

The Power of Language: Exploring the Role of Language in Politics

Habiburahman Rahmani^{1*}, Abdul Rahman Saeed²

¹English Language and Literature Department, Education Faculty, Kandahar University

²Department of Law, Law and Political Science Faculty, Malalay Institute of Higher Education

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8080152>

Received: 27 July 2024; Accepted: 02 August 2024; Published: 07 September 2024

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

The relationship between language and politics is intricate and multifaceted. Language is not just a means of communication but also plays a crucial role in politics and diplomacy. Language is a powerful tool for persuasion and manipulation in politics and a tool in political discourse. This study aimed at gaining a more in-depth understanding of the role of language in politics and international relations. It also aimed at identifying, describing, and explaining the linguistic features found in the speech of politicians. The researcher used the qualitative research approach in the study, notably; secondary data were used for collecting reliable conclusions for the research. The findings suggested that language is a powerful tool in politics, used to shape public opinion, frame issues, and create political identities. In diplomacy, careful and formal language helps countries communicate and resolve conflicts. Globally, language connects different cultures, with English often being the common language used in international relations as the lingua-franca. Politicians use emotional language in speeches to connect with people and gain support. Key features of political language include rhetorical devices, metaphors, metonymy, pronouns, presuppositions, repetition of words and stylistic devices were used. These tools help create persuasive messages that influence how people think and act. Understanding the role of language in politics shows its impact on diplomacy, international communication, and the power of political speeches.

Keywords: Diplomacy, Language, Linguistic Features, rhetorical devices, Politics

INTRODUCTION

Background

Language is a powerful tool in political discourse and it is a powerful tool for persuasion and manipulation in politics. Political leaders use language to convey their messages, shape public opinion, and mobilize support for their agendas. Rhetoric, speeches, and propaganda are all examples of how language is used in politics to influence and persuade. Politicians use language strategically to frame issues, shape narratives, and sway public opinion. The choice of words, tone, and rhetoric can influence how policies are perceived and debated. Political parties often use specific language and slogans to differentiate themselves from their opponents and appeal to their base. Likewise, understood rhetoric to be a powerful political weapon for shaping political belief and action. Indeed, it was the art of rhetoric that enabled people to live and engage in civilized communal life (Bizzell & Herzberg, 1990).

Statement of the Problem

Identification of the gap in understanding the role of language in politics. Importance of studying language as a political tool in shaping public opinion and behavior. This study analyze the rhetoric strategies employed by political leaders and parties to convey their ideologies and agendas. It examine the impact of political language on public perception, attitudes, and behavior. It identify the linguistic features which could be found the speeches of politicians.

Research Objectives

1. To identify the role and importance of language in politics and in public diplomacy.
2. To determine the impact of political language on public perception, attitudes, and behavior.
3. To describe and explain the usage of linguistic features in political speeches.

Research Questions

1. How the language plays an important role in politics?
2. Which tools of language do politicians use for persuasion?
3. What are the linguistic features found in the speeches of politicians?

Significance of the study

This study investigates the relation of language and politics. It determine the role of language in politics and diplomacy. This study is significant in the sense that it provides sociolinguistic awareness not only to the researchers but also the lecturers and students to develop their understanding about the role of language in politics and to know the linguistic features used in political discourse. The results offered in this paper will provide useful information for future research into numerous areas of the language. In addition to this, the data collected will also help the readers to improve academically. Finally, this study is a good contribution in the fields of linguistics as it would help to understand the intricate and multifaceted relationship between language and politics.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative research design to explore the role of language in politics. This paper systematically reviews related research on the relation of language and politics. To get useful results, the author relied on secondary data. The data was collected from a variety of reliable sources, including publications, articles, reviews, and previous research investigations to gather relevant studies concerning the role of language in politics by using “language & politics” as the key words for related literature. The findings are based on the most current and reliable data available. The study covers a variety of literature and research perspectives on the issue to establish the usefulness of language in politics and public diplomacy. Secondary research makes use of not only a massive quantity of data but also data that has been collected carefully. Researchers use secondary data, which allows them to deal with massive data sets that have already been compiled by others. As a result, this study shed light on many different aspects of the language in political discourse.

FINDINGS

The entire research findings of the study have been reviewed from various journals, research papers, articles, etc. The results of this paper show that Language plays a crucial role in politics. It described that language has multifaceted role in politics, it emphasized that political actors use language differently to persuade, manipulate, and mobilize citizens. By exploring dimensions of political language, this study looks forward to understanding the relation between language and politics.

