

Linguistic Disintegration in the Political Speeches of President George W. Bush

Asst. Prof. Dr. Adawiya Hayyawi Doohee
College of Political Science, University of Kufa, Iraq
Email: adawiyah.doohi@uokufa.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

Disintegration is a method whose dialectical potential depends on dividing a single concept into two parts, where they are portrayed as unequal by presenting one as more important than the other. Disintegration consists of speech act, presuppositions, and conversational implication, as well as spatial and temporal characterization and positive and negative politeness strategies, Politicians tend to use persuasive appeals, repetition, metaphor, analogy, exaggeration, and manipulation. Therefore, this study seeks to study the Disintegration in the political discourses of US President "George W. Advocates the use of disintegration in political speeches.

Keywords: Linguistic Disintegration, Persuasive appeals, Exaggeration, George W. Bush.

Section One

Introduction

Disintegration is based on a dialectical method by dismantling the original concept into two new concepts that leads to a result different from the original concept. The two new concepts resulting from separating the original concept are portrayed as unequal, and this method of deconstructing discourses is considered one of the most rhetorical means for politicians to persuade the public to accept their views. In their view, it is one of the appropriate means for creating political power.

Problem

The research problem emerges from the focus on studying disintegration from a practical perspective used in political discourse, and thus, answering the following questions:

- 1- What is the nature of the pragmatic structure of disintegration in political speeches?
- 2- What are politicians' strategies in issuing their deconstructive arguments?
- 3- What are the rhetorical means that make disintegration effective to attract the audience?

Goal

The research seeks to study the grammatical and semantic structure of Disintegration, and achieve a set of goals, the most prominent of which are:

- Determine the pragmatic structure of Disintegration.
- Identify occasions when disintegration is used in political speeches.
- Know the rhetorical tools that politicians use to make Disintegration effective.

Hypothesis

- 1- The study assumes that politicians resort to disintegration in the event of discomfort or a negative judgment being directed against them. Politicians also tend in their arguments to use persuasive appeals, repetition, metaphor, simile, exaggeration, and manipulation.
- 2- The disintegration argument consists of the speech act, the presupposition, and the implicit effect of the conversation.

Procedures

For the purpose of achieving the objectives of this study, the following procedures were followed:

- 1- Conduct a theoretical survey of the literature related to disintegration, and some pragmatic issues.
- 2- Using the eclectic model in analyzing this study.
- 3- Analysis of some selected texts from American political speeches.

Limits

The study is limited to a practical investigation of disintegration in American political speeches, especially speeches related to US President George W. Bush, taken from various websites, in addition to examining the texts.

Value

The study is concerned with researching the pragmatic aspects of disintegration, and it is expected that the study will be of value in the fields of politics, pragmatism, and applied linguistics, and to those interested in this study will benefit.

Section Two

The relationship of disintegration to related concepts

Disintegration is one of the argumentative and rhetorical methods means that politicians use in their speeches to convince the public of their points of view through strategic maneuvering in order to establish power, establish influence, and show the other competitor to be less efficient and capable of managing matters, where one concept is divided into two new, unequal concepts, and more importance is given to one of the two concepts. At the expense of the other. Accordingly, we divide this requirement into four paragraphs: The first paragraph, disintegration in political speeches. The second paragraph, disintegration, semantic transformation, and euphemism. The third paragraph, disintegration, discrimination and division. The fourth paragraph: Disintegration, identification, and convincing definition.

The first paragraph: Disintegration in political speeches

The term “Disintegration” means “separation.” If you separate yourself from a thing or person, you show that you are not connected to them. A concept that constitutes a single entity is divided into a new concept that differs from it (Agnes van Rees, 2009: 13), For example: the letter of the law and the spirit of the law, or that national security is linked to military power, but it is linked to establishing economic relations with other countries (David Zarefsky, 2014: 125).

