

## **A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse**

**Sahrish Saif**

*Lecturer*

*University of Management and Technology*

**Correspondence:** [sahrishsaif@gmail.com](mailto:sahrishsaif@gmail.com)

**Khadija Akram**

*Lecturer*

*Department of Applied Linguistics*

*Kinnaird College for women Lahore*

### **ABSTRACT**

Language is used as a communication tool. But political figures use this tool to put specific economic, social and cultural ideas into practice. The aim of this research is to explore the rhetorical devices used by Indira Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto in their speeches, and how these figures of speech assist them to take the attention of the public and transmit their message properly. The researcher selected these political speakers as they belonged to patriarchal society yet were elected prime ministers of their respective countries twice. The study reveals what kind of rhetorical tropes are used by selected speakers. The research is carried out by employing the model of Critical Discourse Analysis based on Paul Gee's (2011) framework. Both speakers used almost the same persuasive devices. The persuasive devices which are employed by speakers are repetition, amplification, antithesis, allusion, alliteration, parallelism, hyperbole, metaphor, ethos, pathos, logos, litotes, sententia and imagery. They used rhetoric at phonological, lexical and syntactical level. The study reveals that although they are women belonged to male dominant societies yet by using these tropes speakers appealed the target audience and succeeded in their political objectives.

**Keywords:** *politics, rhetorical devices, patriarchal society, female politicians, political objectives*

### **Introduction**

Language is used as a medium to communicate with others and to reduce gaps among the members of society. People use language not only to express their feelings about the world but also to influence the behavior of others. Woods (2006) states in his study that through language political orators convey their intended goals to audience not only to persuade but also to provoke them towards their planned objectives. Language itself is not powerful but it obtains power when it is used by political orators. The discourse used by politicians for the achievement of their goal is called political discourse. Political discourse, the sub-category of discourse is typically determined by the history and culture of a certain society which deals with political matters for instance ideology, practices and beliefs of that very society. In political discourse, the words and sentence structures are not randomly chosen. The political speakers pick each word prudently in the discourse which they deliver to the target audience for the accomplishment of their political goals. Wareing (2004) states in his study that the expressive function of language is related to who is permitted of saying, what he says and to whom he says, which is "deeply tied up with power and social status"

(Wareing, 2004, p.9). Likewise, how people select and use different systems of language differs according to speakers' identity, their perception, and their communication goals. According to individuals draw very strong implications for others from their talking styles.

Over the past few decades, in the field of sociolinguistics and critical discourse analysis, the research which aims to find out the gendered features of oral or written discourse has fabricated a great collection of interpretations. Ample of this research states the variations of communication between the male and female communication style, which are related to cultural prototypes and their social roles (Kozakowska A, 2016). For instance, it is said that because of their social and political status, the male discourse has dominant feature due to the informative role whereas informal or phatic features mark female discourse. Nevertheless, Kozakowska (2016) notes that there is a vast range of diversity between male and female communicative and rhetorical style and he also advises not to make generalizations. The patriarchal social order defines women's role as subordinating to men for their interests and wants. This directs to the elements of "powerless language" which are inculcated in females. But existing research demonstrates that current selected female speakers' language is not powerless.

### **1.1-Research Objectives:**

The study proposes information regarding the issues of rhetorical strategies and devices in selected speeches. Mainly, the study intends to:

- i. analyze the rhetorical devices in selected speeches used by selected female political speakers
- ii. analyze the language used in selected speeches

### **1.2-Research Questions:**

The existing study will attempt to answer the following questions.

- i. Which rhetorical devices are employed by both selected orators?
- ii. How rhetorical devices used by selected female political leaders influenced the target audience?

### **2-Literature Review:**

Rhetoric devices are a vital part of oral or written discourse which makes any communication worthwhile. Alvesson (2000) describes in his paper that independently these devices have no significance but when one composed them in any discourse they produce an effective impact on the addressee. As it has been stated above that political discourse is fundamentally used to persuade the audience because political orators influence the public "with their assertion of power"(David M, 2014 p.1). And for succeeding their political claims they use rhetorical tropes. The rhetorical mechanism is used in communication for persuasion. According to Khan et al, (2016) even in ancient times political orators were believed to be proficient in using persuasive language and their living was based on it. This custom is still in practice and still, words are manipulated in political discourse. Still, political orators use the persuasive mechanism in order to influence an audience. It is understood thing that politics is related to power, the power to make choices, to influence others and to control their thoughts and their