The relation of language and politics

The relationship of language and politics in history dates back to the Greek polis, where the Aristotelian concept of bios politikos first emerged. He meant by the bios politikos that it transcends the necessities of labor and work; it is the life of one who has freely chosen to devote oneself to the polis. The bond between language and politics is derivable from the association of language and communication. The function of language in politics lies in the fact that every political action is prepared, accompanied, controlled, and influenced by it (Schaffer, 1996). The study of the language of politics is important in order to know how language is utilized by those who

desire to gain, exercise, and keep power (Beard, 2000). Language is used in politics to make speeches and remarks. Thus, political career is negotiated, secured and practiced through the instrumentality of language whose product, in this wise is mainly speech making. Beard (ibid: 35) further adds that "making speeches is a vital part of the politicians' role in announcing policies and persuading people".

As Lakoff (1990:7) appropriately shows, "language is politics, politics assigns power, and power governs how people talk and how they are understood." He goes ahead to show that political manipulations depend on language since it initiates and interprets power relations. As such, the roles that language bestows upon its users confer power and explain relationships among them. Power manifests itself in the use of language: every user of language "plays the linguistic power game according to hidden agendas, the unsaid being far more potent than the said" (Ibid: 21).

Opeibi (2009) puts it that language is the vehicle of politics in that it offers room to politicians to explore its verbal communicative resources, and the manipulative abilities of words in fitting their intentions. Language is a channel through which a candidate's manifesto, superior political thoughts, and party ideologies are expressed. Most importantly, language provides a tool for translating these into social actions, bringing about the much-needed social change and continuity in society. Thus, the role of language in convincing, mobilizing, persuading, and enlightening the citizenry cannot be overstated. It is a passport to the heart of the people. For Akinkurolere (2011), citizens' support for politicians rests on the message these politicians deliver, along with the manner in which it is presented, as these determine the success of candidacy, programs, or policies. As such, both the political message and its manner of presentation are crucial.

Chilton and Schaffner (1997) argue that politics cannot work without language, and the use of language in forming social groups leads to what we broadly define as 'politics' (206). Pelinka (2007) further highlights that the study of language goes beyond literature and linguistics, suggesting that language should be viewed and analyzed as a political phenomenon. He also contends that politics should be conceived and studied as a discursive phenomenon (129).

In the context of making certain terminological distinctions between the notions *language* and *politics*, this inquiry views them considering the definitions offered by Chilton. Thus, the scholar states that *language* is 'the universal capacity of humans in all societies to communicate, while by *politics* he means 'the art of governance'. Thus, this inquiry views the language as an instrument to interact or transact in various situations and/or in different organizations being conventionally recognized as political environment (Chilton, 1998).

Language as a political tool

Language, as a dynamic mode of communication is therefore seen as instrumental in molding political discourse in the sense that it actually fashions and remodels both public opinion and, therefore, the structure of politics in a nation. The words that flow out of the mouth of political leaders, their narrative construction, and rhetoric devices are critical determinants of the directions that policy might follow and even public perception. On Hudson's (1978) argument, language is a resource from which potential politicians derive power or even maintain power in a strategic way.

The Influence of Political Speeches (Emotive language)

The persuasive power of political talk depends on the skillful use of language. Politicians with many language tools can effectively claim political power and authority. In democratic societies, political power is mainly gained and kept through persuasive language. Words are tools and weapons that evoke emotions. They have great power to express feelings that cause various reactions in the reader or listener. They also show the feelings and attitudes of the writer or speaker.

Thus, Cuddon (1998: 257) views emotive language as a "language intended to express or arouse emotional reactions towards the subject matter or the addressee"; it is distinguished with referential (or scientific) language that is used to denote exclusively. In addition, according to Lopez (2000: 19), emotive language is the use of descriptive words which color or dramatize speaking or writing. It makes the content more interesting and may

also reveal bias. Finally, Lum (2001: 23) adds that emotive language "sways the emotions of the audience either for or against the view presented."

Words are important for politics. The speeches and writings of politicians, like presidents and prime ministers, have big and lasting impacts. These impacts are worth serious study. Politicians aim to be good at speaking and writing to gain an edge over their rivals. They skillfully use emotive language, often with a positive spin, to persuade most of their audience and motivate them to act (Macagno & Walton, 2014: 4).

