



## The Pragmatic Functions of Propaganda Techniques

### in Al-Abadi's Selected Political Speeches

**Eba' M. Yahya Al-Rassam**

Asst. Prof / Dept. of English Language /College of Arts / University of Mosul

**Riyadh Ameen Hussein**

Asst Lect./ AlMesk Secondary School/ Nineveh ducation Directorate

#### Article information

##### Article history:

Received June 9, 2022

Review July 8, 2022

Accepted July 16, 2022

Available online December 1, 2023

##### Keywords:

Al-Abadi,

Impoliteness,

Politeness,

Propaganda Techniques,

Political Speech.

##### Correspondence:

Eba' M. Yahya Al-Rassam

[ebamudhafar@yahoo.com](mailto:ebamudhafar@yahoo.com)

#### Abstract

Today, using propaganda becomes very prevalent in the world and it is easier to spread than it has ever been. It can be used by politicians, military states, advertisers, media, and social matters. The present study identifies propaganda techniques that are used by the ex-prime minister Haider Al-Abadi in his speeches. Also, it accounts for the pragmatic functions of these techniques. A lot of attention is being paid, as well to the (im)politeness strategies that are interrelated within these techniques. It hypothesizes that politicians use propaganda because they have certain intentions and these intentions are reflected in the choice of the techniques. Also, it hypothesizes that Iraqi politicians try to be polite in that they do their best in order not to use impoliteness strategies and use politeness strategies instead. The following procedures are adopted: (1) choosing certain speeches of Al-Abadi (2) Analyzing six political speeches according to the synthetic model that we have adopted. The findings of the analysis confirm the above-mentioned hypotheses.

DOI: [10.33899/radab.2023.179929](https://doi.org/10.33899/radab.2023.179929), ©Authors, 2023, College of Arts, University of Mosul.

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## الوظائف التداولية لاساليب الدعاية في خطابات سياسة مختارة للعبادي

رياض أمين حسين\*\*

إباء مظفر يحيى الرسّام\*

المستخلص

\* استاذ مساعد / قسم اللغة الانكليزية /كلية الاداب / جامعة الموصل  
\*\*مدرس مساعد / ثانوية المسك / مديرية تربية نينوى

استخدام الدعاية (Propaganda)) في هذه الايام أصبح رائجاً في العالم, إذ إنها تنتشر بسهولة أكثر من أي وقت مضى.. فيمكن استخدام الدعاية من قبل السياسيين والوحدات العسكرية وفي الاعلانات ووسائل الإعلام والقضايا الاجتماعية.

تبين هذه الدراسة اساليب الدعاية (Propaganda Techniques) التي يستخدمها رئيس الوزراء السابق (حيدر العبادي) في خطابه السياسية.

فضلاً عن أنها تفسر الوظائف البراغماتية (أي التداولية) لهذه الاساليب المستخدمة في خطابات العبادي. كما يتم ايضاً اعطاء الكثير من الاهتمام للاستراتيجيات المهذبة وغير المهذبة (Politeness Strategies) (Impoliteness Strategies) and المترافقة ضمن الاساليب المستخدمة لغرض الدعاية ..

تفترض هذه الدراسة أن السياسيين يستخدمون الدعاية لأن لديهم نوايا معينة وتنعكس هذه النوايا في اختيار الأنماط او الاساليب المختلفة الخاصة بالدعاية. كما أنها تفترض ايضاً أن السياسيين العراقيين يحاولون أن يكونوا مهذبين مع جمهورهم من حيث أنهم يبذلون قصارى جهدهم حتى لا يستخدموا استراتيجيات غير مهذبة (Impoliteness Strategies) ,

بدلاً من ذلك يتم استخدام استراتيجيات مهذبة. (Strategies (Politeness) في هذه الدراسة يتم الاعتماد على الإجراءات الآتية: (1) اختيار بعض خطابات العبادي (2) تحليل ستة خطابات سياسية للعبادي على وفق النموذج التركيبي الذي اعتمدها. واخيراً, تظهر لنا نتائج التحليل بان الفرضيات المذكورة في أعلاه قد تحققت .

**الكلمات المفتاحية :** العبادي ، اساليب الدعاية ، الحديث السياسي ، الاستراتيجيات غير المهذبة ..

## 1. Introduction

Propaganda has been in use for centuries and it is one of the oldest terms that people associate with communication. With advances in communication technologies, propaganda has become increasingly important since it affects communication both domestically and abroad. In this modern day, propaganda becomes more dangerous (Vincent 2006: 233). As propaganda connects with communication channels, it is considered a suitable device to convert common opinion through persuasive or manipulative techniques. Politicians usually use propaganda as an influential procedure to attract the masses' attention and deviate it to a specific political action.

