة الحزبية / المحاصصة الحزبية* *partisan quotas* on the audience is strategically vital in such a context where President Salih presented his point of view positively. He referred to the current reality of the political process in Iraq, which is based on negative concepts and practices represented by sectarianism and partisan belonging. He indirectly criticized other politicians and officials whose factional and partisan practices led the internal situation to get worst, and matters could be out of hand. This example gives an obvious representation of ideological polarization in which the speaker is intentionally depicted in a good picture. Others are in a pessimistic picture that reflects the reality of the political process in Iraq.

Citing

In his speech, President Salih used this rhetorical device to conciliate the recipients' emotions, whether the citizens or security forces, for aims outlined in his speech.

Example 13:

هذا الدم عراقي.. الذي يتدفق حتى يظل ببقته هو عراقي.. والى حاول يافع عن الؤسسات من عنصر
ا من وال جيش هو عراقي.. ما زمن وصل ال هذي ال وحل قرشوف دم بانظا للش وارع.. و زمن رجع واحي شد
ظمر لثان يال مواطن وال مسؤول وال حبي حتى نتجاوز هذي المحنة. (Salih, 2019, Ext.8)

“This blood is Iraqi blood.. The one who chants slogans to demand his rights is Iraqi.. And those security and military forces who defend the institutions are Iraqis.. We must not reach this stage where we see the blood of our sons on the streets.. We need to re-support one another: the citizen, the official and the soldier to overcome this ordeal.”

Instead of using Standard Arabic, President Salih used a citation of Colloquial Arabic. There are two reasons for using this rhetorical strategy. The first reason is that President Salih intended to utter this piece of speech colloquially because he realized that most people preferred to be talked to in a simple, not complicated language. The second reason for this strategy is that it enabled him to send his message to the people correctly because he hoped to touch upon the feelings and emotions of the recipients, to affect their thoughts, and hence, to absorb and calm down the intension between the demonstrators and the security forces. That is why this strategic device was manipulatively used for the speaker's image to be positively viewed in the eyes of the Iraqis.

The results of the semantic and rhetorical devices as manipulation strategies in President Trump' speech are clarified in tables (one and two) below with their frequencies and percentages:

Table 1. *Semantic Devices as Manipulation Strategies-Trump's Speech*

| Semantic Level | | |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Items | Frequency | Percent |
| 1.1 Lexicalization: <i>Words/Expressions of Ideologically-positive Connotation</i> | 137 | 58.54 |
| 1.2 Lexicalization: <i>Words/Expressions of Ideologically-negative Connotation</i> | 84 | 35.89 |
| 2. A List of Three | 13 | 5.55 |
| Total | 234 | 100% |

Table one reveals that President Trump's speech was written to create an intended effect of meaning with two main strategies: lexicalization and a list of three. The lexicalized words or expressions of positive connotation scored the highest frequency of occurrence, amounting to 137 examples forming 58.54% of this level. The lexicalization of negative-connotation words/expressions was utilized with a frequency of 84 examples to create 35.89%. The strategy of a list of three was used 13 times with a percentage of 5.55%.

Table 2. *Rhetorical Devices as Manipulation Strategies-Trump's Speech*

| Rhetorical Level | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Items | Frequency | Percent |
| 1.1 Repetition of a Lexical Item | 377 | 80.38 |
| 1.2 Repetition of a Phrase | 78 | 16.63 |
| 1.3 Repetition of a Clause | 11 | 2.34 |
| 2. Citing | 3 | 0.63 |
| Total | 469 | 100% |

Table two sheds light on the rhetorical devices used by President Trump in his speech. It is observed that he used the strategy of repetition of one lexical item 377 times, holding 80.38% of the rhetorical level, while the repeated phrases recurred 78 times with a percentage of 16.63%, and

only 11 times of repeated clauses with a percentage of 2.34%. The strategy of citing was used three times, constituting 0.63% of the rhetorical level of the speech.

Tables three and four below illustrate the frequencies and percents of the manipulation strategies actualized by the semantic and rhetorical devices used in President Salih's speech.

