

EXPLORING THE MANIPULATIVE GASLIGHTING IN JOE BIDEN'S SPEECHES ON THE WAR IN UKRAINE

Dr Marius Eder BROU
Université Alassane OUATTARA
ederbrou@yahoo.fr

Abstract: Language is a sign system used in the process of communication to convey information to others. In political sphere, this function of language can be justified with speculations from all sides on the Russian military invasion of Ukraine with some argumentative styles showing that truth can be represented in number of ways. Thus, we discuss how an argumentative style is instrumental to the arguer's strategic maneuvering in discourse to defend standpoints through linguistic choices and their argumentative functions. Using a methodology of identification and interpretation, it is possible to figure out that beyond social concerns, there is a manipulative gaslighting embedded in JOE Biden's arguments. Through pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation in Biden's 25 February 2022 speech, we realize that language is a complex phenomenon with multiple functions. In utilizing a particular argumentative style, the arguer is not only concerned with a presentational dimension, but also with a strategic maneuvering in the argumentative moves to get support in his or her favor

Keywords: argumentative, gaslighting, language, maneuvering, manipulation, strategic, style

Résumé: La langue est un système de signes utilisé dans le processus de communication pour transmettre des informations et des arguments à d'autres personnes. Dans la sphère politique, cette fonction du langage peut être justifiée par les spéculations de toutes parts sur l'invasion militaire de l'Ukraine par la Russie avec certains styles argumentatifs qui montrent que la vérité peut être représentée de plusieurs manières. Ainsi, examinons-nous comment dans le discours, le style argumentatif joue un rôle dans la manœuvre stratégique de l'argumentateur pour défendre son point de vue par le biais de choix linguistiques et de leurs fonctions argumentatives. En utilisant une méthodologie d'identification et d'interprétation, il est possible de comprendre qu'au-delà des préoccupations sociales, il y a une manipulation au détournement cognitif contenue dans les arguments de JOE Biden. Grâce à l'approche pragma-dialectique de l'argumentation dans le discours de Biden du 25 février 2022, nous nous rendons compte que le langage est un phénomène complexe aux fonctions multiples. En utilisant un style d'argumentation particulier, l'argumentateur ne se préoccupe pas seulement d'une dimension de présentation, mais aussi d'une manœuvre stratégique dans les jeux d'argumentation afin d'obtenir un soutien en sa faveur.

Mots clés: argumentatif, détournement, cognitif, langage, manœuvre, manipulation, stratégique, style

Introduction

Language is a means of communication used to convey information and arguments to others. As such, it is a powerful instrument that can be used to shape or destroy humans in their relationship namely in politics. In political discourse, language is not only concerned with a frugal presentational dimension, but also with a strategic maneuvering in the argumentative moves to reach a specific objective as is the case in some Joe Biden's speeches on Ukraine war. Those speeches drive us to notice how leadership and the quest of legitimacy and support are conquered in international relationships. Thus, rather than being a frugal tool of communication, language stands as a weapon; a double-faced knife ready to be used for praising or destroying people in argumentation; argumentation defined as an art of convincing through words.

Joe Biden speeches on Russia invasion of Ukraine do not stray from this argumentative function of language. Biden's attempts to make his addressees only believe in western arguments and reject their own perceptions and Russia justifications beyond this invasion is perceived as a manipulative gaslighting whose purpose can be manifold. Therefore, the following questions arise: What is manipulative gaslighting in political speech? How is it manifested/ perceived in Biden's speech? What orientations does it give to Biden Speech? Therefore, the study analyzes the manipulative gaslighting in Biden's political speech. Through Pragma-dialectics which draws on the theory of speech acts that highlights the link between speech and action, the study first examines what manipulative gaslighting is, then how manipulative gaslighting is constructed in Joe Biden's speech and finally it accounts for the rightfulness behind this communicative style.

1. Manipulative Gaslighting in Political Discourse.

1.1. Act of Persuasive Language.

According to Kenzhekanova (2015), discourse is the process of real-life verbal communication in which an important role is paid to the systemic characteristics of language. Thus, in a political discourse, emphasis is put on a specific language use in order to persuade, to hustle or deceit. In this regard, Gaslighting is a persuasive communication style in which the speaker utilizes emotional or logical arguments in order to change the audience's attitude



towards something or their behavior. Gaslighting develops and maintains tight control over people in their intimate relationships.

Political discourse is a social phenomenon. In politics, manipulative gaslighting is this way of communicating in which the politician (gaslighter) manipulates his addressee or a recipient (*the* gaslightee) in order to make the later doubt his own perceptions of reality. That is to say the gaslighter attacks and impacts on the personality of the gaslightee so as to perceive and comprehend the situation accurately and favorably. In this trend, there is an attempt to manipulate in order to persuade the other doubt his own capacities and perceptions of reality and take gas lighter's view for granted. Gaslighting is therefore the fact of persuading through hypnotizing in order to have control over the individual. The target of manipulative gaslighting is to persuade so as to obtain results such as sharing and agreeing with the speaker's words. Therefore, manipulative gaslighting has a close link with argumentation.