Our aim in this study is to identify the propaganda techniques that are used by the ex-prime minister of Iraq Haider Al- Abadi in some of his speeches. Then, to detect the pragmatic functions of these techniques by paying attention to the (im)politeness strategies that are used within these techniques. Consequently, this study hypothesizes that politicians use propaganda because they have certain intentions and these intentions are reflected in the choice of the techniques. It hypothesizes as well, that politicians try to be polite in that they do their best in order not to use impoliteness strategies and use politeness strategies instead.

The questions that this study tries to answer are: Is the language of the propaganda used by Al-Abadi merely informative? What types of propaganda techniques that Al-Abadi uses in his speeches to deliver his intentions? Is there any room for (im)politeness in his

speeches? In order to test the hypotheses of this study, achieve the objectives and answer the above-mentioned questions, the following steps are going to be adopted: (1) The literature about political propaganda will be outlined concentrating on the techniques that are used by politicians to convey their intentions and purposes, in addition to some pragmatic notions such as the (im)politeness strategies. (2) Choosing six political speeches of Al-Abadi. (3) Analyzing these speeches according to the model we have adopted.

## **2. What is propaganda?**

Defining the term propaganda is not an easy task, nor is it always easy to identify. Conventionally, activities referred to as propaganda might further be categorized as image consulting, public relations efforts, and the common information or news shared. Likewise, advertising can be measured as propagandistic in nature (Vincent 2006: 233). The purpose of propaganda is simply to convert beliefs and persuade others with the help of deliberately selective and biased information. Many widespread examples of propaganda use are illustrated and include Napoleon's use of the press, painting and even his image or China in the early 19th century.

In the most neutral sense, propaganda means to disseminate or promote particular ideas or beliefs by transferring an ideology to an audience with a related objective. Words such as lies, distortion, deceit, manipulation, mind control, psychological warfare, brainwashing, and palaver are frequently used as synonyms for propaganda (Jowett and O'Donnell 2012: 2).

According to Jowett and O'Donnell (2012: 7) propaganda is 'the deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behaviour to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist'.

When examining the words of the fore mentioned definition, we will find that the word "deliberate" means willful and intentional. It implies careful consideration to be most effective in promoting an ideology as well as maintaining an advantageous position. The word "systematic" complements "deliberate" because it means "precise and methodical, carrying out something with organized regularity." "Attempt" refers to the goal of the propagandist in which he/she tries to create a certain audience. "Shaping perceptions" is usually attempted through language and images, which is why slogans, posters, symbols, and even architectural structures are developed. As perceptions are shaped, cognitions may be manipulated. This definition, in fact, 'reflects the common view of propaganda as self-interested manipulation – an assumption that can be difficult to prove, because propagandists try to conceal their motivation and intent' (Jowett and O'Donnell 2006: 7).

Soules (2015: 6) claims that propaganda aims to gain the compliance of its mass audience and mobilize it to act, or not act, in the propagandist's interests. Similar to this view, Ellul (1973) considers propaganda as an essential instrument in democracy simply because the

audience participates in political decisions.

Moreover, Snow (2010: 66) says that ‘when a persuasive message is designed to benefit only the sender, it moves toward propaganda, especially by consciously misleading or exploiting beliefs, values, and attitudes for the propagandist’s benefit. Because propaganda attempts to sway mass public opinion in favour of the objectives of the institutions (usually state or corporate).’

The three mentioned views point to the same meaning which illustrates that propaganda is set to be in favor of the propagandist only, i.e. not in favor of the masses.

On the other hand, Stanley (2016: 114-116) believes that such a thing is too narrow, for governments and others can issue propaganda that is not misleading or false. According to him propaganda need not be necessarily false and the propagandist must not be dishonest or support bad causes. Thus, Stanley's point is that propaganda can be used for good or bad.

Although propaganda employs persuasive plans to manipulate the masses, yet it differs from persuasion in purpose. Jowett & O’Donnell (2012: 29-33) illustrate that propaganda tends to be linked with a general societal process, whereas persuasion is regarded as an individual psychological process. They claim that persuasion seeks to change attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviours, with mutual needs being met. It is regarded as more mutually satisfying for both sides (persuader and persuadee) than propaganda. Thus, both the persuader and the persuadee stand to have their needs fulfilled.