## A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse

resources. Politicians use language as a medium to put certain political, cultural, social and economic ideas into practice aiming to gain power. And for this, language plays a central role as language helps to equip, escort and perform every political action (Bayram F, 2010). They employ such kind of linguistic faculties which help them to convince the target public and accomplish their political goals. Political discourse facilitates politicians to attain their communicative purposes (Bhatia, 2006). Politicians rule over the people by the apt usage of language, so language is crucial for politics. For without language politics cannot be conducted. There is the great tendency of politics depending on the language that's why to separate language from politics is not possible (Chilton, 2004). Jones and Peccei (2004) state in their study that since early classical times politicians have succeeded in their political intentions because of their skill to use rhetoric, aiming to convince the target audience by expressing validity of their decisions and using chosen sophisticated language. Wareing (2004) discusses in his study that words have a powerful effect on individuals' attitudes as they cannot only form people's views and opinions about the world, but words can also have the power to control them. The example of Newspeak (a form of English designed for the novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell) can be used to support this notion. The novel shows that by the language the vision of people can be controlled and restricted (Bayram F, 2010). The novel demonstrates that there is a possibility to fabricate the ideology which can steer people's thought and beliefs. The central objective of politicians is to convince the audience of their political intentions. All in all, politicians want the implementation of laws, administration systems which they utilize for power. They peruse to influence others for the sanction of their policies hence enforcing their power.

There is a great contribution of research on rhetoric devices by different scholars. Komar (2016) came out with an interesting research about feminine rhetoric. She revealed the difference between the feminine and masculine rhetoric styles. She explained in her paper that the woman as a modern rhetorician has gained the prominence which has brought the procedure of re-elucidation of cultural and historical structures about gender roles. She attempted the study in order to examine the modern concept of how females use rhetorical tropes to produce substitute ways of rhetorical manifestations. In her study, she analyzed the different political speeches of male and female political orators in the context of rhetoric. The study aimed to discover specific feminine and masculine characteristic of speech writing and argumentation by examining selected discourse. The main purpose of the study according to Komar was to typify "*Feminine Rhetoric as a discipline*" (Komar, 2016, p.1). The author claimed that analysis focused on three main points, what kind of studies conducted in the past, present observations about females and future predictions.

She claimed that according to Lunsford (1995) classical rhetoric was exclusively masculine. This was in practice not because women never used rhetoric but because they were never recognized as rhetoricians. She continued by saying that in such kind of context how women could dare to step forward and use feminine types of content rhetoric and structures. However, she had to adopt masculine rhetoric and contents and fix them into her own language in order to participate in politics. The author explained that in the work of Andrea Lunsford's *Reclaiming Rhetorica, Women in the Rhetorical Tradition* (1995) multiple texts have been

analyzed which unlocked great relatively unfamiliar doors towards the investigation of rhetoric. After analyzing previous studies she moved towards the present spectrum of feminine rhetoric. She claimed that some studies revealed that classical masculine style which is marked with control, violence, and rivalry made men and women frustrated which led to many crisis people are facing today, for instance, war, conflicts, disparity, and scandals.

Kozakowska ((2016) completed her study by researching the rhetorical construction of Hillary Rodham Clinton.com as a presidential contender. She argued that women politicians are needed to be more vigilant about their public opinion. The study attempted to examine the persuasive and rhetorical strategies used by HRC. The author chooses her as a subject because she is a brand name in America and during the course of 2016 election campaign; she needed to fabricate again her brand in order to compete for the superior post. While campaigning she marked herself as “*a champion for American Families*”. In the presidential campaign of 2016, she operated certified web channels, used social media to demonstrate herself as a capable and affable persona. Kozakowska in her study reviews rhetorical strategies of forming the image of Hillary as a presidential candidate in the election of 2016. The study discovers persuasive strategies in the context of “*gendered political discourse*”. It claims that female politicians in the United States require more efficiency than male politicians in order to build their public image.

She states in her paper that in recent years, research in different fields intends to discover the differences in communication style of male and female. Those differences based on cultural patterns which draw the social roles of both men and women. She supports her claim by giving the example of Tannen, (1994) who describes male communication style as dominating because of his social position whereas female communication style is decoded by him as a phatic or conversational style. After cracking down differences between “*gendered discourse*” the author talks about the position of women in politics. According to the author of the study women, politicians have to face more hindrances than men in politics in order to establish their firm political image. No matter what they do, they have to meet public criticism. If they adopt dominant style they are criticized for being unfeminine on the other hand if they reveal their emotions and personal experiences in a public setting, they are labeled as a sign of weakness. Thus to gain success women politicians have to manoeuvre for managing the balance among public expectations about gender. Afterward, she analyzed the official website of HRC.com. She claims the site which is there for political communication is greatly persuasive. The author aims to disclose both lexical and symbolic strategies which were used to fabricate Hillary as an appropriate candidate. In the present study not only HRC’s political speeches, declarations, thank you notes and many other political texts are included in the verbal analysis but the visual composition is also the part of the analysis. As it is believed that to construct the public image the design of the website has got its own importance in corresponding HRC’s persuasive style.