One of the important highlights during the inauguration ceremony of a newly elected president is the speech delivery. The inaugural speech comes with fanfare, jubilation, and renewed hope that indeed there is a bright future ahead. Speeches by sitting presidents are always unique in many ways. Though it is a political speech, it is given after the end of an interval of several years, most often four. It has national and international implications with its listeners across the borders. An inaugural speech is a victory speech; it marks the success of the incoming President and compels the opposition party or parties to accept and submit to the new leadership. This represents the linguistic commencement and legislation of a new socio-political and ideological era.

Language and Diplomacy

Nick (2001: 39) posits that it is possible to give various definitions to the term "language in diplomacy". It could be the speech used by a nation, a tribe, or a large group of people. Additionally, it could be understood as a certain way for expressing the needs of the diplomatic profession: certain ways or methods of expressions, forms, styles, manners, or tones. In any of these senses, the use of language in diplomacy is very important. However, there is a problem that most diplomats do not manage to communicate in a single language, common for all participants. Considering these differences, diplomacy can be defined as the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups or states and enhancing international relations regarding issues of peace-making, trade, war, economics, and culture. The ability to conduct diplomacy is one of the very features that distinguish the different states from each other. The practice of diplomacy dates back to the existence of the first city-states.

An important aspect of diplomatic negotiation is the language or the strategic means of communicative interactions. The use of language in diplomacy is crucial, as it is not merely a tool for transmitting thoughts or a communication instrument, but often the very essence of the diplomatic vocation. This has been true since the early beginnings of the profession. For this reason, from ancient times, the first envoys of the Egyptian pharaohs, Roman legates, and medieval Dubrovnik consuls had to be educated and trained individuals who were well-spoken and multilingual.

Thus, the language of political and diplomatic communication has its own rules, norms, cultural pragmatics, and stylistic patterns, which cannot be strictly defined within a structural language framework. Therefore, in modern linguistics, it is rational to employ new methods of linguo-cognitive orientation that study the mechanisms of worldview and understanding of individuals through language.

Diplomatic language is a functional and international language of politics, distinct from the rich, journalistic, and free literary language. It is concise, precise, and classically simple, characterized not only by accurate evidence but also by deeper analysis and summaries of government policies and actions. The diplomat's primary weapon is their language; they often speak extensively and vividly while providing limited information. In many cases, diplomacy is synonymous with negotiations, involving the conduct of international relations through discussions, ambassadors, and representatives to settle various conflicting interests (Ismailova et al., 2020).

The present era is characterized by globalization, leading to the continuous expansion of international relations. As countries increasingly interact on a single platform, effective communication with appropriate language use becomes vital. Proper communication is essential to establish and strengthen international relations (Xhemali, 2022).

In public diplomacy, selecting the appropriate words is crucial. Words are the building blocks of phrases, and each sentence should convey a clear idea. To ensure clarity, especially when using a language one does not fully

master, it is preferable to use short, concise, and straightforward sentences. In this context, English is the most widely used diplomatic language, being the first choice for both public and legal affairs, according to Lin (2019).

The role of language in political movements and revolutions

Since the separation of India and Pakistan in 1947, there have been constant political tensions between the eastern and western regions of Pakistan. These tensions intensified regarding the language question immediately after Pakistan's establishment. Although the language movement began in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) to establish Bengali (Bangla) as the state language of Pakistan, there was also controversy within East Pakistan about granting Bengali official language status. The people of East Pakistan had long used Urdu as a sacred language, and it was the language of the wealthy and educated. Consequently, some academics and politicians advocated for retaining Urdu as the medium for education, official activities, and socio-cultural functions, including religion and entertainment. Notably, Urdu was also the language of prominent East Bengal politicians and influential leaders such as Mohammad Akram, Maulana Moniruzzaman, and Maulana Azad (Ahmed, 2013).

However, most of the people in eastern Pakistan (now Bangladesh) participated in various socio-cultural movements, including the Swadeshi movement. The Swadeshi movement (1906) bolstered the spirit of the Bengali language in East Bengal (then East Pakistan, now Bangladesh). During that period, Bengali served as a unifying force between West Bengal (now India) and East Bengal, fostering awareness of Bengali culture, language, and literature. The remnants and effects of the Swadeshi movement persisted among the people in parts of Bangladesh even after the formation of Pakistan in 1947.