Whereas the purpose of propaganda is promoting a partisan or competitive cause, not to satisfy both sides and not necessarily to be in the best interest of the recipient, in the best interest of the propagandist instead. However, the recipient may believe that the information communicated by the propagandist is merely informative and may seem to be indisputable and thus totally factual. Accordingly, the propagandist knows that the main purpose is not promoting mutual understanding between him/her and the audience but rather to stimulate and raise his/her own objectives. Hence, the propagandist can control information flow and be able to manage a certain public view by shaping perceptions through using informative communication (Jowett & O’Donnell 2012: 31-34).

### **3. The model of analysis**

The model of this study is a synthetic one, in that we have analyzed the data according to the propaganda techniques suggested by Lee and Lee (1939), Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies and Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies, as they are illustrated below:

#### **3.1. Lee and Lee's (1939) propaganda techniques**

The Institute for Propaganda Analysis (IPA) was created in 1937 and it was an

American- based organization that contains opinion leaders, social scientists, journalists, etc., headed by an American person called Edward A. Filence. The (IPA) was designed to highlight rational thinking and its purpose was to educate and offer a guide to help America and the public from the persuasiveness of political propaganda as well as the dangers that could be possible threats to the democratic ways of life. The concentration of (IPA) was on domestic propaganda issues, that's why it published a series of books. One of the most influential books edited by Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth Briant Lee's (1939) was 'The Fine Art of Propaganda' (Vincent 2006 :243). This book outlines and illustrates seven propaganda devices or what is called "tricks of the propagandist" that frequently occur in political issues.

According to Vincent (2006) these devices or techniques are used in communication textbooks and taught in school. These techniques, as a result, are so artfully articulated in this day and they are; name calling, glittering generality, transfer, testimonial, plain folks, card stacking, and finally the bandwagon effect. These concepts are illustrated below.

### **3.1.1. Name calling**

Name calling technique makes use of labels directed at an idea in the form of verbal abuse. It is an attempt to project an idea in the light of either favourable or unfavourable matter by negatively impacting the opponent's view. This technique encourages the masses to draw emotional reactions and achieve hasty conclusions depending on what is said (Vincent 2006: 243). Thus, it may give "bad names" to individuals, groups, nations, races, policies, practices, beliefs, and ideals which the propagandist labels as something the masses fear and reject, without examining the evidence. By using discriminatory words such as; "terrorists, heretics, communists, tyrants, killers, etc", the propagandist gives a negative label to whatever he/she wants the audience to view negatively and arouses suspicion and prejudice. He/she appeals to the audience's hate and fear. The aim is to reach absolute hate or dislike of the categorized group. So, the reasonable game is to verbally attack the opponent's beliefs, leaders, religion, institutions, etc (Lee & Lee 1939: 26).

### **3.1.2. Glittering generalities**

The tendency in this technique is to associate an idea or an issue that the propagandist desires with a virtuous or noble term. This device is planned to stir and provoke both faith and respect in listeners and readers (Vincent 2006: 245). The propagandist makes generalized statements attractive to the audience to appeal to their emotions of generosity, love of country, glory, desire for peace, family values, patriotism, and anything general enough to inspire pride. He/she uses good words like prosperity, truth, freedom, loyalty, social justice, and democracy to suggest shining ideals. Thus, these words are used as instruments to make the masses accept a certain program. So, the propagandist wins the

masses' approval (Lee & Lee 1939: 47).

### **3.1.3. Transfer**

This device is proposed to carry over the approval and authority of an issue the masses love and revere like "a flag" to something the propagandist wants the masses to accept. In other words, linking a revered symbol like "a flag or a church" with an event, idea, or a program that the propagandist promotes. This stir of emotions makes it difficult for people to clear their minds and think critically. Thus, the propagandist transfers the symbol's authority, sanction, and prestige to the program he/she wants. Then, the masses may accept and approve of what the propagandist says. This technique is used both for and against causes and ideas and symbols are constantly used here, such as; the cross, flag, a picture of a national hero, a shrine, etc. (Lee & Lee 1939: 69).

### **3.1.4. Testimonial**

This technique explains that a famous or distinguished and respected unpopular personality is used to recommend a service, individual, idea, program in either a positive or negative light (Vincent 2006: 248). Testimonial tries to make a kind of association or link between seemingly an authoritative person and the cause. The aim is that the respected person will vouch and lead the masses to follow the propagandist's program by means of giving value to this program. The propagandist secures statements or letters from prominent people with the expectation that the crowd will follow the leader. Frequently, testimonials can be observed in quotations of famous personalities and then to be exploited by propagandists to guarantee a program and to give as much as credibility to their political cause (Lee & Lee 1939: 74).