The author states in her study that according to Nielsen & Tahir (2012) the site has a “*minimalistic design*”. The composition of colors on the homepage symbolizes the party as a democratic one having the amalgamation of modernism and firmness. The author examined that the site is not only expertly run and has an

## A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse

aesthetic view but it is also quite easy to search for appropriate information indicating HRC as the reliable, modern and approachable contender.

To run the official homepage, one should present the political manifesto of the contender in a way which activates a lot of supporters without giving the impression of any regional, female or youth-oriented project. So HRC lists every issue first then highlights it in a phrase and then explained. The overview of HRC's issues indicates that the application of modal verbs and parallel syntactical structure fashions the sense of authority. There is the use of rhetorical tropes such as antitheses, repetition, metaphors, simile, definite articles and personal plural pronoun projecting the sense of common interests despite political separation. There are also personal narratives of Hillary on the website. To share personal experiences is also one of rhetorical strategy which according to Aristotle is ethos, speakers share emotions and personal experiences to influence the audience and mobilize their emotions. At last but not least, taking into consideration the importance of official website of campaigning as it is persuasive discourse, analysis of HRC website demonstrates that the rhetorical strategies not only used in speech but also the design and visual sources applied this technique. In regard to her verbal rhetorical style, the author claims that she used feminine rhetoric depicting her personal persona, whereas when Hillary has to use tactic features, she becomes direct, firm and constant representing herself as an authoritarian in a persuasive manner. Kozakowska states that according to many analysts Hillary usually avoids "powerless language" in her discourse and gives preference to such kind of linguistic items which are people oriented and convey the zeal of progress.

The existing study is about to analyze the rhetoric devices in the political speeches of female politicians. Several female politicians deliberately tweak their speaking style in order to meet the societal expectations of a political platform.

### 3-Methodology:

This research is exploratory as it intended to examine the persuasive devices of selected discourse. The current research was aimed to critically analyze the rhetorical tropes in selective political feminist discourse. Keeping into consideration the purpose of the study qualitative methodology was selected. Wyse (2011) states in his study that qualitative research is utilized to expose hidden meanings and look deep into the problem. The conducted research aims to analyze the selective feminist political discourse by focusing on the unique figures of speech. So keeping in view the nature of study researcher operated a qualitative approach in this study. The study took into account two speeches of both selected female political speakers from two different books which were delivered on different occasions and on different subjects. The data has been selected randomly. Hence the main focus was to analyze the persuasive strategies of selected female political orators. Three speeches of Benazir Bhutto were extracted from the book "Benazir Bhutto: selected speeches from 1989-2007" compiled & edited by Sani H. Panhwar. The speech which is selected; "address by Benazir Bhutto Prime Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at US House of Representatives - June 07, 1989. The speech of Indira Gandhi was taken from the book which is, "The Great Speeches" edited by Dr. R. K. Pruthi and the selected speech is, *Martin Luther King famous speech, New Delhi, India: January 24, 1969*. Random sample technique was adopted by the researcher as speeches on a specific topic or of

election campaign could not be found by researcher due to lack of resources. The research is carried out by implying the discourse analysis model of Paul Gee which is also called seven building tasks.

#### **4-Data Analysis**

The political speeches of two first and only female political leaders of India and Pakistan; Indira Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto were selected for the analysis.

##### **4.1-Context**

Indira Priyadarshini Gandhi was born on November 19, 1917 and was the only daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru who was the first prime minister of India. She was outstanding in studies and after the death of her mother, she adopted the political lifestyle of her father. After the death of her father's successor, she became a third leader and first female prime minister of India. She served her country from January 1966 to March 1977 as a prime minister and once again from January 1980 to her assassination which was in October 1984. During her political tenure, India was in great chaos. According to Saverimuthu (2014) Indira did some revolutionist works during her tenure as she campaigned for agricultural necessities and introduced new machinery in the countryside. As the time advanced she was accused of political corruption and was brought to court at that time she announced a "state of emergency". But when she was elected a second time as prime minister there was a separatist movement begun by Sikh Extremists. And there was the fatal mistake committed by Indira as she ordered to invade the sacred place of Sikhs. She was assassinated by her own Sikh bodyguards on October 31, 1984.