Table 3. *Semantic Devices as Manipulation Strategies- Salih's Speech*

| Semantic Level | | |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Items | Frequency | Percent |
| 1.1 Lexicalization: <i>Words/Expressions of Ideologically-positive Connotation</i> | 175 | 60.97 |
| 1.2 Lexicalization: <i>Words/Expressions of Ideologically-negative Connotation</i> | 105 | 36.58 |
| 2. A List of Three | 7 | 2.43 |
| Total | 287 | 100% |

President Salih also used the lexicalization strategy with two opposite connotations. The words/expressions of positive-ideologically connotation constituted 60.97% of the semantic level with a frequency of 175 times, while those of ideologically-negative connotation recurred 105 times with a percentage of 36.58%. He used the strategy of a list of three seven times to hold 2.43% of the semantic network.

Table 4. *Rhetorical Devices as Manipulation Strategies- Salih's Speech*

| Rhetorical Level | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Items | Frequency | Percent |
| 1.1 Repetition of a Lexical Item | 177 | 89.40 |
| 1.2 Repetition of a Phrase | 20 | 10.10 |
| 1.3 Repetition of a Clause | ----- | ----- |
| 2.Citing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Total | 198 | 100% |

Table four considers how President Salih used the rhetorical devices represented by the repetition of lexical items and phrases for aims pre-determined in his speech. The repetition of lexical items held 177 examples having a percentage of 89.40% of the rhetorical level. The repetition of phrases recorded 20 times in total, with a percentage of 10.10%. Citing strategy was used once throughout the speech, which constituted 0.50% of the rhetorical level. It is worth mentioning that the strategy of clausal repetition was not used in President Salih's speech.

Discussion

Research Question One: What are the manipulation strategies most used at the semantic and rhetorical levels of the two selected English-Arabic political speeches?

After applying the eclectic model to the two speeches, the study found that the speakers showed strategic independence on specific linguistic features to be employed manipulatively within the

semantic and rhetorical levels. Both presidents semantically used the strategies of lexicalization and a list of three in their speeches. They also used the strategies of repetition and citing at the rhetorical level of their speeches.

Research Question Two: What is the effect of the positive-self/ negative-other ideological dimension in agitating a manipulative discourse?

Obviously, both the speeches reflected one of the main principles of CDA, which was "ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997 as cited in Paltridge, 2012, p.187). The ideological dimension of positive-self and negative-other presentation was actualized through using either positiveness-bearing words or negativeness-bearing words. Hence, the political actions, economic procedures, reform steps, nationalism, collectiveness, sympathy, and other positive-ideologically selections were invested to better off the speaker's image. The other part of the selected words was dedicated to criticizing others' behaviors and practices. Therefore, it was a reflection of how the speakers presented others negatively. The second marked semantic feature was a list of three in which the two speakers showed mastery in directing the semantic effect towards specific points of criticizing the others directly or indirectly. At the rhetorical level of the two speeches, types of repetition were used, except for the clausal repetition. It was not used in Arabic political speech. The purpose of repeated some lexical items, phrases, or clauses was to create the intended influence on the recipients' thoughts and understanding for ideological aims that helped to emphasize the speaker's sense of personal responsibility, inclusiveness, or nationalism, and to better off his image. The strategy of citing was used to hopefully exert some influence on the recipients' thoughts and feelings. Trump, for example, cites from the private letters of specific people whose words had emotional content. Salih also made use of some words and expressions of the Colloquial Arabic most Iraqis understand. Thus, a crucial aspect of manipulative language in politics is the selected words or structures considered a reflection of politicians' ideological agenda in their political communication (Fairclough, 1992). Hence, politicians show their skill in using language effectively to target the people's minds and emotions, who are viewed as "victims" (Van Dijk, 2006a, p. 361), i.e., they lack the sufficient ability to grasp the manipulator's real intention.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the present study is different in some perspectives: first, the studies cited in the literature review concentrate on manipulation as far as English is concerned, whereas the current study explores manipulation in English and Arabic. Second, this study is concerned with manipulation from semantic and rhetorical points of view. Third, the present study investigates manipulation in two political speeches delivered by two presidents. Fourth, the two speeches' ideological dimension has been taken into consideration, and has been turned into a kind of the point of departure for enhancing the power of manipulation in these two speeches to fulfill the speakers' political aims.