The language movement in East Pakistan began after Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the first Governor-General of Pakistan, proposed Urdu as the state language of Pakistan in a speech in Dhaka in 1948. His speech sparked protests from some segments of the city-centric cultural movement in eastern Pakistan. When a cultural movement formed to establish Bengali as the state language of Pakistan, East Pakistani politicians began to use the language movement as a political weapon against the central government. Consequently, the language movement transitioned from being a cultural initiative to a political movement dominated by politicians.

The language movement, which began as a pseudo-movement with political intentions, led to political issues and movements but did not significantly contribute to the development of the Bengali language. As a result, Bangladesh (then East Pakistan) played no substantial role in the advancement of Bengali language and literature. Therefore, it can be argued that the language movement in East Pakistan (Bangladesh) was primarily a political movement, where the development, propagation, and reproduction of the Bengali language were not prioritized.

It is important to note that the first seeds of the East Pakistan independence movement were sown through the language movement. The debate on language issues continued even after 1971, when Bangladesh became an independent state. However, Article 3 of the Constitution of Bangladesh (1972) clearly states that Bangla is the state language of the republic, promoting Bengali solely as the national language (Abdul Awal, 2022).

Language has always been a political issue, sometimes even violently so. In 1948, Pakistan declared Urdu as its sole national language, resulting in mass discontent, especially among the Bengali-speaking majority of East Bengal. Rising tensions led to a ban on public protests, which was defied in 1952 by students and language activists in Dhaka. The police opened fire on the protesters, killing dozens. The date, 21 February, is now commemorated as International Mother Language Day, established by UNESCO to honor global linguistic diversity and the rights of native speakers.

The role of language in nationalist movements is also well exemplified by the Irish independence movement. During the campaign, Irish Gaelic played a significant role in mobilizing the people and was actively encouraged. However, once independence was achieved, the use of Irish Gaelic significantly declined and nearly became extinct (Iwamoto, 2005).

The role of language in nation building

Language, being deeply intertwined with the culture and history of a community, is used by people to identify themselves within their community and differentiate themselves from others through social interactions in that

language. As Kramersch (2009, p. 3) stated, "People view their language as a symbol of their social identity." Tong & Cheung (2011) asserted that language reflects the lifestyle and carries the social and cultural identities of native speakers in a particular geographical region. Therefore, to construct national identities and promote nationalism, it is important to use a common language to integrate a population into a nation within a state. Language is a powerful tool for uniting individuals into a single community with a common identity, serving as a significant symbolic marker of an individual's or group's identity (Kaur & Shapii, 2018, p. 2).

This effort becomes imperative in states with multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual contexts, such as India, Pakistan, and Ethiopia. Language policy and planning are crucial for newly independent nation-states like Pakistan, to adopt a national and official language that supports the development of the nation-state and socio-economic equality within its population. After independence, nations often use a shared common language as a symbolic marker to integrate their diverse population into a single unified nation. Language thus becomes central in the processes of nationalism and nation-building, and in culture in general, leading to the politicization of language policy and planning. Since the inception of Pakistan, Urdu has been represented as its national language, while English is regarded as the official language of the state (Shah & Pathan, 2016).

Turkish had been the official language since 1876 when the first constitution was declared in the Ottoman Empire. During the nation-building process, speaking Turkish became not only a legal requirement but also a crucial precondition for being considered a member of the Turkish nationality. This sentiment is reflected in the words of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish nation-state: "One who regards himself as a member of the Turkish nation should first of all and in every case, speak Turkish. If someone who does not speak Turkish claims membership in Turkish culture and community, it would not be right to believe in this" (Şeker, 2005).

Japan is unique in that it refers to its language as *kokugo* (national language) rather than *nihongo* (Japanese). *Kokugo* is deliberately ambiguous, serving to blur the distinction between language and national authority (Tanaka, 1992: 201-202). It is widely believed in Japan that there is no difference between the national language and the official language. However, Japan is not "monolithic" in terms of language. There are many dialects and registers, as well as a gap between the centralized official language (whether written or spoken) and ordinary speech, similar to other countries. Despite this, the term *kokugo* has the effect of masking these contradictions and presenting the national language as a single, unified system.