Benazir Bhuttowas born on June 21, 1953. She was the eldest child of the politician Zulfikar Ali Bhutto the former prime minister of Pakistan from 1971 to 1977. She completed her early education in Pakistan and went to the United States for higher education. She completed her bachelor degree from Harvard University and subsequently, she studied philosophy and political science at Oxford University. In 1979 after the execution of her father she became the ostensive head of her father's party and from 1979 to 1984 suffered several house arrests. She went to England in 1984 and returned to Pakistan in 1986 in order to promote the election campaign for elections. When president Zia ul- Haq died in a plane crash, she was elected as a prime minister and became first female prime minister of a Muslim nation in worldwide. Her period of the ruling was ended in 1990 when Ghulam Ishaq khan president of Pakistan dismissed her government and called for new elections. c While she was in England and Dubai, in 1999 she was convicted of corruption and punished for three years in prison. She returned to Pakistan in 2007 where President Musharraf on corruption charges granted pardon to her. On 27<sup>th</sup>December 2007 in an election campaign rally, she was killed by an assassin.

##### **4.2-Analysis**

The existing speech was delivered by Indira Gandhi at the occasion of the presentation of Jawaharlal Nehru Award to Coretta King in New Delhi on January 4, 1969. Coretta was the wife of Dr. Martin Luther King who sacrificed his life for the civil rights movement. At this moment Coretta alone came as Dr. King died. The speech consists of nine hundred thirty-one words. This piece of language is analyzed according to Gee's model which consists of seven steps.

#### 4.2.1-Significance

Indira Gandhi in present speech threw light on the significance of Martin Luther's martyrdom and the presence of Coretta on the occasion by using certain rhetorical devices.

**Imagery:** imagery makes use of some specific words to create a visual depiction of ideas in the minds of the listener. She used imagery as a persuasive device by saying that,

Example 1: *"we had hoped that on this occasion, Dr. King and you would be standing side by side on this platform"*. She wanted to take the attention of Coretta as well as the audience from the beginning so she started her speech with those words which would appeal and make King's significance prominent to King's wife and audience.

Example2: *"When you were once asked what you would do if your husband were assassinated, you were courage personified, replying that you might weep but the work would go on...."* Indira reminded Coretta and the audience of this scene when Coretta was asked about the upcoming death of King to express how much she admires her bravery. She used those words which would impress the target audience as she was speaking to the international audience along with her audience was her nation as well.

**Hyperbole:** it involves exaggeration of certain expressions for the sake of prominence. Staugaite (2014) explains in her paper that when an orator has to overemphasize or put a more noticeable effect on specific notions, they use hyperbole for this purpose. This figure of speech was also employed by Indira in current speech as she was expressing her admiration for Coretta while saying,

Example 1: *"Your face of sorrow, so beautiful in its dignity coupled with infinite compassion, will forever be engraved in our hearts"*. Here she used hyperbole technique as she expressed those words. She wanted to influence the audience so she used their grief which is the loss of Dr. King in her words in such a way that would not only influence but also showed sympathy and empathy of the speaker.

Example 2: *"Dr. King's dream embraced the poor and the oppressed of all lands"*. No doubt Dr. King was fighting for the equality of men especially black and white but still there were some lands where his message or movement could not reach.

Example 3: *"The mighty conqueror of death"*. She exaggerated here and used hyperbole. She called Dr. King "mighty" which is an adjective carrying the meaning of powerfulness and used for those who cannot be defeated and she also called him subjugator of death. As a matter of fact, Dr. King was not as mighty as he was assassinated and also not the defeater of death as he died but she called him just to bring enthusiasm and influence target audience.

**Repetition:** according to Tannen (2007) repetition involves in the reoccurrence of phrases or words in a single piece of language. In existing speech repetition has been used by Indira several times to enhance the importance of certain things. She used "we" fourteen times and back to back in this discourse for instance,

Example: *"we remember vividly...we had hoped...we admire...we felt his loss....we thought of great men..."*. At the starting sentences, she used "we" seven

times in six sentences. She made use of a personal plural pronoun to put emphasis on the unity and harmony.

Indira employed different persuasive devices in order to create an impressive impact on the audience. All these specifics make the reader see that Coretta's presence on this occasion is treated by Indira as a significant fact.

#### **4.2.2-Practice**

Indira Gandhi delivered a speech at the occasion of the presentation of International understating Awards. She delivered the speech as the head of the state and talked on the behalf of her nation as she used personal plural pronoun fourteen times. She played a powerful role and shed light on the "history" since how things occurred in the past and how they interpret them and how they can make things better for the future. So it can be said that the practice here in which she engaged is presenting history to the audience about King Martin Luther. This is the second visit of Coretta in India as first she came with her husband but now she is alone for Dr. King is no more. The point to consider here is that a practice as "*we admired Dr. King*" and comparing Dr. King with Mahatma Gandhi is an opportunity for Indira to engage the audience in a decent deal of social work.

#### **4.2.3-Identities**

As discussed above in the existing piece of discourse Indira enacted the role of the responsible head of state here. She not only welcomes Coretta but also pays her condolence and tribute to her late husband on the behalf of her country.