Conclusion

This paper presents findings of how some semantic and rhetorical features are used as manipulation strategies in two English and Arabic political speeches by two presidents. These strategies aim to affect the recipients' thoughts and actions. Also, the findings show that English

and Arabic political speeches have a sum of these strategies in common, such as lexicalization, a list of three, repetition, and citing. It is also revealed that positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is the general ideological dimension under which manipulation is visible in these two speeches.

Starting from the strategy of lexicalization, both presidents highly used selected words or expressions of positive connotation. For President Trump, this type of lexicalization was employed to show him as a man of actions and achievements. It was dedicated to depicting his image and administrative policies positively. President Salih also used this strategy to be in his favor. He mainly utilized it trying to enhance his image, and to absorb the public indignation spread among the young demonstrators. Lexicalization of words or expressions of negative connotation was used by both presidents to create some effects on their recipients. President Trump aimed at agitating a sense of hatred and resentment in the American people's minds towards, for example, the "illegal immigrants" and the "failed policies" of the previous administrations. President Salih used this strategy to indirectly criticize those involved in "targeting the demonstrators", and in "administrative and financial corruption".

The second semantic feature used by both speeches is a list of three. In both cases, the speakers used it strategically. They invested the three-lists in their speeches to evoke their recipients' emotions and to make up a type of slogan that the recipients will remember. President Trump, for instance, wanted the American people to associate the Iranian regime with "terror, death, and destruction" which spread throughout the world. In contrast, President Salih wanted to go along with the Iraqi people's collective consciousness towards the political class which presented nothing but "التطمينات" - *reassurances*, "الوعود" - *promises*, and "التكلم" - *talk*.

Repetition is one of the most important rhetorical features in Trump's and Salih's speeches. Throughout his speech, President Trump repeated specific lexical items, phrases, and clauses many times. Nevertheless, the repetition of lexical items was strategically highlighted in his political speech. "*We, I, America, and American*" are some examples of this type of repetition. "Since my election," "my administration," "criminal aliens," and others are examples of phrasal repetition. He also repeated specific clauses in his speech, including "we will always protect" and "my administration is also defending." First and foremost, President Trump desired to beautify his image by the strategy of repetition. President Salih used only the repetition of lexical items and phrases. However, the repetition of clauses was not included in his speech. He repeatedly used the personal pronoun "نحن" - *we*, "شعبنا" - *our people*, "دم" - *blood*, and others in his speech. He also repeated phrases, such as "حصص للاحزاب" - *partisan quotas*, "الرصاص للاحياء" - *live bullets*, "حوار بناء" - *a constructive dialogue*, and other phrases.

Regarding the use of the strategy of citing, both presidents involved this rhetorical feature in their speeches. In both cases, the two speakers intended to evoke their recipients' emotions for the goals outlined previously. President Trump, for example, cited from private letters of specific people who wrote them down in critical times. Thus, he used their words to arouse the American people's emotions and to affect their minds. President Salih used the strategy of citing some speech

from the Colloquial Arabic realized by all Iraqis. He also wanted to evoke the emotions of the Iraqi people and, in particular, the young demonstrators.

From an analytical point of view, it is evident through this examination that manipulation in English and Arabic political speeches is actualized via using strategic linguistic features employed for the speakers' agenda. Besides, the ideological dimension plays a crucial role in enhancing the concept of manipulation in political discourse. In light of this study, linguists and political analysts are invited to figure out more features that might be used as manipulation strategies in any form of political communication.

About the authors:

Dr. Sabah S. Mustafa is a professor of Linguistics and Translation in the Department of English, University of Baghdad, College of Languages in which he has been teaching English since 1987. He has published several articles in the area of Linguistics and Translation. His research interests are contrastive linguistics, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. He is currently Editor-in-chief of the Journal of Languages. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6504-3560>.

Raid Muhammad Jasim is an M. A. candidate in the Department of English, University of Baghdad, College of Languages. His areas of interest are discourse analysis and pragmatics. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0000-5576>.