Common linguistic features to be found in political speeches

Modern linguistics, using a cognitive-discursive approach, increasingly focuses on the discursive features of language, particularly political discourse, due to its predominantly discursive nature (Hager & Hilbig, 2020). Political discourse is characterized by its communication purpose, participants, and methods, including strategies and tactics (Degani, 2018; Markowitz & Slovic, 2020; Scotto Di Carlo, 2020). While linguists and sociolinguists have traditionally led this research, political scientists have also contributed significantly by exploring language's role in political science (Dallmayr, 1984), national identity (Bugarski, 2004), international negotiations (Bell, 1988), and social mobilization (Pelinka, 2007). Politics, like all spheres of social activity, has its own **code**, a term used by linguists to refer to a language variety particular to a specific group.

Personal pronouns in political discourse

Politicians strategically use pronouns for several key reasons (Gastil, 1992; Wilson, 1990). Firstly, pronouns reflect their ideological views; for example, they might use "us" or "it" to describe the government, depending on their stance on public governance. Secondly, pronouns indicate the speaker's closeness to the topic or participants. For instance, Margaret Thatcher skillfully used "I" to establish rapport and "we" to align with supporters and distance herself from opponents (Maitland & Wilson, 1987; Wilson, 1990). Thirdly, using "we" can involve listeners in the argument, making them more receptive. Fourthly, pronouns can assign responsibility differently; for example, using "it," "I," or "we" in similar sentences distributes responsibility in varying ways (Wilson, 1990). Additionally, pronouns can be used for vagueness or precision, helping politicians avoid direct answers in difficult interviews (Bull & Fetzer, 2006). The pronoun "we" also helps establish social groups and identities (Helmbrecht, 2002). Lakoff (1990) noted that pronouns work subtly, with Reagan's ambiguous use of "we" creating both unity and separation among Americans by using inclusive "we" for solidarity and exclusive

"we" to represent his administration.

Rhetorical devices in political speeches

Rhetoric is the art of effective or persuasive speaking and writing. It involves using language skillfully to convince, influence, or engage an audience. The studies reported in this section are concerned with the way in which politicians employ rhetorical devices to invite audience applause in political speeches. In this context, especially of politicians at election campaign rallies, audience reactions such as clapping and booing provide an important barometer of their popular appeal; hence, politicians are often aware of the value of using rhetorical devices in evoking applause to elicit agreement from their audience. As such, applause can be interpreted as a highly noticeable expression of group identity or solidarity with the speaker and the party the speaker represents. In this respect, applause would seem to play a substantial role in the development of a politician's image and career as a popular figure.

To address this issue, a follow-up study was conducted by Heritage and Greatbatch (1986) with more comprehensive sampling of political speeches. They analyzed all the 476 speeches that were televised from the 1981 British party political conferences (Conservative, Labor and Liberal parties). They examined seven basic rhetorical formats (contrasts, lists, puzzle-solution, headline-punchline, combinations, position taking, and pursuits). Their results showed that nearly 70 per cent of all the collective applause was associated with these seven rhetorical devices. In particular, contrasts and lists were by far the most effective: contrasts were associated with around 33.2 per cent of the incidences of collective applause during speeches, lists with 12.6 per cent. In short, nearly half the collective applause was related to the two rhetorical formats originally identified by Atkinson. According to Atkinson (e.g., 1983), there are two rhetorical devices which are widely employed to invite audience applause in political speeches: three-part lists and contrasts.

Metaphor in political communication

Metaphor refers to when a word or a phrase is used which establishes a comparison between one idea and another. When a politician is said to 'take flak' from an opponent, politics is being compared to warfare, with the politician metaphorically being shot at. On the other hand, it may be the politician who is 'on the offensive, targeting' his opponents by 'launching an attack' on their policies. Two common sources of metaphor in politics are sport and war, both of which involve physical contests of some sort. Both politicians themselves, and those who report politics, use these metaphors.

Metaphor, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 159), plays a central role in the formation of social and political reality. From a cognitive point of view, metaphor is, they argued, a conceptual system in which one kind of experience can be comprehended in terms of another. For example, one conceptual metaphor is HAPPY IS UP (ibid. p. 15). They also, argue that metaphors are important for understanding complex ideas. For example, the metaphor "HAPPY IS UP" helps us understand the feeling of happiness by comparing it to the physical direction "up" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 15). In this metaphor, "up" is the source domain (a concrete idea), and "happy" is the target domain (an abstract idea). The way we use "up" to describe "happy" is called a mapping. Kövecses (2002) adds that domains are our mental concepts or images about different experiences, like "BUILDING" or "MOTION." These mental concepts help us understand and use metaphors more effectively.

