

GENERAL FEATURES OF WAR SPEECHES

By

Geraldine Ifesinachi Nnamdi-Eruchalu

Department of English Language and Literature

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

E-mail: g.nnamdi-eruchalu@unizik.edu

Abstract

Variation is an essential ingredient of all human languages. What is to be done with language determines the kind of language to be used. This study sets out to discover the linguistic items favoured by war leaders in their efforts to garner support for war from their citizens and the international community. The researcher argues that there is something in war speeches that convinces people to agree to embark on war. Using deliberate selection as the sampling technique, the researcher collected as many war speeches delivered by different war leader across the globe, as possible. The analysis reveals that war speeches share many linguistics features in common, all of which are directed towards persuading the audience to accept the awful alternative of war.

Introduction

War is a state of armed conflict or hostilities between two or more groups, states, or nations over a period of time. As a kind of social activity, it is conceived, planned, accompanied, executed, sustained and even resolved in language. Language, therefore is a very important societal property. It is the bedrock of all forms of communication in society. Man is a social animal and relate with others through language. When we are not communicating with others we are communicating with ourselves. By language here we do not mean an abstract formal system, but afunctional tool used by members of society to carry out diverse activities in social life. One of such activities is prosecuting wars.

War is a word with various shades of meaning, but in this context, it refers to a form of political violence or aggression carried out between groups within a nation or between nations of the world. War is preponderant in this modern world. In the words of Clausewitz, it is “an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will”(75). The absence of war is peace. Though peace is advocated, and war is condemned as unjustifiable and wasteful, war seems inevitable due to the aggressiveness of the human species. War is a calamity and social disaster. It is synonymous with fighting, and fighting is synonymous with death. It involves deliberate killing and maiming of people. Many also die from starvation and diseases. The world has lost billions of lives to violence of different magnitudes in most parts of the world.

The general population of most countries drawn into war does not always desire the war, but are talked into it by their leaders. Consequently, such leaders seek and utilize oratorical powers to convince the people to embrace war despite the enormity of its consequences.

War speeches, like other political speeches, do not consist of presentation of aims, attitudes, demands, good ideas, but involves a conscious attempt at constructing convincing messages that will achieve the desired effect on the audience. Such speeches encapsulate the problems, necessities, and achievements of the time, and serve as a powerful instrument of persuasion, explanation, and manipulation. War is a period of crisis, and at such times speeches serve many outstanding functions. Wartime leaders use emotive language to paint a sinister image of the enemy so as to evoke grave resentment towards the threat they represent; justify the reasons for war, and use persuasive strategies to gain the support and allegiance of the people. Wenzlowski states that:

speeches that deal with war mainly aimed at creating a feeling of unity, enthusiasm and at enhancing patriotism by referring and appealing to a

nation's history, ideology, convictions and values that are in danger and have to be defended. At the same time the politician has to point out his own position, resolution, his personal authority and responsibility. All in all, it is his task to "promote" the righteousness and necessity of a possible war (3).

Wartime speeches have to be duly ornamented if they are to achieve their persuasive intents. In the words of Wenzlowski "political, and especially speeches that deal with war have to be stirring, appealing and convincing..." (25). Consequently, political leaders employ many rhetorical devices to make their speeches sound more appealing and persuasive. Rhetorical devices are the devices used to manipulate the language to transmit the author's message to a reader effectively. This writer maintains that language is an instrument for the political and social control of many by those in authority, and they utilize it effectively to their own advantage. People are convinced to embrace war despite all odds. To this end the writer sets off to analyze war speeches delivered by war time leaders of the world with a view to discovering the rhetorical features they share in common.

Rhetorical Devices Used in War Speeches

Among the common rhetorical / stylistic devices that have been associated with war speeches over the years include:

- **Strategic Uses of Pronouns:** Pronouns are words used instead of nouns and noun phrases to avoid repetition. They belong to the class of function words, and so do not bear the major meanings in a sentence. In the political sphere, persuasion is of utmost importance, and pronouns have been found to be fundamental in the process. Pronouns have the potentials to "change the meaning or understanding of the sentence, or even of the perception of the speaker depending on how they are

used” (6). Defining pronouns in this light, Bramley notes that “pronouns are linguistic devices that express fixed social relations used to socially construct identities rather than objectively represent them” (13). Nakaggwe observes that:

Even though pronouns do not convey meaning to the extent as content words, which give meaning to a sentence, they may change the meaning or understanding of the sentence or even the perception of the speaker depending on how they are used. Pronouns also indicate the relationship between speaker and listener or between the speaker and a certain situation. Pronouns can place distance between speaker and listeners or a situation or express solidarity and unity. (4)

Personal pronouns specifically provide war leaders with wonderful persuasive strategies to represent their identity, that of the audience and the enemy. Personal pronouns are frequently and strategically used in speeches that deal with military actions and war to manipulate and emphasize meaning. They are used to manipulate the hearer’s perception so as to persuade them and gain support since they embody different shades of meaning. For instance, the inclusive pronoun – ‘We’ (its objective case ‘us’ and possessive counterpart ‘our’) is used by speakers to create rapport with the audience as well as encourage solidarity and evoke a feeling of shared responsibility and unity. Including the audience in the talk makes them identify with the speaker. Audience members feel they are recognized in the venture, and are made party to the organization and prosecution of the war. Examples:

For three years **we** have fought against overwhelming odds. Our conduct of the war has been contrasted sharply with that of the Nigerian hordes. **We** were always aware of **our** limitations, and therefore have never discontinued **our**

efforts for peace and a negotiated settlement. (Odumegwu Ojukwu. "A Call from Exile". January 16, 1970)

A signature was forced out of **us** with a pistol at **our** head and with the threat of hunger for millions of people. And then this document, with **our** signature, obtained by force, was proclaimed as a solemn law. (Hitler. "Speech to Reichstag". September 2, 1939)

We are there because **we** have a promise to keep. Since 1954 every American President has offered support to the people of South Viet-nam. **We** have helped to build, and **we** have helped to defend. Thus, over many years, **we** have made a national pledge to help South Viet-nam defend its independence. (Johnson. "Peace without Conquest". April 7, 1965)

The pronoun 'I' enable's the speaker to show personal involvement, commitment, responsibility as well as assert authority because war speeches are shrouded in power elements, hegemony and ideologies. It also awakes the impression that the speaker is willing and resolute to personally answer for his convictions in the subject of his speech. Here are examples:

I should like to say this to the world. **I** alone was in a position to make such proposals, for **I** know very well that in doing so **I** brought myself into opposition to millions of Germans.(Hitler. "Speech to Reichstag". September 2, 1939)

I pledged in my campaign for the presidency to end the war in a way that we could win the peace. **I** have initiated a plan of action which will enable me to keep that pledge. (Nixon. "Silent Majority" Speech. November 3, 1969)

The personal pronouns ‘he/she/it’ or ‘they’ and the demonstratives, ‘these’ and ‘those’ help speakers to separate themselves and their group from the opponent by effectively constructing different identities for themselves and their group on one hand, and the opponent on the other hand. In the words of Wenzlowski, they enable “the speaker to distance ‘we’ from the enemy” (6). They aim at demonstrating differences and ‘otherness’ of the individual or group denoted by them – thereby establishing the concept of ‘us’ versus ‘them’. Examples:

They will be defeated. This is the real determination. (Gaddafi, Tripoli. July 8, 2011)

Beaulieu fled with the remains of **his** army. Already Normandy may be considered as belonging to the Republic. At this moment Beaulieu is passing through the Venetian States, many of whose cities have closed their door upon **him**. (Bonaparte. “Letter to the Directory”. May 11, 1796)

This war, like most wars, is filled with terrible irony. For what do the people of North Viet-nam want? **They** want what **their** neighbours also desire: food for **their** hunger; health for **their** bodies; a chance to learn; progress for **their** country; and an end to the bondage of material misery. And **they** will find all **these** things far more readily in peaceful association with others than in the endless course of battle. (Johnson. “Peace without Conquest”. April 7, 1965)

The position of Prussia in Germany will not be determined by **its** liberalism but by **its** power ... Prussia must concentrate **its** strength and hold it for the favorable moment, which has already come and gone several times. Since the treaties of Vienna, our frontiers have been ill-designed for a healthy body politic. (von Bismarck. “Blood and Iron” Speech. 1892)

The pronoun ‘you’ can have the effect of strong appeal. Writers distinguish between referential ‘you’, impersonal ‘you’, and the vague ‘you’ (Kitagawa and Lehre 1990, Nakaggwe 2013). The referential ‘you’ identifies a specific person; the impersonal ‘you’ is indefinite in nature and refers to everyone, while the vague ‘you’ refers to an unidentified specific individual. Of these, the impersonal ‘you’ is of special interest in war speeches because it addresses the general public on issues that equally affect them. Examples:

“Soldiers, **you** are naked and ill-fed! Government owes **you** much and can give **you** nothing. The patience and courage **you** have shown in the midst of these rocks are admirable; but they have gain **you** no renown; no glory results to **you** for your endurance...” (Napoleon. Address to the Army at the Beginning of the Italian Campaign. March, 1796)

And so tonight – to **you**, the great silent majority of my fellow Americans – I ask for your support. (Nixon. “Silent Majority” Speech. November 3, 1969)

- **Justification:** Wartime leaders often strive to contrive reasons for embarking on wars. Wars effectuate calamity on the human race and cannot be embarked upon for flimsy reasons like to punish people that have done wrong or to recapture lost things. For war to commence, innocent lives must have been endangered, while it is undertaken as an interventionist approach to protect them. Though wars are catastrophic, they are considered just when they meet certain criteria stipulated by the Just War Theory – “right to go to war” (jus ad bellum) and “right conduct in war” (jus in bello). To this effect, leaders of warring nations or groups make the people see the rationale for beginning a war and sustaining the struggle until victory is achieved, as well as try to abide by the right conducts or else be charged with war crimes. The justification given for the Iraqi war, for instance, was to

prevent terrorists or other attacks on the United States or other nations which war opponents considered a breach of the first criteria above. They criticized the United States for waging 'a war of aggression' against Iraq. Justification for war may be political, economic, religious or ideological. Ojukwu pleads political justification below:

In 1966 it became clear that the central authority was unable and unwilling to fulfill the terms for which it was established. Right under her nose the people of Eastern Nigeria, now Biafrans, were subjected to such acts of barbarism, such atrocities that gave clear indication of a genocide that was to come. The people of Biafra in full consultation and believing that the only guarantee for security lay in the resumption of the sovereignty, mandated me to proclaim their territory the sovereign and independent republic and Biafra, and to take up arms if need be to protect the lives and property of our people and the independence was proclaimed. On July 6, 1967, the Federal forces crossed the boundaries of Biafra and attacked her defenseless populace. Our people, in the face of such aggression, had no alternative but to defend themselves as best they could. (Odumegwu Ojukwu. "A Call from Exile". January 15, 1970)

Other examples are:

This is not a question of fighting for Danzig or fighting for Poland. We are fighting to save the whole world from the pestilence of the Nazi tyranny and in defense of all that is most sacred to man. This is no war of dominion or imperial aggrandizement or material gain; no war to shut any country out of its sunlight and means of progress. It is a war, viewed in its inherent quality, to establish, on impregnable rocks, the rights of the individual, and it is a war to

establish and revive the stature of man. (Churchill. "Speech at the Outbreak of World War II". September 3, 1939)

What are the main facts? There were six countries which entered the war at the beginning. Britain was last, and not the first. Before she entered the war, Britain made every effort to avoid it; begged, supplicated, and entreated that there should be no conflict. (George. June, 1917)

- **Repetitions:** It is a common feature of all human communications to encourage repetition "very much on purpose and for rhetorical ends" (Johnstone, 170). Repetition involves saying or doing something again usually for the sake of emphasis. It was first used in the 15th century, and was derived from the Middle English word, *repeticion*. It is aimed at highlighting the indispensability of the ideas or thoughts they express to the conduct of the war. When something is repeated, it enters the subconscious and influences the thoughts and actions of the audience – the desired effect of the writer. It, therefore, presents strong expressions of emotions. Examples:

You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: **victory: victory** at all costs, **victory** in spite of all terror, **victory**, however long and hard the road may be; for without **victory**, there is no **survival**. Let that be realized; no **survival** for the **British Empire**, no **survival** for all that the **British Empire** has stood for, no **survival** for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal... (Churchill. "Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat". May 13, 1940)

It is **impossible** to demand that an **impossible** position should be cleared up by **peaceful revision** and at the same time constantly rejects **peaceful**

revision. It is also **impossible** to say that he who undertakes to carry out these **revisions** for himself transgresses a **law**, since the Versailles “Diktat” is not **law** to us. (Hitler. Speech to Reichstag. September 2, 1939)

For **France is not alone! She is not alone! She is not alone! She** has a vast Empire behind her. **She** can align with the British Empire that holds the sea and continues the fight. (De Gaulle. June 18, 1940)

Repetition appears in different forms some of which includes anaphora, alliteration, parallelism.