### **3.1.5. Card stacking**

Card stacking occurs when a presentation uses a selection of facts and distortion, elucidation and confusion, and both logical statement (Vincent 2006 :251). Thus, propagandist selects and omits facts, distorts information to win the masses' support for his/her group, nation, race, policy, practice, belief, or ideal. The propagandists tell the audience only part of the truth that supports their own ideas and hide unwanted incidents. So, they can control the beliefs of the masses by stacking the cards against the truth, resorting to lies, omitting facts and offering false testimony. Politicians often present the positive side of their own by exaggerating their facts and hiding their negatives. Conversely, they present whatever negatives of their opponent and omit their positives as well (Lee & Lee 1939: 95).

### **3.1.6. Plain folks**

According to Vincent (2006 :250) plain folks is used when politicians wish to convince the audience that they are similar to everyone else, just like common people. In fact, the propagandist or the politician uses this technique as a way to persuade the audience that he/she is a humble or a normal person, "one of the folks, not of an elite". To win the audience's confidence, he/she appears to be a person like them who shares their own concerns. The plain folks may occur either through language or activities such as; praying in the mosque as an ordinary person, visiting a church, kidding with people, playing with kids, or taking a family out to dinner. Thus, he/she is able to build trust with his/her followers (Lee & Lee 1939: 101).

### **3.1.7. Bandwagon**

The bandwagon approach involves the utilization of a notion that "everybody is doing it" or "we are all doing it", so that group members are encouraged just to join or follow the crowd (Vincent 2006 :252). Lee & Lee (1939: 105) believe that this technique builds an impression of widespread support to reinforce the people's desire to be members of the winning team. The propagandist hopes everybody cooperates or participates and joins the cause. Thus, the propagandist wishes the masses not to be isolated.

### **3.2. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory**

Brown and Levinson's work consists of two parts. The first part is their fundamental theory concerning the nature of "politeness" and how it functions in interaction. The second part is a list of politeness strategies. In the theoretical part of their work, Brown and Levinson introduce the nature of the notion of "face" in order to illustrate politeness in the broad sense. That is to say, all interactions have an interest in maintaining two types of face during interaction: positive face and negative face. Brown and Levinson define "positive face" as the positive and consistent image people have of themselves, and their desire for appeal. On the other hand, "negative face" refers to the individual's desire for freedom of action and imposition (Watts 2003: 86). Brown and Levinson (1987) outline four main types of politeness strategies:

#### **3.2.1. Bald on record**

The speaker does not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. The main reason for using it is that whenever a speaker wants to do FTA with maximum efficiency more than he wants to satisfy the hearer's face, even to any degree, he will choose bald on record strategy (Brown and Levinson 1987: 94-98). This type of strategy is commonly found in people who know each other very well, and who are very comfortable in their environment, such strategy is usually found between close friends and family members who are very familiar with each other.

### **3.2.2. Positive politeness**

Positive politeness strategy is oriented to enhance the positive face of the hearer. "Positive face is the hearer's need to be accepted and appreciated by others. It leads achieving solidarity through offers of friendship. This strategy includes: notice to the addressee's needs or goals, exaggerating interest or approval, intensifying interest to the addressee, using in group identity markers, seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, raising or asserting common group, Joking, asserting or presupposing knowledge and concern for the hearer's wants, offer or promise, be optimistic, include the addressee in the activity, give or ask for reasons, assume or assert reciprocity and finally give gifts to the addressee (sympathy, understanding, cooperation, etc.)" (Brown and Levinson 1987: 101-129).

### **3.2.3. Negative politeness**

This strategy is oriented towards a hearer's negative face. Negative face is the desire of every person to be free from imposition and not to be impeded by others. Therefore, negative politeness strategies automatically assume that there might be some social distance or awkwardness in the situation (Brown and Levinson 1987: 129). This strategy is tending to; "be conventionally indirect, use question or hedge, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, impersonalize by avoiding "I" and "you", state the FTA as a general rule, nominalize, and go on record as incurring a debt".