Disintegration in its expanded form is defined as: "disintegration is an argumentative technique in which, in order to resolve a contradiction or incompatibility, a unitary concept expressed by a single term is split up into two new concepts unequally valued, one subsumed under a new term, the other subsumed either under the original term, which is redefined to denote a concept reduced in content, or under another new term with its own definition, the original term being given up altogether" (Agnes van Rees, op. cit: 13).

Disintegration is known as: "By processes of disintegration, we mean techniques of separation which have the purpose of dissociating, separating, disuniting elements which are regarded as forming a whole or at least a unified group within some system of thought. Disintegration modifies such a system by modifying certain concepts which make up its central parts" (Hervé Corvellec, 2008: 18).

Disintegration differs from cutting ties. Disintegration begins with the speaker starting with one concept and dividing it into two independent concepts, which involves a profound change in the conceptual statements used in the evidential argument, while cutting ties begins and continues with two separate and independent concepts (J. R. Cox, 1986: 93 – 99).

The philosophical pairs resulting from Disintegration result from the opposition between appearance and reality, for example: "personal – objective", and "individual – universal". Philosophical pairs consist of two terms in the hierarchy of value, with the first term representing what the disputant considers deceptive, insubstantial, or Irrelevant, while the second term represents what is real, essential, or relevant (David Goodwin, 1992: 4 – 13).

Disintegration can be used to define the situation, which is: "Affects what counts as data for or against a proposal, highlights certain elements of the situation for use in arguments and obscures others, influences whether people will notice the situation and how they will handle it, describes causes and identifies remedies, and invites moral judgments about circumstances or individuals" (David Zarefsky, op. cit: 230).

The Disintegration depends on a semantic and conceptual mechanism that is translated into a linguistic formulation, as a new concept crystallizes, the content of which is determined in a specific time context in three terms, which are (Corina Andone and Anca Gâță, 2011: 5 – 19):

- 1- Terms emerging from disintegration within institutional environments, such as: scientific discourse, have a long life expectancy, and later become appropriate concepts in a particular social – historical context.
- 2- Terminology arising from disintegration in ordinary communication, such as: everyday conversations, has a long life expectancy, and includes argumentative purposes in the context of conversation in which it was developed.
- 3- Terms emerging from disintegration in institutional settings and ordinary communications, and characterized by a life expectancy, if later reused in this way for their special suggestive power or potential for persuasion.

The term disintegration in political speeches refers to it as a way to exercise power and strengthen private interests, as politicians exploit the means of separating appearance from reality to convince the public through their interpretation of standards, evidence, or issues that are portrayed as the best option, and that alternative interpretations are false appearances (K. M. Olson, 2013: 50).

There are reasons that push politicians to use the decomposition technique to achieve their specific goals, and the most prominent reasons are (Agnes van Rees, op. cit: 112, 113):

- 1- The feeling of discomfort resulting from the clash between how things are defined and how one perceives things. For example: a person or thing may be described in a positive way, while one feels less inclined toward it.
- 2- When a negative judgment or explicit accusation is made against a person or thing, and one may wish to confront it, it is not always possible to deny the accusation clearly, and in this case the solution is to introduce Disintegration.
- 3- Trying to evade an accusation of contradiction. The speaker may commit himself to certain assertions that he cannot deny, without risking being accused of inconsistency. This contradiction can be eliminated using deconstruction.

The second paragraph: Disintegration, semantic transformation, and euphemism

The term semantic shift refers to the transfer of the meaning of a utterance from one domain to another domain other than specifically or generally by means of metaphor, metaphor, or metonymy. It is a concept introduced by Deppermann to refer to the commotion that arises when a group of participants in a discussion uses the same term in the meaning of different, and the semantic shift is characterized by the fact that the term is used with multiple meanings, there is no single meaning to deal with, there is no clarification of one meaning from the other, and there is no attempt to resolve the contradiction resulting from the use of the term with different meanings, while disintegration aims to reserve the word for one of the meanings while excluding the other meanings. (Agnes van Rees, op. cit: 10).