- **Anaphora:** It is a rhetorical device that consists of the repetition of the same word(s) at the beginning of successive clauses or phrases in order to secure emphasis, to heighten the style, distinctness, or charm. Anaphora was derived from the Greek word for carrying back or up. It has been explored by many speakers, writers and poets. Repeating key word(s) at such a strategic position as the beginning of a sentence makes the speech memorable. Anaphora is a powerful rhetorical device to appeal to the emotions of the audience so as to persuade and motivate it. Examples:

We shall go on to the end,

We shall fight in France

We shall fight on the seas and the oceans

We shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air

We shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be

We shall fight on the beaches

We shall fight on the landing grounds

We shall fight in the fields and in the streets

We shall fight in the hills

We shall never surrender... (Churchill. "We Shall Fight on the Beaches".

June 4, 1940)

Last night, Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong.

Last night, Japanese forces attacked Guam.

Last night, Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands

Last night, the Japanese attacked Wake Island. (Roosevelt. "Day of Infamy".

December 8, 1941)

The opposite of anaphora is epiphora (also epistrophe); a word that refers to the repetition of words at the clause's end. The combination of these two gives rise to symplote.

- **Alliteration:** Alliteration is the repetition of a consonant mainly at the beginning of two or more words in a sentence or succeeding lines (in poems) to emphasize meaning. It brings in elements of music in speeches and poems, and therefore brings out "beauty in language use" (Ezeaku 55). Examples:

The second wave targeted other ships and shipyard facilities. (Roosevelt. "Day of Infamy". December 8, 1941)

We are sure that these liberties **will** be in hands **which will** not abuse them. (Churchill. Speech to the House of Commons. September, 1939)

Our **d**ifficulties and **d**angers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them (Churchill. "Iron Curtain" speech)

We wish that this **w**ere not so. But **w**e must deal with the **w**orld as it is, if it is ever to be as **w**e wish. (Johnson. "Peace without Conquest". April 7, 1965.)

- **Parallelism:** Wartime leaders employ linguistic foregrounding in the form of pattern repetition to bring their message to the fore. This involves the replication of a pattern through parallelism (Simpson 2004). In the words of Fabb (462), “parallelism is a relationship of partial identity between two sections of a text”. Yankson defines literary parallelism as “the use of pattern repetition in a literary text for particular stylistic effect” (14). Parallelism involves the presentation of ideas or messages in grammatical equivalent form so as to make them evocative and compelling. It also bestows on messages balance, rhythm, grace, artistic and lyrical coherence that make them memorable.

Parallelism was coined by Robert Lowth from the Latin Phrase *parallelismus membrorum* (parallelism of members) though it was originally derived from the Greek word for ‘beside one another’. The study of parallelism around the world was pioneered by the Russian Roman Jakobson. Parallelism is broadly divided into two types – structural and semantics parallelism. In the English language, structural parallelism operates at the levels of phonology and syntax. Phonological parallelism (sound pattern parallelism) manifests in the form of alliteration; rhyme and metre while syntactic parallelism occurs in the sentence when there are similar words, phrases, clauses, that perform the same grammatical functions. Semantic parallelism is the parallelism between words that are semantic opposites – synonyms and antonyms. Examples of parallelism in war speeches include:

Behind all this glare, behind all this storm, I see that small group of villainous men who plan, organize, and launch this cataract of horrors upon mankind.
(Churchill. “Speech on Hitler’s Invasion of USSR”. June 22, 1941).

The past, with its crimes, its follies, and its tragedies, flashes away.

(Churchill. "Speech on Hitler's Invasion of USSR". June 22, 1941).

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger. (Roosevelt. "Day of Infamy" Speech. December 8, 1941)

It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall rule and guide the conduct of the English-speaking people in peace as they did in war. (Churchill. "Iron Curtain" Speech.)