### **3.2.4. Off record (indirect)**

This strategy is the opposite of bald on record strategy. The main purpose here is to take some of the speaker's pressure off. The FTA is preformed "Off Record" typically through the development of an indirect illocutionary act that carries more than one interpretation and hence, allows for reasonable deniability on the part of the utterance if the intended recipient takes offense at the face threat inherent in the utterance (Bousfield 2008: 58). If the speaker chooses to do the FTA, it means that he wants to withdraw the responsibility in doing it. The speaker, in fact, can do off record and give the addressee the option to decide how to conceive it. In this strategy, the threat to the face is very high. Brown and Levinson (1987: 211), mentioned ways of doing off record, such as; tautology, metaphor, rhetorical question, ellipsis and, ambiguity.

### **3.3. Culpeper's (1996, 2005) impoliteness strategies**

The adopted model of the analysis in this research is partly based on Culpeper's impoliteness strategies which are first stated in Culpeper (1996) and slightly revised in (2005). These strategies to an extent mirror the politeness strategies of Brown and



Levinson (1987). Culpeper in fact, reformulates the discursive nature of social interaction. According to Culpeper (1996: 356) impoliteness consists of the following strategies:

### **3.3.1. Bald on record impoliteness**

The FTA is performed in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and, a concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized.

### **3.3.2. Positive impoliteness**

This strategy as Culpeper (1996) designed is “to damage the addressee's positive face wants. It involves ignoring or snubbing the others (failing to acknowledge the other's presence), excluding the other from an activity, dissociating from the other (e.g. denying association or common ground with the other; avoiding sitting together), being disinterested/ unconcerned/ unsympathetic, use inappropriate identity markers (e.g. use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains), use obscure or secretive language (e.g. mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target), seek disagreement, make the other feel uncomfortable (e.g. do not avoid silence, jokes, or use small talk), use taboo words/ swear/ abusive/ profane language and finally, call the other names or use derogatory nominations”.

### **3.3.3. Negative impoliteness**

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. It includes; “frighten (instill a belief that a detrimental action will occur to the others), condescend/ scorn/ ridicule (emphasizing relative power), belittle the other (e.g., using diminutives), being contemptuous, not treating others seriously, invade the other's space – literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship), personalize by using "I" and "you" and finally, put the other's indebtedness on record” (Culpeper 1996).

### **3.3.4. Sarcasm or mock politeness**

The FTA achieved in this strategy is “by using the politeness strategies that are clearly insincere, i.e. on the surface, the utterances seem polite while the intended meaning is the opposite. For example, (How a smart student you are. Said by a teacher in a sarcastic way to his student). The role of sarcasm is to fulfill social disharmony and it is of course, the opposite of mock impoliteness (banter) which is used for social harmony” (Culpeper 1996).

#### **4. Data analysis**

In the following section, six speeches of Al-Abadi are analyzed according to the model we have suggested for the study. Yet, due to the shortage of space, only one extract of Al-Abadi is given as an example for each technique. All six speeches are analyzed in the same way and the frequency of the techniques are to be calculated and shown in Table (1). Also, this table would show the (im)politeness strategies that have been found within these techniques and their frequencies.

##### **1. Name calling**

Extract ( 1 )

" ولقد أراد التكفيريون ومعهم البعثيون وبقايا البعث أن يوقفوا ولادة عراق جديد "

Translation: The expiatory individuals, along with the Baathists and their remains wanted to stop the birth of a new Iraq.

Name Calling is the first technique of propaganda that Al-Abadi uses in his political speech. In this regard, he labeled the opponent nations as "terrorists, the Baathists and expiatory group". These labels have strong implications for neutralizing the opponent and at the same time, sending an alarming message to those individuals who might follow their path. This technique is used to appeal to the emotional prejudices of the audience by instilling fear among them by means of horrible names as mentioned before. Thus, he hopes to win the masses' trust and approval.

The negative impoliteness strategy is used to display contempt when Al-Abadi belittles the Baathists altogether with those groups whom he called expiatory people. His aim is to arouse the mass to hate and scorn any group who tries to be against him as a president and against the progress and prosperity of Iraq.

##### **2. Glittering generalities**

Extract ( 2 )

" فقد وضعنا ضمن برنامجنا أهدافاً أساسية، كان موضوع الإصلاح الاقتصادي والمالي والإداري في مقدمتها، إضافة " إلى مكافحة الفساد "

Translation: We have set basic goals within our program, which the matter of economic, financial and administrative reform was at the front as well as anti-corruption.