As for the euphemism or euphemism of speech, euphemism in the language is from the substance of euphemism, the meaning of which is obscure and hidden (Hana Ahmed Muhammad Shuwaikh, 2012: 211), and it occurs by using a word or phrase in place of another, as it is believed that the other is offensive or obscene, that is, the basic term of a certain concept is changed with a concept. Another with less pejorative connotations than the original term, as the euphemism does not replace the semantic content of the term, but rather introduces a different term, and deconstruction overlaps with the euphemism when the euphemism is placed next to the original term and compared to it and distinguished from it, i.e. the original term with connotations is preserved The bad along with the new term, for example: “She did not ask for euthanasia, just a small injection to help her die” (ibid: 11).

The third paragraph: disintegration, distinction, division, and precision

Distinction in a language is the separation of one thing from something else. Distinction is used in argumentative functions such as disintegration, but it requires distinction. Through disintegration, a number of aspects are placed outside a specific field, while distinction is kept within a specific field. This is due to the fact that the alternatives resulting from decomposition gets different values, for example: two branches of physics are distinguished "Newtonian physics" and "post – Newtonian physics" as they are used to describe separate phenomena, but both are valued equally in physics (ibid: 11).

As for division, it is the division into two groups or groups that differentiate it. Agnes van Rees pointed out in his study of the phenomenon of dualities that polarized differences are the basis of opposing positions in dialogue, as some of these dualities are similar to the philosophical pairs resulting from disintegration, and the two terms in the duality of division obtain different values. Such as: objectivity – subjectivity, absolute – relative, reality – imagination, and theory – application.

This situation does not make division and disintegration alike, as the measure of value used in division is only one, along the lines of what is desirable – undesirable, but when the measure of value is used along the lines of appearance – reality, the division depends on disintegration, because in this Case A term is placed outside the scope to which the original term belongs (ibid: 11).

Fourth paragraph: Deconstruction and convincing definition Persuasive definition is a concept introduced by Charles Leslie Stevenson, which refers to changing the descriptive meaning of a pre – existing term while retaining its new emotional meaning. The goal of this change is to influence the attitudes of the audience, for example: “Culture means imaginative sensitivity and originality”. The speaker gives new content to the term culture, while maintaining the positive connotation of the original term, and separates the real culture from the external symbol of culture.

Disintegration is similar to persuasive definition, but they are not synonymous. However, disintegration may not involve a persuasive definition. Disintegration can also be applied to terms that do not have a clear emotional meaning. For example: This is not a storm. This is just strong winds. A real storm makes people go. Into the wilderness (Agnes van Rees, op. cit: 5 – 14).

Section Three

Rhetorical means used to deconstruct political discourses

Disintegration is closely linked to rhetorical means. In order for Disintegration to be rhetorically effective, the speaker must present a certain state of affairs in a light appropriate to his interest. The speaker must also ensure that the audience is committed to those interests or concerns, and that the rhetorical presentation makes discrimination acceptable on the basis of consensual opinions, values, and beliefs (Ruth Amossy, 2007: 1 – 4), and one of the basic ways to do this is to present arguments or forms of speech that appeal to these views, values and beliefs in favor of discrimination, so politicians use strategies that have persuasive functions, and have political importance in the context of communication, such as: similes, Repetition and exaggeration (Samuel Gyasi Obeng and Beverly Hartford, 2002:8). Accordingly, we divide this requirement into three paragraphs: The first paragraph: persuasive appeals that are used to arouse compassion and slogans. The second paragraph, linguistic repetition based on alliteration, parallelism, polysyndeton, and metaphor. The third paragraph, similarity based on exaggeration and manipulation.

The first paragraph: persuasive appeals to arouse pathos and slogans

Persuasive appeal is known as: "issociation seemingly obviates the need to argue for one's position. That is because disintegration always offers an alternative interpretation of a situation. Thus, it enables the speaker to effectively replace the definition of the situation that he wishes to criticize by one that he prefers. The presence of the alternative interpretation often is enough to convince the audience that the original definition of the situation cannot hold" (Agnes van Rees, 2009: 121).