- **Rhetorical Questions:** These are questions asked to make a point or achieve a particular effect on the addressee, rather than to get an answer. It, therefore, functions as a declarative sentence, though its form is interrogative. Rhetorical questions are asked to raise the consciousness of the audience to the realities of the situation so that they can consider the message or speaker's viewpoint. If this rhetorical device is effectively constructed it endears the speaker to members of the audience and makes them want to consider the speaker's message. Rhetorical Questions do not need answers. They are aimed at raising the consciousness of the audience to the realities of the situation. Examples:

For 18 white men, Europe is aroused. **What have they said about our millions? 18 white men assisting the crime of genocide! What does Europe say about our murdered innocents? How many black dead make one missing white?** Mathematicians, please answer me. **Is it infinity?** (Odumegwu Ojukwu. "The Ahiara Declaration". June 1, 1969)

Yes soldiers, you have done much – but remains there nothing more to do?

Shall it be said of us that we know how to conquer, but not how to make use of victory? Shall posterity reproach us with having found Capau in

Lombardy? (Napoleon. “Proclamation to the Soldiers on Entering Milan”. May 15, 1796).

Why must we take this painful road? Why must this nation hazard its ease, and its interest and its power for the sake of a people so far away? (Johnson. “Peace without Conquest”. April 7, 1965.

Also, Ariel Sharon remarked to Palestinians:

Today I suggest that you think long and hard what you and your children would want to achieve in the coming years. **Will you continue to follow those who lead you to ruin, destruction and despair? Will you continue to be misled by those who call upon your sons to commit suicide, or will you follow those who choose to progress and to thrive?** (February 11, 2009)

- **Hyperbole:** This is “the use of exaggerated terms to emphasize the importance or extent of something” (Drabble and Stringer 355). This device blows a thing or situation out of proportion to attract and sustain the attention of the audience. Hyperbole makes things sound better, more exciting, delicate, and dangerous than what they are.

I have ordered my Air Force to restrict itself to attacks on military objectives. If, however, the enemy thinks he can from that draw carte blanche on his side to fight by the other methods, he will receive **an answer that will deprive him of hearing and sight.** (Hitler. “Speech to Reichstag”. September 2, 1939)

- **Simile and Metaphor:** These figures of comparison are used to create vivid images in the minds of the audience. According to Drabble and Stringer, 463),

metaphor is “the transfer of a name or descriptive term to an object different from but analogous to that to which it is properly applicable. Unlike simile, metaphor compares two dissimilar things by establishing a direct relationship between them – describing one as if it were the other. Examples:

It is not quite the story of **the wolf and the lamb**. I will tell you why – because Germany expected to find **a lamb and found a lion** (George. June, 1917)

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic **an iron curtain has descended across the Continent**. Behind that line lies the capitals of the ancient states of central and Eastern Europe. (Churchill. “Iron Curtain” speech.)

Simile, on the other hand, is a literary device that compares two things, phenomena or concepts using **as, like, as if, as though**, and by so doing, asserting similarity in otherwise two dissimilar things. Harvey describes it as “an object, scene, or action, introduced by way of comparison for explanatory, illustrative or merely ornamental purpose (756).

I see also the dull, drilled, docile, brutish masses of the Hun soldiery plodding in **like** a swarm of crawling locusts. (Churchill. Speech on Hitler’s Invasion of USSR.)

This excerpt from Lloyd George’s speech contains a metaphor and a simile.

She is not the **Jonah** in this storm. The part taken by our country in this conflict, in its origin, and in its conduct, has been **as honourable and Chivalrous as** any part ever taken in any country in any operation (June, 1917)

Jonah in this excerpt is a metaphor, while **as honourable and chivalrous as** is a simile.

- **Readiness to adopt Military Option:** Speeches of this nature display speakers resolve to accept military option as the only way out of the crisis situation that led to the war. It shows readiness to display military in pursuit of political objective.

Consider this:

This night for the first the Polish regular soldiers fired on our territory. Since 5.45 a.m. we have been returning the fire. And, from now on, bombs will be met with bombs. Whoever fights with poison gas will be fought with poison gas. Whoever departs from the rules of humane warfare can only expect that we shall do the same. (Hitler. "Speech to Reichstag". September 2, 1939).

4.11 Anticipating Objections: War is a delicate and catastrophic venture that affects every aspect of life in society. It is natural that citizens should question, at least in their mind, whether the reasons for embarking on a war are worth endangering their lives and property.