Utilizing "Glittering Generalities" as a second technique of propaganda, Al-Abadi intends to associate his program with shining and glittering future via "good words" that everyone in the audience is waiting for. Raising issues like economic, financial, and administrative reforming as well as anti-corruption will inevitably attract the people's attention and make them agree and accept with what the propagandist says. These simple catchphrases are deeply exploited by Al-Abadi to win the audience on his behalf.

Al-Abadi uses "Noticing or Attending to the masses' want" as one of the strategies of positive politeness to show interest in the masses' needs. The pragmatic function of the technique used in this extract is to inform the audience that their social insurance will be achieved. He pays close attention to the audience's social rights.

### **3. Transfer**

Extract ( 3 )

" نُعلنُ لكم ولكل العالم أنّ الأبطالَ الغيارى قد رفعوا علمَ العراق فوق مناطقٍ غربيّ الأنبار التي كانت آخرَ أرضٍ عراقيةٍ مغتصبة، وأن علمَ العراق يرفرفُ اليومَ عالياً فوق جميعِ الأراضي العراقيةِ وعلى أبعدِ نقطةٍ حدوديةِ "

Translation: We announce to you and to the whole world that our heroes have raised the Iraqi flag over western Anbar areas that were the last Iraqi-occupied land. Today, the Iraqi flag flies high above all the Iraqi lands and at the farthest border point.

Transfer, is another type of propaganda techniques by which Al-Abadi makes use of the good reputation and prestige of the Iraqi flag to transfer the victory he had made over ISIS in all Iraqi provinces. He makes a positive declaration and creates confident feelings for the masses by linking the symbol of the flag to the victory to make the latter more cherished.

Al-Abadi, in this piece of speech, is feeling proud and confident about the announcement of the event of rising the Iraqi flag over the buildings of Iraqi provinces that were under the authority of ISIS. These provinces are now, released and returned back to the lap of the country by the brave Iraqi soldiers who stood against ISIS. On this occasion, Al-Abadi is relying on "intensifying interest" towards the audience to be used as a pragmatic function of positive politeness.

### **4. Testimonial**

Extract ( 4 )

" في مثل هذا اليوم, خسر العراق شخصية بارزة , واسما لامعا , وعالما مجاهدا واصل الليل والنهار من اجل التصدي " للظلم ورفع راية الحق ومحاربة الظالمين والارهابيين والانتصار لهذا الشعب العظيم, هو السيد الشهيد محمد باقر الحكيم "

Translation: On this day, Iraq lost a prominent figure, a brilliant name, and a struggling scientist who continued day and night in order to confront injustice, raise the banner of justice, and fight the tyrants and terrorists to get victory for these great people. He is the martyr master Muhammad Bakir Al-Hakim.

Testimonial is another technique of propaganda that is used in this extract by Al-Abadi. He used this device as an instrument to associate fighting against terrorism to the struggle of an appreciated person "Muhammad Bakir Al-Hakim." This "big name" is a reinforcement for the audience to do whatever the speaker wants and thus, Al-Abadi

mentioned this name to give credibility to his program. Politicians, usually, take advantage of the names of respected and well-known persons to direct the audience to something they planned to do.

Al-Abadi uses "minimizing imposition" to the audience's face as a pragmatic function of negative politeness. He avoids being offensive toward the audience.

## **5. Card stacking**

Extract ( 5 )

"استطعنا ان نعبر ببلدنا عاماً ونصف العام من الضغط المالي، وتحديات نفقات الحرب، وحفظنا البلد من انهيار كان وشيكاً بكل المعايير المالية والاقتصادية، حين اضطر فيها عديد من الدول إلى اعلان خطط قاسية بالرغم من ارصدها الكبيرة واحتياطاتها الضخمة والتي لا يملكها العراق"

Translation: We could manage to pass through our country a year and a half of financial pressure, and challenges of war expenditures. We saved the country from a collapse that was imminent by all financial and economic standards, where many other countries were forced to announce tough plans despite their large assets and huge reserves that Iraq does not have.

Card Stacking is also one of the techniques of propaganda used by Al-Abadi as a way of showing his positives only and the negatives of the opposing countries. By carefully using only those facts that support his side, he makes the best case possible for his side and the worst for the opposing people, whether they are natives or foreigners. So, exposing some parts of facts like leading the country to a safe side, is taken as an exaggeration at this opportunity. In contrast, he leaves and hides so many social essential issues to be discussed and solved. However, by using his positive card, he intends to earn the faith and belief of the audience.

Al-Abadi here avoids using the pronoun "I" and uses "we" instead, in order not to give offence to his masses. This "Impersonalize" strategy is part of the negative politeness used by him.