When Blair's supporters in 1997 wanted to suggest that if he won, his government would act promptly on issues, they used a metaphor taken from warfare and promised to 'hit the ground running'. This phrase originates in the idea of soldiers leaping from combat helicopters and running straight into action. After Ronald Reagan's poor showing in a televised debate in 1984, his supporters promised a campaign of 'damage control'. The word 'campaign' is itself a reference to battle, and in campaigns 'political battles are won', 'leads are surrendered'.

Metonymy in political discourse

Metonymy involves replacing the name of something with something that is connected to it, without being the whole thing. For example, the President of the United States, his government and advisors, are sometimes replaced by the much simpler term 'The White House', which is the presidential residence and administrative

center. Similarly, when an announcement is made by a member of the British royal family, it is often described as follows: 'Buckingham Palace today denied claims that the royal family is out of touch with the people.' In other words the building where they live - Buckingham Palace - replaces the name of the people who live there - the royal family. The above announcement without use of metonymy would read 'The royal family today denied claims that they are out of touch with the people' or 'The Queen today denied . . .'

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) give as an example of metonymy the phrases 'she's just a pretty face', 'there are a lot of faces out there in the audience', and 'we need some new faces around here'. Here the face as part of the human body stands for or represents the whole human body -this idea of part for whole is also sometimes referred to as **synecdoche**. Lakoff and Johnson go on to show that metonymic uses are not random, but systematic, in that they show how we organize our thoughts, actions and attitudes.

Linguistic features found in the speeches of politicians

Inaugural speech as a form of discourse offers elected public office holders the opportunity to make promises and to give assurance of good governance through effective language use. Through the analyzed speech, Trump makes a lot of presuppositions to demonstrate his vast knowledge of the Americans and current socio-political realities of the United States of America. The presuppositions serve as premise for the various promises he makes. They also account for the prevalence of structurally simple sentences through which he draws on the shared knowledge of his American listeners without boring details.

Ayeomoni and Akinkulere (2012) use the framework of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) speech act theory to this analysis of President Musa Yar'adua's victory and inaugural speeches. They identify the triad of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts in the speeches and analyse their pragmatic patterns. The study finds that though Yar'adua uses a range of speech acts such as assertives, directives, expressives, verdictives, commissives, and declaratives, asserts are however predominant in his speeches.

A pragma-stylistic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's inaugural speech with the aim of explaining the linguistic acts of the speech is done by Abuya (2012). The definition in this study borrows from Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) classification in their theory of speech acts. The paper identifies some locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. By analyzing the acts, the paper shows that President Jonathan's speech is made up of assertive, verdictive, commissive, and declarative acts, with the commissive being more widespread compared to others.

Balogun (2015) examines the use of parallelism in the speeches of President Goodluck Jonathan and President Barack Obama. This time, he uses Davy and Crystal's (1969) stylistic theory to appreciate how emphasis and foregrounding are employed in their speeches. He additionally indicates in his work that President Obama uses parallelism more aesthetically than Jonathan, which he attributed to the difference in the experience the two speakers have with the language. Furthermore, the study finds that repetition considerably contributes to the effects of foregrounding in both presidents' speeches.

One more academic paper, for example, states that "public speeches of American and Kazakh politicians have been compared. It has been proved that in the inaugural speeches of the President of Kazakhstan Kassym-Jomart Tokayev and the President of the United States Barack Obama use plenty of figures of speech to bolster the emotional effect and to accentuate their engagement with the topics". Both presidents, in their speeches, manipulate rhetoric to achieve their goals. But Obama uses more stylistic devices in his speeches than Tokayev. The analysis has represented that the most dominant stylistic device in their speeches is metaphors. It implies that presidents use metaphorical language since metaphors do have a huge impact on people and help gain support. Obama appeals to the audience's awareness by emphasizing economic and educational issues, whereas Tokayev evokes emotions by stressing national unity (Ademi et al., 2021).

CONCLUSION

The relationship between politics and language is very intricate. Language performs functions of communication, empowerment, and cultural preservation. Politically, language is identification, sovereignty, and rights. This article discusses how politicians use language in their communication. It is indicative of the

ability of politicians to equivocate in order to get around uncomfortable questions, their use of rhetorical devices that will procure applause and thus enhance their popularity, and their strategic use of personal pronouns to convey attitudes and stances, social stratification, and motivations. Furthermore, this article will examine how metaphor is used within political communication. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) showed that metaphors can highlight one aspect at the expense of another, thus simplifying a complex message, but they can also lead to misleading perceptions of reality. For example, Bush administration used a wide range of metaphors to justify military actions in the Gulf War (Lakoff, 1991).