It becomes necessary to know the meaning of persuasion and its difference from rhetoric, as persuasion is defined as "human communication designed to influence others by modifying their beliefs, values, or attitudes" (Herbert W. Simons, 1976: 21), and persuasion includes a goal and intention to achieve this goal on the part of The sender of the message, finding the appropriate means to achieve this goal, and the recipient must have free will (Daniel J. O'Keefe, 1992: 79 – 82).

Any definition of rhetoric necessarily includes the idea of persuasion, but they are not identical, as persuasion refers to the intention to change the audience's thinking, action, and influence, while rhetoric refers to the methods that the speaker uses to persuade, and not to the entire process of persuasion (Jonathan Charteris Black, 2011: 13).

There are three ways in which a persuader can seek to influence the recipient of a message: shaping the response, enhancing the response, and changing the response. The persuasive message must comply with the audience's desires and needs in exploiting beliefs, attitudes, and values (ibid: 144).

Persuasion consists of four components: the source that sends the message. The message containing the information. The intended recipient of the message. The channel through which the message is sent. Aristotle Thales lists three appeals for persuasion: "spirit or moral appeal", "pathos or emotional appeal," and "logos or logical appeal", which will be explained below (Magedah E. Shabo, 2010: 8):

1- Appealing to the spirit

Credibility is based on the spiritual or personal appeal of the speaker. The speaker gains the audience's approval when he or she tries to appear principled and competent. One way to do this is to build a persona that appears intelligent by showing that the speaker is well – versed in the issues he is discussing. For example: Politicians go back to the authorities to justify... their views and actions (Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee, 2004: 170).

2- Appealing to compassion

A pity appeal aims to create highly emotionally charged positive feelings in the minds of listeners to encourage the audience to take a particular course of action, for example: donating money to a charitable cause to starting a war (Magedah E. Shabo, op. cit: 13).

3- Appeal to slogans

Logos relies on proof and rational reasoning rather than perceptions and emotions, which is the best standard that can be achieved in a natural argument when it provides evidence. For Aristotle Thales, if rhetoric is effective, persuasion can be considered the result of the interaction between ethos, pathos, and logos (Fran Piazza, 2013: 537).

The second paragraph: Linguistic repetition based on alliteration, parallelism, polysyndeton, and metaphor

Repetition is defined as: “a fundamental unifying element in almost all poetry and in much prose, and may consist of sounds, syllables, particular words, phrases, syllables, metrical patterns, ideas, allusions, and forms” (John A. Cuddon and Claire E. Preston, 1999: 742), and repetition is a rhetorical tool used by politicians to attract the public’s attention to the new definition of the position. Repetition consists of several types, which are:

1- Alliteration

Alliteration is defined as: “a word or phrase that is repeated at the beginning of each of a series of phrases or sentences” (Robert Cockcroft, 2014: 232).

2- Parallelism

Parallelism is defined as “the repetition of similar grammatical patterns in adjacent phrases, clauses, or sentences,” as politicians attempt to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out in their speech through parallel patterns (Alex Preminger, Terry V.F. Brogan, and Frank J. Warnke, 1993 : 877).

3- Polysyndeton

A term in which conjunctions are used to connect a series of words, sentences, or sentences. Politicians use polysyndicated either to emphasize the length of the enumerated items or to emphasize the distinctiveness of each item from the others (Arthur Quinn and Lyon Rathbun, 2009: 542).

4- Metaphor

Metaphor is defined as "the use of language to refer to something other than what it was originally applied to, or what it literally means, in order to suggest some similarity or connection between the two things," and it is a tool to express or distinguish something by giving it qualities or characteristics of something else, where characteristics of one thing are transferred to another, and politicians use metaphors in their speeches for many reasons, such as: “to explain, illustrate, express, evaluate, and entertain” (Murray Knowles and Rosamund Moon, 2006: 2–3).