Some may ask: Why act now? Why not wait? The answer is clear: The world could wait no longer. Sanctions though having some effects, showed no signs of accomplishing their objective. Sanctions were tried for well over 5 months, and we and our allies concluded that sanctions alone would not force Saddam from Kuwait. (President George Bush. "Announcing War against Iraq" January 16, 1991)

Tonight, therefore, I would like to answer some of the questions that I know are on the minds of many of you listening. Let us all understand that the question before us is not whether some Americans are for peace and some Americans are against peace.... (Nixon. "Silent Majority" Speech. November, 1969)

➤ **Use of Evidence:** A big task before a persuasive speaker is to transmit his ideas clearly and creatively. One of the ways of achieving persuasiveness in war speeches is by making skillful use of supporting materials to bolster the speech. Evidence helps to clarify and reinforce your ideas. Strong evidence is useful in war speeches because many members of the target audience are skeptical about the speakers' ideas, and will definitely oppose the speech at least in their mind –“asking questions, raising objections, and creating counter arguments to “answer” what you say” (Lucas 434). Evidence consists of supporting material such as testimonies, statistics, and facts.

i. **Testimonies-** Testimonies of other people usually influence decision making. Listening to the testimonies of those we consider knowledgeable and of sound mind is capable of swaying the audience into accepting their positions. Such people can be quoted directly or paraphrased in order to create the desired impact in your speech. Example:

Listen to one of our great officers out there, Marine Lieutenant General Walter Boomer. He said: “There are things worth fighting for. A world in which brutality and lawlessness are allowed to go unchecked isn't the kind of world we're going to want to live in” (Bush. “Announcing War against Iraq”. January 16, 1991)

Listen to Master Sergeant J.P. Kendall of the 82nd Airborne: “We're here to for more than just the price of a gallon of gas. What we are doing is going to chart the future of the world for the next hundred years. It's better to deal with this guy now than 5 years from now”. (Bush. “Announcing War against Iraq”. January 16, 1991)

- ii. **Facts and Figures**– The clarity and authenticity of ideas are heightened by supporting them with figures. We have been accustomed to numbers as they seem to reflect our knowledge. Examples:

More than a million people of German blood had, in the years 1919-1920, to leave their homeland. (Adolf Hitler. Speech to Reichstag. September 2, 1939)

At 7:53 a.m. on Sunday, December 7, 1941, the first assault wave of Japanese fighter planes attacked the U.S. Naval base at Pearl Harbor... The first wave targeted airfields and battleships. The second wave targeted other ships and shipyard facilities. The air raid lasted until 9:45 a.m. Eight battleships were damaged, with five sunk. Three light cruisers, three destroyers and three smaller vessels were lost along with 188 aircraft. The Japanese lost 27 planes and five midget submarines which attempted to penetrate the inner harbor and launch torpedoes. (Roosevelt. "For a Declaration of War". 8 December, 1941)

Fifty years ago, in this room and at this very desk, President Woodrow Wilson spoke words which caught the imagination of a war-weary world. He said: "This is the war to end all wars. His dream for peace after World War I was shattered on the hard realities of great power politics and Woodrow Wilson died a broken man. (Nixon. "Silent Majority" Speech. November 3, 1969)

- **Anecdotes:** Anecdotes are short stories taken from the speaker's own life which helps to authenticate his/her evidence. Anecdotes must be related to the content of the speech in order to give it a boost. Example:

I was a member of the cabinet at the time, and I remember the earnest endeavours we made to persuade Germany and Austria not to precipitate

Europe into this welter of blood. We begged them to summon a European conference to consider. .. (George, 1917)

- **Touching on Emotion:** Emotional appeals make persuasive speeches compelling. The speaker consciously chooses emotion-arousing language to create emotional pictures in the listeners' mind's eye. This is achieved by choosing words that can provoke all manner of emotions that the speaker requires of his audience. Such words used deliberately to create an emotional impact or response are called emotive words. Meanwhile, emotion does not rest on the words or phrases themselves, but on the audience when the words or phrases can spark an emotional response, that is, when they strike the right chords in the audience. Examples:

I thank you for your absolute commitment to the cause for which our youth are making daily, **the supreme sacrifice**, and a cause for which we all have been **dispossessed, blockaded, bombarded, starved and massacred**. I salute you. I salute **the memory of the many patriots who have laid down their lives in defense of our fatherland. I salute the memory of all Biafrans – men, women and children – who died victims of the Nigerian crime of genocide....** (Odumegwu Ojukwu. The Ahiara Declaration. June 1, 1969)