A common language is vital for fostering national unity and identity. In nationalism, language is a key political tool for shaping national identity and forming a cohesive society. It plays a significant role in communication, persuasion, and creating political meanings and identities. Understanding the link between language and politics is crucial for analyzing political discourse, theory, and practice.

Language captures culture, history, and values of a nation, which influences governance, identity, unity, political discourse, legislation, and education. In recent writings on language and political behavior by Carver & Pikalo (2008), Chilton (2004), Fairclough (2000), and Wilson (1990) metaphors in political language are shown to be tools with which politicians oversimplify arguments, incite emotions, or in some instances show contempt of opponents. Metaphors assist politicians to gain power, demean the opponent, make their actions look right, and stress particular issues. This study is hopefully going to be used as the springboard into more and deeper research concerning the relationship between language and politics.

Finally, In Afghan political discourse, language is a vital tool for addressing the country's ethnic and linguistic diversity. Politicians use language strategically to foster national unity by promoting a shared identity and bridging ethnic divides, often switching between Dari and Pashto to engage different linguistic communities. This inclusiveness helps them build broader political support and address regional issues effectively. Politicians also use language to project their authority and gain legitimacy. For example, former President Ashraf Ghani frequently used formal and authoritative language to discuss issues of national security and development, aiming to bolster his position as a strong leader. Similarly, Hamid Karzai used inclusive rhetoric to build support across various ethnic groups, emphasizing unity and national cohesion.

Language is also crucial in mobilizing support during elections in Afghanistan. Afghan Politicians use persuasive rhetoric and slogans to appeal to voters. During election campaigns, candidates employ emotive language and address local issues to connect with their electorate on a personal level, as seen in the use of traditional proverbs and culturally resonant phrases. Overall, Afghan politicians use language to build national unity by connecting with diverse ethnic groups; to assert authority; to persuade and mobilize public support through emotive and persuasive rhetoric.

REFERENCES

1. Abdul Awal. (2022). Legal and political intervention on language issues in Bangladesh: A sociolinguistic perspective, *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability*, Vol. 1 No. 2, December: 22-35.
2. Abuya, E. J. (2012). 'A Pragma-stylistic analysis of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's inaugural Speech.' in *English Language Teaching*. Canadian Center of Science and Education .5 No. (11).
3. Ademi, Zh., Kurmanova1a, Gulnar, K., Sarsikeyeva2a, Gulzat, Zh., Utegulova3b, (2021) Political Linguistics: Public Speech of American and Kazakh Politicians, *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*.
4. Ahmed, A.M. (2013). *Amar dekha rajnitir panchash bachhar [Fifty Years of Politics as I Saw It]*. Khoshroz Kitab Mahal
5. Akinkurolere, S. O. (2011). 'A speech act analysis of selected political speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'adua'. An Unpublished M. A. Thesis of Department of English, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife.
6. Atkinson, J.M. (1983) 'Two devices for generating audience approval: A comparative study of public discourse and text'. In K. Ehlich and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Connectedness in Sentence, Text and Discourse*. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg Papers in Linguistics, pp. 199-236
7. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.