The third paragraph: Similarity based on exaggeration and manipulation

A simile is a figure of speech that is defined as an explicit comparison using “like” or “like.” The comparison works to reveal an unexpected similarity between two seemingly dissimilar things. The comparison in a simile is clear, unlike a metaphor,

which implicitly includes comparison (Alex Preminger, Terry V.F. Brogan, and Frank J. Warnke, op. cite: 1149).

Each simile can be analyzed into three components: the subject (the element being illustrated), the image (the representative figure), and the point of similarity (the actual meaning of the similarity in the context). The speaker can also achieve many functions by using a simile, the most important of which are: the use of these functions by politicians to emphasize distinction through disintegration. Concepts are reformulated using a simile to explain the terms most familiar to the audience, which is an abstract concept. A simile is used to achieve a new understanding of the experience by observing Implicit relationships in context (Elizabeth Minchin, 2001: 3 – 32).

1- Exaggeration

Exaggeration is "a figure of speech in which something is deliberately exaggerated by making it seem more enthusiastic and serious to increase effect or attract attention. Exaggeration may be positive or negative". Exaggeration denotes extremes and exaggeration either exaggerates or diminishes some factual matter (Olcay Sert, 2008: 27).

Exaggeration is one of the rhetorical means that politicians use in their arguments in political speeches. It is a means of focusing attention on specific aspects of reality in a way that leads to awareness of the values and standards associated with these aspects in an emotionally charged way. Exaggeration is used to structure reality so that some aspects overshadow others, that is, That conflicting views are brought into consensus or organization by emphasizing one at the expense of another (Marc Swartz, 1976: 111).

2- Manipulation

Manipulation is defined as: "the conscious use of language in a deceptive way to control others." Using language in a devious way is using it in a way that conceals one's strategies and goals. Therefore, manipulation is described as deceptive. There is a three-fold approach to manipulation, considering it as a form of misuse of social power and cognitive control. With reason and discursive interaction (Van Dijk, 2006: 359).

Manipulation is defined as: "Socially, manipulation is defined as illegitimate domination confirming social inequality. Cognitively, manipulation as mind control involves the interference with processes of understanding, the formation of biased mental models and social representations such as knowledge and ideologies. Discursively, manipulation generally involves the usual forms and formats of ideological discourse, such as emphasizing Our good things, and emphasizing Their bad things" (ibid: 213).

Manipulation is a social phenomenon that involves interaction and misuse of power between groups and social actors, a cognitive phenomenon through the manipulation

of the minds of participants, and a discursive phenomenon through text and speech. Manipulation can be considered a form of persuasion despite restricting the freedom to act and react to what is said, and thus, the recipients of persuasion have a very negative role assigned to them, which makes them victims of the manipulation of political discourse (Agnieszka Grzywna, 2013: 368).

To illustrate the rhetorical tools used to disintegrate political discourses, we relied on an example of US President George W. Bush's speeches related to the occupation of Iraq in 2003, which are:

Text (1)

"I believe true leadership is a process of addition, not an act of division. I will not attack a part of this country because I want to lead the whole of it" (George W. Bush).

Occasion

The context of the speech indicates a feeling of uneasiness resulting from the head of the former Iraqi regime, Saddam Hussein. George W. Bush asserts, saying: "True leadership is a process of addition, not a process of division", and he presents a deconstruction of the unitary concept of "leadership", namely: "incorrect leadership", the less valuable concept that is linked to a leadership style that he does not prefer, and "true leadership". The highest value concept that relates to his leadership style.

Content of the conversation

George W. Bush implicitly opposes "leadership is incorrect", and the contradiction between the view that leadership is an act of division, and the argument that leadership should be based on the principle of addition, is resolved by implying that he does not like a style of leadership that is based on policies putting one group of people against another group.

Rhetorical tools

Persuasive appeals

This disintegration is based on a spirit, such as: George W. Bush's attempt to appear as a moral person who intends to unite America and not divide it. He says, "I will not attack any part of this country because I want to lead all of it".