References

- Al-Hindawi, F. H & Kamil, S. I., (2017). *The Pragmatics of Manipulation in British and American Political Debates*. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing.
- Barnhill, A.(2014). What is manipulation? In C. Coons, & M. Weber, (Eds.), *Manipulation: Theory and practice* (pp.50, 72). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.
- Blass, R. (2005). Manipulation in the speeches and writings of Hitler and the NSDAP from a relevance-theoretic point of view. In L. de Saussure, & P. Schulz, (Eds.), *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century. Discourse, language, mind* (pp.169-190). Amsterdam, Netherland: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bramley, R. N. (2001). *Pronouns of Politics: The Use of Pronouns in the Construction of 'self' and 'other' in Political Interviews*. Australia: Australian National University.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561218>
- Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4>
- Claeys, G. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Modern Political Thought* (set). Washington: CQ Press. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452234168>
- Danler, P. (2005). Morpho-syntactic and textual realizations as deliberate pragmatic argumentative linguistic tools. In L. de Saussure, & P. Schulz, (Eds.), *Manipulation and ideologies in the twentieth century: Discourse, language, mind* (Vol. 17, pp. 45-60). Amsterdam, Netherland: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Darwish, S. A. (2011). *A Discourse Analysis of Selected American/Iraqi Presidential Speeches*. (Unpublished Master's thesis) University of Baghdad; College of Languages.
- David, M. (2014). Language, Power, and Manipulation: The Use of Rhetoric in Maintaining Political Influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164–170.
- De Saussure, L. (2005). Manipulation and cognitive pragmatics: Preliminary hypotheses. In de Saussure, L., & Schulz, P. (Eds.), *Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, language, and mind* (pp.113-145). Amsterdam, Netherland: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fowler, R.(1991).*Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Goshgarian, G. (2011). *Exploring Language* (14th ed.). London: Longman Publishing Group.
- Håkansson, J. (2012). *The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches: A Comparative Study of the Pronominal Choices of Two American Presidents*. Sweden: Linnaeus University. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:531167/fulltext01.pdf>
- Handelman, S. (2009). *Thought Manipulation: The Use and Abuse of Psychological Trickery*. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood Publishing House.
- Johnstone, B. (1994). Repetition in discourse: a dialogue. In B. Johnstone (ed.) *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*(pp. 2-23). New Jersey: Ablex Advances in Discourse Processes Norwood.
- Klein, J.(1995) Politische Rhetorik. Eine Theorieskizze in Rhetorik-kritischer Absicht mit Analysen zu Reden van Goebbels, Herzog und Kohl. *Sprache und Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 75/76, 62–99.
- Kulo, L. (2009). *Linguistic Features in Political Speeches: How Language can be used to Impose Certain Moral or Ethical Values on People*. Bachelor Thesis. Sweden: Lulea University of Technology. Retrieved from <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:1028973/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- McArthur, T. (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nordlund, M. (2003). *Linguistic Manipulation: An analysis of how Attitudes are Displayed in News Reporting*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*(2nd ed.). London, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 3(3), 201–204.
- Stepanyan, L. (2015). *Stylistic Peculiarities of Political Speeches in English and Armenian*. Retrieved from http://publications.yzu.am/wpcontent/uploads/2015/12/Lilit_Stepanyan.pdf
- Trump, D.(2020, February 4). Full Transcript: Trump's 2020 State of the Union Address. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/05/us/politics/state-of-union-transcript.html>.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995).Ideological discourse analysis. In E. Ventola & A. Solin, (Eds.), *Special issue interdisciplinary approaches to discourse analysis* (pp. 135-161). New Courant: University of Helsinki.

- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis?. *Belgian Journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The semiotics of racism. Approaches to critical discourse analysis* (pp. 85-103). Vienna: Passagen Verlag.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359-383.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140. DOI: 10.1080/13569310600687908
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important aspects, and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer(Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-14). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Woodward, G. C., & Robert, E. D. Jr. (2014). *Persuasion and Influence in American Life*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
- صالح, برهم . (2019/10/7). في خطاب لى الشعب العراقى. تم ا ع من الموقع : <https://presidency.iq/Details.aspx?id=8414#gsc.tab=0>