#### **4.2.4-Relationships**

Here Indira tried to build harmony and coordination by using certain rhetorical tropes. For instance, as discussed earlier, she used the plural personal pronoun repeatedly for the sake of creating the factor of association. She also used hyperbole for the previous factor by saying, "*...we feel his spirit*". Here she just exaggerated the things in order to show her respect and appreciation for Dr. King. Some more rhetorical devices are as under which were used by Indira for building relationships.

**Allusion:** it can be described as the short reference of a famous person in order to enhance the understanding of the concepts under discussion. Indira used allusion in her speech by describing the relationship between the ideas of Martin Luther, Holy Christ, Mahatma Gandhi, and Buddha. She used their references to influence the target audience as at that time her target audience was Hindus, Christians and the followers of Buddha.

**Pathos:** it is a rhetorical strategy where speaker appeals audience emotionally to support their claims. In the present speech, Indira Gandhi did use pathos to make relations between the two nations strong. She used this strategy while talking about King Martin Luther, his death and how his death is the sign of victory for his people. She said that his sacrifice for his nation was unforgettable. She and her people would remember him. She further added by addressing to Coretta his wife that Coretta gave him encouragement and strength to achieve his goals, so she and her nation was glad that she Coretta was with them.



#### 4.2.5-Politics

Gee claims that people use language to convey their opinions or thoughts on the distribution of social good which implies to construct a perspective about social goods. Of course, the social good here about which Indira conveyed her perspectives is her nations' reputation in front of former foreign leader's wife and international platform. She made use of certain persuasive strategies to show her credibility and appeal audience emotionally.

**Ethos:** Anderson (2008) describes in her study that ethos according to Aristotle is an appeal which chiefly focuses on the speaker's character. She further states that Aristotle argues that when the delivering speech makes the orator's character credible sometimes this factor becomes the means of persuasion. Indira did use language in such a way which infers her credibility and showed her wisdom.

For example: *"So today we are gathered not to offer you grief, but to salute a man who achieved so much in so short time"*. She shared her thoughts on the death of Dr. King and made the use of those words which support and give strength to his wife and nation. She also shared her thoughts on the racism which demonstrate her personality as anti-racist with the reference of Martin Luther by saying;

Example: *"Martin Luther King was convinced that one day the misguided people who believed in racial superiority would realize the error of their ways....It is ironic that there should still be people in this world who judge men not by their moral worth and intellectual merit but by the pigment of their skin or other physical characteristics"*.

#### 4.2.6-Connections

It deals with connecting the things with the use of language. Indeed, Indira connected things with specific convincing strategies such as she used metaphor simile and parallelism.

**Metaphor and simile:** she used metaphor and simile within a single sentence to connect the death of Dr. King with his victory.

Example: *"Dr. King chose death for the theme of a sermon, remarking that he would like to be remembered as a drum major for justice, for peace and for righteousness"*. She used simile at the end as well while she was talking about the dream of Martin Luther. Example: *"His dream was that white and black, brown and yellow would live and grow together as flowers in a garden with their faces turned towards the sun"*. She made the connection among all the human beings in spite of discrimination and called them flowers to expose her perspective about racism.

**Parallelism:** she also made the use of parallelism in her speech in order to build connections in ideas.

Example: *"Just as training for violence included learning to kill, the training for non-violence, he said, included learning how to die"*. She used this structure to show her perspective on violence and non-violence while constructing the connection between non-violence and martyrdom.

Example: *"While there is bondage anywhere, we ourselves cannot be fully free. While there is oppression anywhere, we ourselves cannot soar high"*. She built a

connection between their nation and world by expressing her thoughts on discrimination that until there are discrimination and racism we as a human cannot be free.

#### **4.2.7-Sign Systems and Knowledge**

Indira used words to make certain ideas privilege. In the existingspeech, she used her knowledge on current and worldly affairs to privilege the ideas. She used Martin Luther King's last name as saying Dr. King which indicates that she expressed her appreciation and respect for Coretta's late husband. She gave prestige to the ideology of Martin Luther and tried to connect it with Mahatma Gandhi's ideology while using specific sign systems.

#### **Benazir Bhutto's speech analysis**

**Background of speech:** Benazir delivered speech at the occasion of a joint session of Congress on 7<sup>th</sup> June 1989 where she not only praised America's support to Pakistan but also made that kind of promises which America wanted to hear and recognized herself as a first Muslim lady who could lead Muslim country with new enthusiasm and strategies. This speech was punctuated by several rounds of applause and consisted of two thousand two hundred twenty-two words.

#### **4.4.1-Significance**

In current speech, Bhutto highlighted the significance of America's "unwavering support" to the democracy of Pakistan. In order to highlight the significance of certain ideas, she used certain rhetorical devices which are as under.