Yesterday, December 7th, 1941 - a date which will live in **infamy**—the United States of America was **suddenly** and **deliberately** attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan...No matter how long it may take us to overcome this **premeditated** invasion, the American people in their **righteous** might will win through to absolute victory. (Roosevelt. "Day of Infamy". December 8, 1941)

- **Appeal to a Supreme Being:** One striking feature of war speeches is an appeal to a supreme being, the level of preparedness of the army notwithstanding. Upon this Supreme Being rests the strength and hope for sustenance and victory. This is a reflection of the limitations of the human specie in deciding his/her destiny. Examples:

The freemen of the world are marching together to victory! I have full confidence in your courage, devotion to duty and skill in battle. We will expect nothing less than full victory! Good luck! And let us all beseech the blessings of Almighty God upon this great and noble undertaking. (Eisenhower. Address to the troops about to take part in the Normandy Invasion”)

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain inevitable triumph. So help us God. (Roosevelt. “For a declaration of War”. December, 1941)

I must warn all Easterners once again to remain vigilant. The East will never be intimidated, nor will she acquiesceto any form of dictation. It is not our intention to play the aggressor. Nonetheless, it is not our intention to be slaughtered in our beds, we are ready to defend our homeland. Fellow countrymen and women, on Aburi we stand. There will be no compromise. God grant peace in our time. (Odumegwu Ojukwu. “On Aburi we Stand”. May, 1969)

- **Playing on the Listener's Sense of Guilt:** War leaders employ this technique to get undivided and unwavering support from the people despite the monumental destructions of lives, property and infrastructure involved in wars.

These are not easy times. A rasping cry is heard from some quarters in these days when we must - more than ever - remain calm, reasonable and restrained. When it comes to matters of war and peace, we must not act rashly. There is a time for everything - not too late and not too early. This is the only way to win a war and the only way to achieve sustainable peace. (Sharon' Speech to Israel)

Let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that. (Nixon. "Silent Majority" Speech. November 3, 1969.)

- **Contrasts:** Contrasts mean comparing two or more ideas, concepts, phenomena in order to show the difference between them is an effective way to convince the audience. Contrasts highlights the good attributes of the chosen idea over its counterpart by making the difference between them glaring and easily understood by the audience. Examples:

This is no class war, but a war in which the whole British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations is engaged, without distinction of race, creed, or party. It's not for me to.....but...(Churchill. "Speech on Hitler's Invasion of USSR". June 22, 1941).

I see the ten thousand villages of Russia where the means of existence is wrung so hardly from the soil, but where there are still primordial human

joys, where maidens laugh and children play.(Churchill. “Speech on Hitler’s Invasion of USSR”. June 22, 1941.)

Not through speeches and majority decisions will the great questions of the day be decided - that was the great mistake of 1848 and 1849 - but by iron and blood. (Bismarck. “Blood and Iron” Speech. 1892)

- **Positive Self-presentation and Negative Other-presentation:** Every society creates a sense of identity that allows individuals to be classified into two hierarchical groups: ‘us’ and ‘them’. ‘Us’ is ‘self’, while ‘them’ is ‘other’. ‘Self’ signals partnership and togetherness while ‘other’ represents a potential enemy and a valueless group who threaten the peace of ‘us’. The concept of ‘self’ and ‘other’ is a long standing sociological concept that centres on how majority and minority identities are constructed. Its use also extends to the fields of literary studies and psychology. This introduces us to the concept of otherness. In the words of Staszak

otherness is a result of a discursive process by which a dominant in-group (“us” the self) constructs one or many dominated out-groups (“them” other) by stigmatizing a difference – real or imagined – presented as a negative of identity and thus a motive for potential discrimination. (2)

The in-group carves out an identity for itself, and perceives the out-group as a valueless group which opposes the in-group. Third person pronouns and demonstratives serve to demonstrate differences and ‘otherness’ of the individual or group denoted by them. In war situations, speakers use this feature of language to present their own side of the conflict as the genuine one which the enemy nation has wickedly set out to attack. The enemy nation is the devil, while theirs is the angel. This feature of war speeches helps the speaker to establish the relation between ‘us’ and ‘others’. Example:

For two long years, we have been locked in mortal combat with an enemy unequalled in viciousness; for two years, defenseless and weak we have withstood without respite the concerted assault of a determined foe. We have fought alone. We have fought with honour. We have fought in the highest traditions of Christian civilization. Yet the custodians of the civilization and our one-time mentors are the very self-same monsters who have threatened to devour us. (Odumegwu Ojukwu. "The Ahiara Declaration". June, 1969)

Findings

The study reveals that war leaders being mindful of the hard times they would plunge their nation and her inhabitants into by embarking on war resorts to the manipulation of their thought and actions through effective discursal manipulation. Discourse manipulation arises from effective deployment of linguistic items to achieve desired goal on the audience. It takes the form of mind control which obstructs alternative interpretation of the linguistic items presented to you. To achieve the desired effect on the people, war leaders deploy such linguistic embellishments as strategic use of pronouns, justifications, euphemism, positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, hyperbole, appeals and many other stylistic devices in war speeches.