8. Ayeomoni, O.M. and Akinkuolere, S.O. (2012). "A pragmatic analysis of victory and inaugural speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (3) 461-468.
9. Balogun, S. (2015). A linguistic stylistic analysis of parallelism in inaugural speeches of presidents Barrack Obama and Goodluck Jonathan. An unpublished Master's Thesis of the Department of English, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
10. Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.
11. Bell, D. (1988). Political linguistics and international negotiations. *Negotiations Journal*, July 4(3). 233–46.
12. Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (1990). *The rhetorical tradition: readings from classical times to the present*. Boston: Bedford.
13. Bugarski, R. (2004). Language policies in the successor states of former Yugoslavia. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3(2). 198–207.
14. Bull, P. and Fetzer, A. (2006). 'Who are we and who are you? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews'. *Text and Talk* 26(1), 1-35.
15. Carver, T. and Pikalo, J. (2008) *Political Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*.
16. Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (1997). *Discourse and politics. Discourse as social interaction*, ed. by Teun van Dijk, 206–30. London: Sage.
17. Chilton, P. (1998). *Politics and Language*. In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*, 688-694. London: Elsevier.
18. Chilton, P. (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
19. Cuddon, A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary terms and Literary Theory*. London: The Penguin Group.
20. Dallmayr, Fred. (1984). *Language and politics: why does language matter to political philosophy*. London: University of Notre Dame.
21. Degani, M. (2018). From the light of truth to the dark alleys of tyranny: The evocative power of metaphor in American political speeches. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 8(2), 157–183.
22. Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language*. London: Routledge.
23. Gastil, J. (1992) 'Undemocratic discourse: A review of theory and research on political discourse'. *Discourse & Society* 3(4), 469-500.
24. Hager, A., & Hilbig, H. (2020). Does public opinion affect political speech? *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(4), 921–937.
25. Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. (1986). 'Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences'. *American Journal of Sociology* 92, 110-157
26. Hudson, K. (1978). *The language of modern politics*. London: MacMillan.
27. Helmbrecht, J. (2002) 'Grammar and function of we'. In A. Duszak (ed.), *Us and others*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 31-50.
28. Ismailov, F., Rayeva, G., Koblanova, A., Yelikbayev, B., Yessenova, K. (2020) Analysis of political and diplomatic language in linguistic, cognitive and pragmatic aspects, *Opción*, Año 36, Regular No.91 (2020): 803-819, ISSN 1012-1587/ISSNe: 2477-9385
29. Iwamoto, N. (2005). *The Role of Language in Advancing Nationalism*, *Political Science, Linguistic Journal*.
30. Kaur, P., & Shapii, A. (2018). Language and Nationalism in Malaysia: A Language Policy Perspective. *International Journal of Law, Government and Communication*, 3(7), 1-10.
31. Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
32. Kramsch, C. (2009). *Language and Culture*. London: Oxford University Press.
33. Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking power*. Basic Books.
34. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphor We Live By* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago) Main Reference: Adrian, Beard. *The language of Politics*.
35. Lin, D. (2019). "A contrastive study of university English-medium instruction lectures given by native and non-native English lecturers: rhetorical move structure and formulaic language." PhD diss., School of Foreign Languages Institute of the Social Technology Suranaree University of Technology.
36. Lopez, A. (2000). *Targeting Media*. Sydney: Copyright Agency Limited.
37. Lum, C. (2002). *Scientific Thinking in Speech and Language Therapy*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
38. Macagno, F. & Walton, D. (2014). *Emotive Language in Argumentation*. New York: Cambridge

University Press.

39. Maitland, k., & Wilson, J. (1987) 'Ideological conflict and pronominal resolution'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 495-512.
40. Markowitz, D. M., & Slovic, P. (2020). Communicating imperatives requires psychological closeness but creates psychological distance. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 39(5– 6), 598–625.
41. Mendal, N. (2001) *Language and Politics, Political Theory and Practice*, The University of British Columbia.
42. Nick, S. (2001). "Language in Diplomacy". In *Language in Diplomacy* (pp. 39). University of Malta.
43. Opeibi, B.O. (2009). *Discourse, politics and the 1993 presidential election campaigns in Nigeria Lagos: Nouvele Communications Limited.*
44. Pelinka, A. 2007. Language as a political category: the viewpoint of political science. *Journal of Language & Politics* 6(1). 129–43.
45. Şeker, N. (2005) Identity Formation and the Political Power in the Late Ottoman Empire and Early Turkish Republic, *HAOL*, Núm. 8 (Otoño, 2005), 59-67, issn 1696-2060.
46. Scotto Di Carlo, G. (2020). The 'trumpusconi' phenomenon: A comparative discourse analysis of us president Trump's and former Italian prime minister Berlusconi's political speeches. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 14(2), 43–72.
47. Schaffner, C. (1996). 'Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis.' *Current Issues in Language and Society*. 3 (3) <http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/>
48. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: CU
49. Shah, S. W. A., & Pathan, H. (2016). Representation of Western Culture in O' level English Language Textbooks. *English Language Forum (ELF)*, 18.
50. Tanaka, K. (1992) *Kokkago o Koete [Beyond a national language]*. Tokyo: Chikuma Publishing Co.
51. Tong, H. K., & Cheung, L. H. (2011). Cultural identity and language: A proposed framework for cultural globalization and glocalization. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(1), 55-69.
52. Wilson, J. (1990) *Politically Speaking*. Basil Blackwell.
53. Xhemaili, M. (2022). The Importance of The English Language in Public Diplomacy and International Relations, *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs*, DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.47305/JLIA2281322x>