**Amplification:** amplification is a rhetorical device where the speaker repeats a word or a phrase more than one time to put emphasis on it and to show its significance. This device was used many times by the speaker in the current speech.

Example 1: "*We gather together, friends and partners, who have fought, side by side, in the cause of liberty. We gather together to celebrate freedom....*"

In this sentence, she used two times the phrase "*we gather together*" which indicates the speaker's intention to put emphasis on the purpose for which they were there. She wanted to have the full support of US for her country as the United States was the supreme power at that time and it was considered a great deal to which it was supporting.

Example 2: "*America is a land of great technology. America is a land of economic power.*" Benazir used words to show the supremacy of America as technology and economy is considered significant for any country to become powerful. She called America the land of technology and added the adjective "great" which means she selected those words which can influence the audience.

Example 3: "*America's greatest contribution to the world is its concept of democracy, its concept of freedom, freedom of action, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought*". Here the word which she used repeatedly was "freedom", she was the prime minister of that country which was colonized once, got freedom and now underdeveloped and needed support and aid of foreign countries in order to flourish. She used this to demonstrate the significance of "freedom" while praising the ideology of America.

## A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse

Example 4: *Some claimed to fear revenge, revenge against the murderers and torturers, revenge against those who subverted the constitutional law. But, ladies and gentlemen, there was no revenge. For them and for dictators across the world--democracy is the greatest revenge”.*

Speaker used repeatedly the word ‘revenge’, basically, Benazir Bhutto’s father Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who was also prime minister of Pakistan and was hanged by Gen. Zia-ul-Haq and his family suffered home arrest for several years. Here she talked about the “revenge” as now she was in power and could take revenge on those who did those acts to them but she did not want to take. It is also a hidden warning to them. By speaking these words she demonstrated the significance of power and democracy. For she once was about to exile from the country and now was elected the first prime minister of her country.

**Antithesis:** which denotative means “opposite” is a persuasive device where the speaker puts two opposite ideas together in order to achieve the effect of contrasting, emphasizing and showing the importance of ideas. Benazir implied this strategy in her speech while saying,

*Example: “But your greatest export is not material. Your greatest export is not a product. Your greatest export is an idea.”*

Benazir here praised the products of America and said that your products are sent all over the world but she used the opposite phrases while emphasizing ton their greatest export which she thought is an idea. She knew well how to influence the audience which was not only America but the whole world. She used the adjective “greatest to make it significant as everybody knows “knowledge is power” and America was the country in the 20<sup>th</sup> century which was doing progress in technologies and many other fields.

### 4.4.2-Practice

Benazir was at an official meeting and was addressing as the representative of her country which indicates that she was playing a powerful role. She was giving the history of the things how they happened in the past telling about present how things are between Pakistan and America and how things would be by making promises on the behalf of her country. It signifies that the practice in which she engages here is addressing and influencing the people as the representative of her nation.

Such kinds of practices are common in this kind of projects as she was prime minister at that time of her country. Prime ministers have to go to different countries as representative and influence the audience with their speeches, praising those who help and aid them and make those promises which make the audience happy. So she did the same here.

### 4.3.3- Identities

As it is already mentioned above that Benazir enacts in her language the identity of the responsible doer. Here she is not only representing her individual personality rather her whole country. Her identity here is not as Benazir herself but as Pakistan and a Muslim lady. For in the beginning, she greeted the audience with a Muslim greeting which is “*As Salaam-o-Alaikum*” means “peace be with you”. She could say to them “Hello” or “Good afternoon” which are the common greetings of

United States but instead of using these words which were the habit of audience she greeted the audience in her own language which demonstrated that she was here enacted the identity of a Muslim lady who became the first prime minister not only her own country but in whole Muslim nations.

#### **4.3.4- Relationships**

In this piece of language, Benazir tries to enact the relationship of friendship and harmony. For this purpose, she used certain rhetorical devices. As mentioned above she used amplification many times in this speech and if one looks closely, it comes to knowledge that amplification is mostly used when she talks about America, its ideology and the relationship between America and Pakistan. For instance, she repeated these phrases as mentioned above “*we gather together*”, “*America is aland*”, “*our struggle was driven by faith*”.

When she talked about the new era and new challenges for both America and Pakistan, she talked in these words,

Example; “*Today we are on the threshold of a new democratic partnership between our two countries, addressing new priorities. A partnership which addresses both our security concerns and our social and economic needs. A partnership which will carry us into the 21st century--strong in mutual trust...*”

Here she was addressing to the United States and her emphasis was on “partnership” which indicates her purpose of speaking as she wanted America to become or to take the friendship of Pakistan as a positive sign because she wanted the development of both countries in all field of life. Basically, she wanted the development of her country because America was already developed the country.