## **6. Plain folks**

Extract ( 6 )

"وقد قلنا للمتظاهرين منذ البداية نحن منكم ومعكم في خندق واحد ولسنا في خندقين"

Translation: From the beginning, we have told the protesters that we are one of you and we are with you in one trench, not in two.

By using the Plain Folks device of propaganda, Al-Abadi attempts to convince the audience that he is one of the protesters who want their social rights as Iraqi citizens. He intends to satisfy the protesters with the plain folks and to cover up his selfishness and failure. His inability to fulfill what the citizens need to live in their country leads him to

retain this strategy as a potential tool to make them calm. Thus, he may be considered a wise person and the one who deserves to be the leader.

Al-Abadi uses "in group identity marker" to claim common ground and be part of the protesters. The pragmatic function of this positive politeness strategy is to convince the audience that he is a humble person.

## 7. Bandwagon

Extract ( 7 )

"وأكثر همنا اليوم هو ادامة زخم الانتصارات بكل ما يملك العراق وشعبه من مقدرات مالية وبشرية، فالمعركة مقدمة " على كل الاولويات لأنها معركة وجود وطن وشعب ويجب ان تكون كذلك. واليوم اناشدكم في هذه الظروف الحساسة والخطيرة التي يمر بها العراق وتمر بها المنطقة موقفا موحدًا"

Translation: Today, our most important concern is to retain the energy of victories with all the financial and human resources that Iraq and its people have. The priority is for the battle because it is for the sake of the existence of a nation and home and it must be so. Today, I appeal to you in these sensitive and dangerous circumstances that Iraq and the region are going through a unified position.

This part of Al-Abadi's speech is an urgent request made to the public by using the Bandwagon technique. He appeals to all Iraqi people to join the battle with everything they have and support the victory. This is an implication to contribute to the crowd and if they don't jump on this bandwagon and participate in this war against the terrorists who occupy several Iraqi provinces, then the chance will pass them by and become loser. Thus, he intends to motivate the Iraqi people to support the battle and to be united.

Bald on record politeness is used directly and concisely by Al-Abadi as an imperative formulaic entreaty represented by "I appeal to you". The pragmatic function of this technique which is bandwagon is to ask the masses to support the battle against ISIS.

## 5. Results and discussion

The results of the analysis are elaborated in the following table with the total numbers of propaganda techniques and (im)politeness strategies

No.	Propaganda Techniques	Frequency	Politeness Strategies	Frequency	Impoliteness Strategies	Frequency
1	Name Calling	5	Bald on Record	16	Bald on Record	0
2	Glittering Generalities	28	Positive	40	Positive	0

3	Testimonial	5	Negative	12	Negative	6
4	Transfer	6	Off Record	1	Sarcasm	0
5	Card Stacking	14				
6	Plain Folks	1				
7	Bandwagon	16				
<b>Total</b>		75		69		6

Table (1): Total numbers of propaganda techniques, (im)politeness strategies.

From the six selected political speeches of Al-Abadi, it is found that the seven propaganda techniques were used 75 times, as illustrated in the table above, to influence people to believe or follow a certain program or idea. This is a clear indication that almost all political speeches contain propaganda techniques.

One of these techniques is highly frequent in the data and it is used 28 times by Al-Abadi which is "Glittering Generalities." This technique as Lee & Lee (1939: 47) mentioned, utilizes "virtue words" to appeals to the masses' emotions of love and generosity. Therefore, Al-Abadi attracts the masses' attention by polishing certain programs and referring to glittering words like freedom, prosperity, social justice, and public service. Because almost all people believe in these ideas and wait for hope from the president to live happily and safely. This is why Al-Abadi uses much of "Glittering Generalities."

Concerning the least frequent technique, it is found that "Plain Folks" only appeared once in Al-Abadi's speeches. Lee & Lee (1939: 101) assert that this technique mostly occurs when doing activities such as; playing with children, taking a family out to dinner, praying in Masjid with ordinary people, kidding with people, considering oneself one of the attendant members, etc. Therefore, these actions are not often happened with authoritative people. Usually because of their prestige and the value of time.

Concerning the (im)politeness strategies that are used within these propaganda techniques, it is found that politicians often make use of politeness strategies more than impoliteness ones as shown in the table above. Politicians, in order for their messages to be accepted and approved, tend to avoid impolite forms of communication. Instead, they try to be polite in their utterances as much as possible and give the masses a feeling of expectation and desire for certain benefits to happen. So long as a politician displays polite aspects and offers social services, the audience accepts and sticks to his/her program.