Repetition

George W. Bush uses identical, parallel grammatical patterns in adjacent phrases: "True leadership is a process of addition, not an act of division". He uses two opposing ideas in the same sentence, with the aim of drawing the audience's attention to the distinction between the first term and the second term.

Exaggeration

George W. Bush uses hyperbole, saying, "I'm not going to attack part of this country because I want to lead all of it".

Manipulation

George W. Bush is trying to convince his audience that his leadership style is capable of leading the nation because it is unified.

Text (2)

“I ask your continued participation and confidence in the American economy. Terrorists attacked a symbol of American prosperity. They did not touch its source. America is successful because of the hard work, and creativity, and enterprise of our people. These were the true strengths of our economy before September 11th, and they are our strengths today” (George W. Bush).

Occasion

The context of the disintegration is feeling uneasy about Saddam Hussein's regime, and then George W. Bush demanding that the people “participate and trust in the American economy” despite attacking terrorists. To resolve the contradiction, George W. Bush offers to dismantle the unified concept of “strengths” into two new concepts: “incorrect strengths”, the less valuable concept, and “true strengths”, the more valuable concept.

Content of the conversation

George W. Bush implicitly opposes “inauthentic strengths”, and resolves the contradiction by defending the unchanged status of the American economy by implying that terrorists only attacked the false strengths of the American economy by attacking its symbol.

Rhetorical tools

Persuasive appeals

George W. Bush emerges as a national president who views America's exceptional qualities as the foundation of economic power (i.e., soul). This appeal is intertwined with the emotional appeal of giving the American public hope.

Repetition

George W. Bush uses polysyndeton to present information that supports his disintegration, saying “America is successful because of the hard work, creativity, and enterprise of our people”. He also repeats similar grammatical patterns in sentences as a parallel: “These were the real strengths of our economy before 9/11, and they are our strengths today”.

Metaphor

George W. Bush uses a metaphor, saying: “The hard work, creativity, and enterprise of Americans are the true strengths of the American economy”.

Manipulation

George W. Bush tries to convince his audience that the real strengths of the American economy are the hard work, creativity, and enterprise of Americans.

Conclusions and recommendations

Disintegration is one of the powerful manipulation methods that politicians use in different situations and on different occasions to serve their political purposes. This is proven by the high percentage of rhetorical tools that are achieved through the use of disintegration. Politicians may resort to disintegration when there is a feeling of discomfort or when they are directed a negative judgment, the following conclusions have been reached:

- 1- Politicians tend to use persuasive appeals, repetition, metaphor, similes, exaggeration, and manipulation to show their points of view in a more receptive way to persuade the public to accept alternative interpretations imposed through deconstruction, where the persuasive appeal of the spirit is used more than pathos and logos.
- 2- Politicians use repetition of what they want to clarify or emphasize by presenting their characteristics or definitions related to disintegration.
- 3- Politicians exaggerate their disintegration in an unnatural way, as Disintegration is considered manipulation, as politicians always try to impose their political ideologies on the public in a manipulative way.

Recommendation

Giving disintegration more attention in university studies so that researchers and students can obtain the controversial and convincing benefits of this technique and benefit from these benefits in their professional lives.

References

1. Agnes van Rees, 2009, *Disintegration in Argumentative Discussions: A Pragma – Dialectical Perspective*, New York and London: Springer US.
2. Agnieszka Grzywina, 2013, “Manipulation and Pragmatics in Political Discourse”, In I. Kecskes and J. Romero – Trillo (eds.), *Research Trends in Intercultural Pragmatics*, Boston and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
3. Alex Preminger, 1993, Terry V.F. Brogan, and Frank J. Warnke, *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
4. Arne Naess, 1966, *Communication and Argument: Elements of Applied Semantics*, California: Bedminster Press.
5. Arthur Quinn and Lyon Rathbun, 2009, “Polysyndeton”, In T. Enos (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*, New York: Routledge.
6. Corina Andone and Anca Gâță, 2011, “Manoeuvring Strategically with Disintegration in a Political Interview”. In E. Feteris, B. Garssen and F. Snoeck