#### **4.3.5- Politics**

In the current speech, the speaker knew that the hierarchy of status and power was at stake. She wanted the aid of social goods from America the country which was at its supreme and speaker knew very well the high status of the audience. To influence her audience, she utilized persuasive devices.

**Logos:** it is one of Aristotle’s defined rhetorical devices which means speaker makes the use of logical ideas, arguments and that evidence which are supportive to speaker’s arguments. Benazir used this term in her speech. She talked about how Pakistan government has been helping Afghan refugees for ten years. It not only sustained the families rather housed them. She told the audience how throughout these ten years America was with Pakistan and its army for this bilateral effort. She used this technique to show the audience that her country was not harmful to anyone rather it wanted and spread peace everywhere. It even helped those which did not belong to this land. Pakistan not only welcomed the refugees but also nurtured them as well.

She also used this technique while asking them to aid her country in such a way,

Example: “*The widening gap between rich and poor countries; environmental pollution; drug abuse and trafficking; the pressure of population on world resources; and full economic participation for women everywhere. We must join together to find remedies and solutions for these problems before they overcome us.*”

## A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse

She was the prime minister of the underdeveloped country or what it can be said in other words the prime minister of infant country who was in the state of growth and needed the aid of developed countries in order to grow. So to take help of United States for her country as a prime minister she compared the rich and poor country and their problems. She said to America that it was necessary for America to join Pakistan to solve these problems. She influenced the audience with her such arguments.

**Litotes:** it is a persuasive technique where a speaker uses a specific form of understatement which denies the opposite of the word. Benazir used this term in her speech after talking about how Pakistan helped Afghan refugees.

Example: *“We both deserve to be proud of that effort. But that effort did not come without a price.”*

She said that the effort which we made was worth to be appreciated but we had to pay price for that. And the price which they paid was the loss of many social goods as Pakistan’s natural resources were run short. The country’s peace changed into its state of agony. Still, they were committed to their commitment.

She argued these points in her speech to exhibit the determination of Pakistan and to show the status of social goods as well. As mentioned above Benazir wanted the United States to aid her country so she utilized these persuasive devices to persuade an audience.

### 4.3.6- Connections

Benazir no doubt in this piece of language connected some things and made them relevant to each other just with the proper use of language.

**Sententia:** in classical rhetoric, the use of a maxim, proverb or famous quote in a speech is called sententia. Benazir used this technique in her speech.

Example: *“We gather together to celebrate freedom, to celebrate democracy, to celebrate the three most beautiful words in the English language: ‘We the People’.”*

This very phrase holds great significance as the constitution of the United States starts with these words and this phrase was penned by Madison. She connected herself with the audience as friends and the referred to themselves as “the people”. She again used this phrase while talking about the progress of Pakistan.

Example: *“We the people had spoken. We the people had prevailed.”*

Example: *“...a government of the people, by the people, for the people.”*

She quoted these famous words of Abraham Lincoln who was the president of the United States once and was a great leader. She was talking about the ruling form “Democracy”. Before her government, there was a dictatorship in her country and here she was telling to the audience that her presence there was the sign of true democracy in her country which got the victory.

Example: *“I do not shrink from the responsibility –I welcome it”.*

She was influencing the audience by casting light on how she became prime minister. She was thirty-five years old at that time and it was a great obligation for

her, but she described her thoughts on this obligation in the words of John Kennedy that she would welcome it. She was doing all this to impress the audience they should not take her easygoing prime minister because she was a woman rather, she had the ability to run and rule over the country.

#### **4.3.7- Sign system and knowledge**

In this piece of language, Benazir gave privilege to specific sign systems and made certain beliefs disprivilege while using certain persuasive devices. For instance, she privileged to the system of democracy while using amplification, litotes, and antithesis. She deprivilege the system of dictatorship which was ruled in Pakistan before her selection as a prime minister.