1.2. Manipulative Language of Deception

Gaslighting is a manipulative act that departs from reality to make the target vulnerable and disoriented. Sarkis (2018) states that gaslighting undermines a person's confidence in their judgment, making it easier for manipulators to exert control. The victim is, thus, mentally disarmed as they are made to believe that their thinking is absurd and obsolete, and to trust a version that is credible and fair. The version of the gaslighter. Thus, the manipulative gaslighting affects the target in such a way that his behavior or action is an instrument of attaining the goal of the manipulator. It is designed "to implant false and/or distorted narratives that are specially designed or formulated to manipulate a person into a destructive web of deception, loss of control, and the surrender of personal freedom and beliefs of self-worth, self-value, self-esteem, and productivity." (Ross Rosenberg, 2021).

As a deceptive process, manipulative gaslighting goes with obscuring truth. It is made of set of fallacies to endorse the addressee to the vision or perception of the speaker; and this is clearly remarked by Galinsky (2000) when he grasped it as a communication act that is intended to induce the addressee in a particular belief by manipulating the truth and falsity of information. It can be noticed that there is an argumentative mood in Biden's speech from which manipulative gaslighting operates. This argumentative mood is contained in the type of argumentation he uses in his statements.

2. Modalization of Manipulative Gaslighting in Biden’s Speech

Manipulative gaslighting is an argumentative form of discourse. Generally speaking, discourse reveals that language use is determined by many factors among which socio-cultural, historical, ideological, and institutional condition. The study of gaslighting in Biden’s speech reveals that aspect of language use and points out that manipulative gaslighting operates at the level of the argumentation style that forms the strategies of Biden’s manipulative gaslighting.

2.1. Using Causal Arguments as an Argumentative Style in Manipulative Gaslighting

Argumentation in the words of Sloane (2001, p.33) is reason giving “used by people to justify their beliefs and values and to influence the thought and action of others.” Therefore, there is an indication of arguments Russia uses on the motives of Ukraine’s invasion following Biden’s speech. These arguments put forward by Russia are flawless in the words of Biden as evoked by Biden in the following example:

(1) Putin denies Ukraine has, or ever had, real statehood. He claims the Soviet Union created Ukraine. And just two weeks ago, he told the world that if the United States and our allies withdraw — and if the United States withdraws, our allies will as well — military support for Ukraine would have, quote, a week left to live. But we’re not withdrawing. (JOE Biden, Oct. 19, 2023)

Utterance (1) permits to have an idea of the invasion of Ukraine by Russia through the absolute negation contained in the verb “denies” meaning. For Biden, Ukraine is attacked because the president of Russia refuses the sovereignty of Ukraine as a free and independent country. This causal argument presented by Biden is confusing and manipulative because it does not expose the why. Louis de Saussure (2005, p. 120) states “to manipulate is firstly to communicate the relevance of things that are not relevant by themselves or/aid retain actually relevant information.” Truly, one can notice that there is an implicature in Biden’s speech. This implicature can be historical or even ideological to the extent that the implicature contained in the misleading association “But we’re not withdrawing” lead to convince us that Biden is hiding relevant information so as to successfully manipulate his audience and favors his interests. The truth is that Biden ignores the historical compromise between the NATO



and Russia concerning their geopolitical positions. Such an attempt of ignorance filters through Biden's distortion of the perception of reality at his advantage. Not only he does not mention the impact his collusion with Ukraine can have on the security of Russia, but he puts Ukraine as a victim whereas the later was already aware of Russia's position on the matter.

Biden's argumentation just mentions how the crisis arises "Putin denies Ukraine has, or ever had, real statehood" without further information and a requirement formulated by Russia president "he told the world that if the United States and our allies withdraw". These junks refer to a strategic ambiguity which does not explain reality but tries to entice the audience on his side through deceptive argumentation. One can therefore, realize that Biden is attempting to persuade opinions that Russia has no argument to attack Ukraine and did it because Russia wants it. Biden simply wants the audience to believe in his words so he does not even tell the consequences of what Russia censures because the objective is to demonize Russia. Biden, thus makes an appeal to common sense on the motives of the war in a manipulative stance for the sake of twisting people opinion on the crisis at his advantage when he says "He claims the Soviet Union created Ukraine" whereas he knows the real reason. For Szanto (1978, p.7) the language of politics is a "lexicon of conflict and drama, of ridicules, and reproach, pleading and persuasion, color and bite permeated. A language designed to valor men, destroy some and change the mind of others." From this perspective, language has two major functions. It is an instrument of valorization and destruction, both leading to the fulfillment of a particular aspiration. As such, language is an instrument for facilitating and obtaining something. These language functions operate in manipulative gaslighting as an input in someone's mind to make it receptive to manipulation. On this basis, manipulative gaslighting has a healing function since it looks like a remedy that is used by the speaker to satisfy his or her own will.