- Henkemans (eds.), *Keeping in Touch with Pragma – Dialectics: In Honor of Frans H. van Eemeren*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
7. Daniel J. O’Keefe, 1992, “Two Concepts of Argument”, In W. L. Benoit, D. Hample and P. J. Benoit (eds.), *Readings in Argumentation: Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, New York and Berlin: Foris Publications.
 8. David Goodwin, 1992, *The Dialectic of Second – Order Distinctions: The Structure of Arguments about Fallacies*, *Informal Logic* (journal), University of Windsor, Canada, Vol. 14, No. 2.
 9. David Zarefsky, 2014, *Rhetorical Perspectives on Argumentation: Selected Essays*, New York and London: Springer US.
 10. Elizabeth Minchin, 2001, “Similes in Homer: Image, Mind's Eye, and Memory”. In J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes Orality & Literacy in the Greek & Roman World*, Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.
 11. Fran Piazza, 2013, “Rhetoric and Pragmatics: Suggestions for a Fruitful Dialogue”, In A. Capone, F. L. Piparo and M. Carapezza, *Perspectives on Pragmatics and Philosophy*, London and New York: Springer US.
 12. George W. Bush, *The American Presidency Project*, California: University of California, On the website: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu>.
 13. Hana Ahmed Muhammad Shuwaikh, 2012, *Health psychology*, Cairo: Anglo – Egyptian books.
 14. Herbert W. Simons, 1976, *Persuasion: Understanding, Practice, and Analysis*, Boston: Addison – Wesley Publishing Company.
 15. Hervé Corvellec, 2008, *Introducing the New Rhetoric into organization studies*, Göteborg: Gothenburg Research Institute.
 16. J. R. Cox, 1986, “Argument and Usable Traditions”, In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair and C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation: Across the lines of discipline*, Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris Publications.
 17. John A. Cuddon and Claire E. Preston, 1999, *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, (4th ed.), London: Penguin.
 18. Jonathan Charteris Black, 2011, *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*, (2nd ed.), New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
 19. K. M. Olson, 2013, “Intransigence and Self – Justification as a Political Way of Life”, In Clarke Rountree (ed.), *Venomous Speech: Problems with American Political Discourse on the Right and Left*, California: ABC – CLIO.
 20. Magedah E. Shabo, 2010, *Rhetoric, Logic, and Argumentation: A Guide for Student Writers*, Delaware: Prestwick House, Inc.
 21. Marc Swartz, 1976, “Hyperbole, Politics and Potent Specifications: the Political Uses of a Figure of Speech”, In W. O’Barr and J. O’Barr (eds.), *Language and Politics*, The Hague: Mouton.
 22. Murray Knowles and Rosamund Moon, 2006, *Introducing Metaphor*, London and New York: Routledge.
 23. Olcay Sert, 2008, “An Interactive Analysis of Hyperboles in a British TV Series: Implications for EFL Classes”, In ARECLS, Newcastle University, England, vol. 5.

24. Robert Cockcroft, Susan Cockcroft and Craig Hamilton, 2014, Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
25. Ruth Amossy, 2007, Commentary on M . A . van Rees: “Dialectical and Rhetorical Effects of Disintergration”, In H. V. Hansen, C. W. Tindale, J. A. Blair, R. H. Johnson and D. M. Godden (eds.), Dissensus and the Search for Common Ground, Proceedings of the 7th OSSA Conference, United kingdom: University of Windsor.
26. Samuel Gyasi Obeng and Beverly Hartford, 2002, Surviving Through Obliqueness: Language of Politics in Emerging Democracies, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
27. Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee, 2004, Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students, New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
28. van Dijk, 2006, T. A. Discourse and manipulation, London: Sage Publications.