#### **5-Conclusion:**

Existing dissertation highlights the persuasive strategies which were used by selected political leaders. Selected orators were female political leaders of male dominant societies. In patriarchal societies, women are dominated by male members of society. Men are marked for ruling and presiding. Whereas women are considered dumb and are meant to work under the dominance of men. But the selected women speakers were not only the leaders of their political party but were elected prime minister twice of their respective countries. Present research is an attempt to analyze the language of their certain speeches in order to find out how they ruled by using the language. Because political leaders control other people's thoughts and can change their attitudes and opinions just by using the appropriate language. According to David (2014) audience despite the differences in history, culture, region, and ideology can be persuaded with the apt use of language by political leaders. Thus, both speakers used linguistic strategies to influence the audience, as most political leaders do. Indira Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto used impressive language to appeal to the public. The emotional manipulation was done with the use of pathos and sharing personal experience. Analyzing the linguistic strategies of these selected speeches by employing the models of CDA helped to detect the persuasive devices at three levels of language structure. The main object of the thesis was to analyze the persuasive language of speakers. The analysis uncovers that speakers used influencing language to make contexts in their support. Indira and Benazir mostly used the same persuasive devices, though both addresses were in dissimilar in contexts and were adhered to different times. The analysis based on Paul Gee's framework demonstrates that both orators employed repetition, hyperbole, and allusion deliberately to make significant specific notions which support their ideologies. Indira employed these strategies to give the importance to her foreign guests and to make a name at international level. Whereas Benazir used these techniques to pursue the support of foreign people in order to brace her government. Khadair (2016) states in his research that the strategies like emotional appeal and making promises which worth for recipients are generally employed by political speakers with the purpose of supporting their claims and make speeches persuasive. So was done by Indira and Benazir in current speeches. The practice in which both speakers were enacting was an official meeting and they were playing the role of head of state and were representing their countries, culture, and religion. Both female orators tried to build relationships with foreign recipients while using persuasive devices. For this purpose, they used allusion and repetition in their speeches. Current research

## A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse

shows that both speakers employed almost similar rhetorical devices even at every level of language structure. They used rhetorical strategies not only lexical but syntactical and phonological level as well. The general tone of Indira's speech is based on hospitality as she was welcoming Coretta the wife of the former foreign leader, whereas Benazir's speech revolves around the favor of democracy and her country as she was addressing to Congress with the aim of their support for her government. The overall goal of the current research was to discover the persuasive strategies used by selected speakers in their delivered two speeches to foreign people. They appealed the target recipients using persuasive language and became the new darlings of democracy of their time. Though at the end they met the same fate and were assassinated by the people of their respective countries yet both brought historical changes in their nations at the time of their governance.

Several avenues for future work can be generated by this research. One can entail this project by working on the linguistic strategies of selected speakers. A comparative study of the political discourse of both selected speakers is indicated in order to find out the ideologies directed by speakers. There are also certain other aspects which can be studied for research. Keeping in view the patterns, other approaches of CDA can be applied to existing speeches.

**References**

- [1] Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000). Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research challenges, responses, and consequences. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 36(2), 136-158.
- [2] David, M. K. (2014). Language, power and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influences. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164-170.
- [3] Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- [4] Harris, R. (2007). Evaluating a handbook of rhetorical devices.
- [5] Jones, J., & Peccei, J. S. (2004). *Language and politics*. NA.
- [6] Kangira, J. (2012). Praiseworthy values in President Hifikepunye Pohamba's epideictic speech marking Namibia's 20th anniversary of independence.
- [7] Kennedy, G. A. (2007). *On Rhetoric - A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- [8] Khan, M. A., Malik, N. A., & Mushtaq, S. (2016). FALLACIES AS IDENTITY MARKERS: A CRITICAL COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SELECTED POLITICAL DISCOURSE. *Science International*, 28(2).
- [9] Khdair, S. J. (2016). *Repetition as a Rhetorical Device in the Political Speeches of Three Egyptian Presidents: Mubarak, Morsi and Al-Sisi A Comparative Translation Study ( Doctoral Dissertation)*
- [10] Komar, Z. (2016). Feminine Rhetoric: Feminine and Masculine dimensions in the context of Rhetoric, Gender and Social Spheres. *Opus et Educatio*, 3(2).
- [11] Lazar, M.M. (2007). Feminist Critical discourse analysis: Articulating feminist discourse praxis. *Critical discourse studies*, 4(2), 141-164.
- [12] Molek-kozakowska, K. (2016). The rhetorical construction of Hillary Rodham Clinton as a presidential contender in 2016: A case study of hillaryclinton.com. "*Res Rhetorica*", (2).
- [13] Panhwar, S. (2009). *Benazir Bhutto Selected speeches from 1989-2007* (1st ed., p. 600).
- [14] *The Great Speeches*. (2013). 8th ed. New Delhi: Indiana Publishing House, p.230.
- [15] Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). "Political discourse and political cognition". *Politics as text and talk: Analytical approach to political discourse*, 203



A Critique of Rhetorical Devices in Selective Political Discourse

- [16] Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese discourse*, 1(1), 17-28.
- [17] Wareing, S. (2004) 'What is language and what does it do?', in Thomas, L.(ed), *Language, society, and power*. New York: Routledge.
- [18] Weida, S., & Stolley, K. (2013). Using rhetorical strategies for persuasion. *Purdue Online Writing Lab*.
- [19] Wyse, S. E. (2011). What is the difference between qualitative research and quantitative research. *Snap surveys*, 16-1.