Conclusion

War portends great danger to life and resources, and so will naturally be avoided by many people. Where it becomes inevitable, leaders resort to speeches (and propaganda) to convince the people to embrace it despite all odds. They engage the resources of language to persuade the people to put up a spirited fight in support of the war. To succeed in this persuasive agenda, war leaders adorn their language by the use of rhetorical devices. This

chapter explores some of these rhetorical devices that have been associated with war speeches over the years. They include: the strategic use of pronouns, use of justifications, parallelism, repetitions, hyperbole.

Works Cited

Bush, George. "Announcing War against Iraq". January 16, 1991. Web. 2 February 2013.

[www.history place.com](http://www.historyplace.com)

Churchill, Winston. "At the Outbreak of World War II". 3 September 1939. Web.

<[www.history place.com](http://www.historyplace.com)>

-----"Blood, Toil, Tears and Sweat". 13 May 1940. Web. 8 March 2013.

<http://www.winstonchurchill.org>

----- "We Shall Fight on the Beaches". 4 June 1940. Web. 8 March 2013.

<<http://www.winstonchurchill.org>>

Clausewitz, Carl von. "On War". (Ed. & Trans.). Howard, Michael and Peter Paret. New Jersey: Princeton, 1984. Print.

Collins, Tim. "Eve of the Battle Speech". March 19 2003. Web. 10 March 2014.

Ezeaku, Afamefuna." Fundamentals of Literature". Awka, Anambra: Fab Anieh, 2014. Print.

Harvey, P. and Eagle D. (Rev). The Oxford Companion to English Literature. Oxford: Oxford, 1967. Print.

Hitler, Adolf. "Speech to Reichstag". September, 1939. 22 September, 2013.

Nakaggwe, Lynn. "The Persuasive Power of Personal Pronouns in Barack Obama's Rhetoric". Unpublished paper prepared by the Department of Education and Public Programmes, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum. 2012. Web. 15 July 2014. www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:600522/FULLTEXT02.

Napoleon, Bonaparte. "Proclamation to the Soldiers on Entering Milan". May 15 1796. Web. 22 September 2013.

Neville, Chamberlain. "On Nazi Invasion of Poland". 1 September 1939. Web. 8 March 2013. <http://www.historyplace.com>

Nixon, Richard. "Silent Majority" Speech. 3 November 1969. Web. 22 September 2013. <http://www.vietnamwar.net>

Nnamdi-Eruchalu, Geraldine I. "Parallelism as a Linguistic Tool in Ezenwa Ohaeto's "A Chant at the Anthole" and "The Living and the Dead" In *African Literature and Development in the Twenty-First Century: Proceedings of Ezenwa-Ohaeto International Memorial Conference*. Owerri, Imo: Living Flames, 2009. 219 - 226. Print

Odumegwu Ojukwu. "A Call from Exile". 16 February 1970. Web. 12 October 2012.

----- "On Aburi we Stand". 30 May 1969. Web. 12 October 2012. <http://www.dawodu.com>

----- "The Ahiara Declaration". 1 June 1969. Web. 12 October 2012. <http://www.dawodu.com>

Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Day of Infamy" Speech. 8 December 1941. Web. 22 September, 2013

-----“First Inaugural Address”. 4 March 1933. Web. 20 September 2013.<<http://www.artofmanliness.com>>

Sharon, Ariel. “Speech to Israel”. 21 February 2002. Web. 20 September 2013. <<http://www.cbnnews.com>>

Wenzlawski, Jennifer. “Words at War – The pragmatic Rhetoric of War Speeches: A Comparison of War Speeches by Winston Churchill and George W. Bush”. Germany: Grin, 2005. Web. 5 January 2013.

<http://books.google.com/books/about/Words>