The analysis demonstrates that the positive politeness strategy appeared more than other strategies. The reason behind this proportion is that positive politeness is basically built to "establish common ground" with the masses and to fulfill their wants to make them feel

good.

The strategies of positive politeness, actually, spring from three broad mechanisms; claiming common ground, conveying that S and H are cooperators, and fulfilling H's want. Concerning "claiming common ground" with the hearer in communication, Brown and Levinson (1987: 103) state that it is a major class of positive politeness by which a series of conversational moves recognize the partner's or the audience's needs. In the same way, political speeches often carry a message of interpersonal relationships between the speaker and the masses to represent a commonality of knowledge, attitudes, interests, goals, and in-group membership. Thus, Al-Abadi emphasizes that both he and the masses are cooperators and want common ground in order to reach the same thing.

In a similar study of politeness strategies conducted by Al- Ameedi and Khudhier (2015) it was found that Obama uses 60% of positive politeness in his collection of five political speeches. It is clear that politeness strategies are very important in political speeches as both Obama and Al-Abadi adhere to politeness strategies in order to keep communication effective.

Off record politeness, on the other hand, is used only once because this strategy relies heavily on indirect language to convey the intended meaning. Therefore, politicians rarely use implicature in their speeches and they hardly give the hearer a chance to interpret the speaker's exact meaning. Instead, they generally depend on obvious and easily perceived language to be understood by all the levels of the masses without leaving any room for ambiguity and so does Al-Abadi.

A very small room is left to use impoliteness strategies in Al-Abadi's political propaganda where it is appeared only six times. That was used just to scorn ISIS and belittle their social role.

## **6. Conclusions**

The current study was conducted to investigate propaganda techniques that are used by the ex-prime minister of Iraq Haider Al-Abadi and to find the pragmatic functions of these techniques. Also, to account for the (im)politeness strategies that are associated with these techniques. The analysis of the data has shown that there is extensive use of the "glittering generalities" technique. The use of "wide" terms typically with high moral connotations is the key that Al-Abadi mostly uses to enter his audience's minds. While the least frequent technique is "plain folks" because it does not accord with the nature of the political speeches.

It has been revealed that the seven propaganda techniques so far examined are being used by Al-Abadi to achieve certain purposes. In other words, these techniques are used to achieve certain pragmatic functions. Of these functions are directly the masses towards the direction the politicians want, by exploiting their feelings and emotions, and by provoking

certain memories and using certain words and concepts, Al-Abadi wins the audience to his cause. The techniques used by Al-Abadi help him in creating common ground and being part of his people. He makes his people dream of a better life and gives them hope for a better future.

Thus, creating an optimistic atmosphere among them. As such, the first hypothesis has been confirmed. The second hypothesis comes in line with other studies in that Iraqi politicians use politeness strategies to appear in their best status to the audience and to pretend to be honest and humble. On the other hand, very little room is being given to the impoliteness strategies and whenever used, they are directed towards the enemy and opponents.

### **References**

1. AL-Ameedi, Riyadh and Khudhier, Zina. (2015). 'A pragmatic study of Barak Obama's political propaganda'. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 6 No. 20.
2. Bousfield, Derek. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
3. Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen. (1978, 1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Culpeper, Jonathan. (1996). 'Towards an anatomy of impoliteness'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25. 349-367
5. \_\_\_\_\_ (2005). 'Impoliteness and entertainment in the TV quiz show: The weakest link'. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1. 35-72.
6. Ellul, Jacques. [1965] (1973). *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*. New York: Vintage Books.
7. Jowett, Garth and O'Donnell, Victoria. (2006). *Propaganda and Persuasion*, 4th edn, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ (2012). *Propaganda and Persuasion*. London: SAHE publication, Inc.
9. Lee, A. and Lee, E. (1939). *The Fine Art of Propaganda: A Study of Father Coughlin's Speeches*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company
10. Stanely, Jasson. (2016). *The Free Speech Fallacy*. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 26.
11. Soules, Marshall. (2015). *Media, Persuasion and Propaganda*. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
12. Snow, N. (2010). *Propaganda, Inc.: Selling America's Culture to the World*, New York: Seven Stories Press.



13. Vincent, Richard C. (2006). Global Communication and Propaganda. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305220829>. On 2019. October, 23
14. Watts, Richard. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge University Press.