2.2. Narrative Arguments to Stereotype Others and Create Hostility and Rejection

Gaslighting verifies the assertion that no communication is value-free, and that all politically motivated discourses are heavily laden with hidden meaning:

(2) We've not forgotten the mass graves, the bodies found bearing signs of torture, rape used as a weapon by the Russians, and thousands and thousands of Ukrainian children forcibly taken into Russia, stolen from their parents. It's sick. Hamas and Putin represent different threats, but they share this in common. They both want to completely annihilate a neighboring democracy — completely annihilate it. (Biden, Oct. 19, 2023)

The analysis of (2) shows some narrative arguments in Biden's speech above. In fact, narrative arguments in discourses, are those arguments relating to facts. They enable individuals to express their stance on a particular issue or situation. In the sphere of political discourse, a narrative argument does not simply rely on real facts; even if it is so, the narration can be distorted for a specific goal; that is why Amossy (2005) asserts:

On ne peut pas considérer que les objectifs de tous discours sont équivalents. Un discours électoral ou publicitaire, un manifeste, une lettre ouverte, se construisent autour d'une visée persuasive dont l'auditoire est bien conscient. Par contre, un roman, une dépêche journalistique, une conversation à bâtons rompus, ne se proposent pas de faire adhérer à une thèse. Il n'en reste pas moins que les discours – littéraires, médiatiques ou quotidiens – qui ne cherchent pas à persuader comportent aussi une orientation argumentative dans la mesure où ils donnent à voir le monde d'une certaine façon. Il faut alors tenir compte non seulement du degré d'argumentativité des discours, mais encore de la distinction déjà mentionnée entre visée et dimension. (Ruth Amossy, 2005, p. 164-165) ; that is to say [The purposes of all speeches cannot be considered equivalent. An electoral or advertising speech, a manifesto, an open letter, are all built around a persuasive aim of which the audience is fully aware. On the other hand, a novel, a journalistic article or a casual conversation are not designed to persuade the audience to accept a certain thesis. Nonetheless, discourses - be they literary, journalistic or everyday discourses - that do not intend to persuade also have an argumentative orientation, insofar as they present the world in a certain way. We must therefore take into consideration not only the degree of argumentativeness of these discourses, but also the aforementioned distinction between aim and dimension.]

It is obvious that each discourse has a target and that is reachable in the argumentative move. In (2), Biden, as a politician, has some manipulative objectives to reach through his narration. By means of negative and blameworthy facts attributed to Russia such as the massive killing of Ukraine people with the use of the metaphor “the mass graves”. Moreover, the assimilation of “rape” to a weapon Russia uses to force Ukrainians and the kidnapping of Ukrainians “thousands and thousands of Ukrainian children forcibly taken into Russia, stolen from their parents”, president Biden values America and its allies and on the one hand, and formulates a destructive web of lies on Russia to tarnish its image. This parallels with Chilton and Schaffner's (1997, p.206) when they opine that “politics cannot be conducted without language”. This is true. It is through language one perceives the world and orients his or her vision of the world and this reality is in Biden's speech. Biden views Russia as a rogue state with no respect of human dignity and right with loaded words such as “mass graves”, “the bodies found bearing signs of torture” and “rape.” In fact, loaded words are words that are associated to strong or positive connotations. In (2), most of those loaded words are negatively connoted. It is a manipulative gaslighting Biden is doing in order to surrender its personal beliefs on the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. He presents Russia as a rogue, criminal, murdering state that has no respect for human life

and violates human rights. There is a violent rhetoric on Russia through exaggeration for the sake of a manipulative scheming to divert people's attention on Russia's real motives that lead to the invasion. Biden simply judges consequences without revealing the real causes. This is typical in political manipulative gaslighting.

In Biden's narration, ideology is put forward with the aim of deception: " Hamas and Putin represent different threats, but they share this in common." Russia is assimilated to a terrorist country when it is compared to Hamas a terrorist group. This parallel between a terrorist group and a state is a manipulative stance of information in order to stir up anger and deception against Russia. This strategic assimilation, that presents Russia as a warlike state and the USA and its allies as saviors who combat oppressor, is meant to value USA actions in order to align the audience on his side. Language use in this condition is valuable for the speaker and destructive for whom it is addressed to.

2.3. Brainwashing the Audience with Evaluation Arguments

Evaluation arguments are those arguments that are meant to judge facts and action in order to see how useful or not they are or how pertinent they are. These types of arguments are indicators of victimization and are used in manipulative gaslighting:

(3) When Putin invaded Ukraine, he thought he would take Kyiv and all of Ukraine in a matter of days. Well over a year later, Putin has failed, and he continues to fail. Kyiv still stands because the bravery of the Ukrainian people. Ukraine has regained more than 50 percent of the territory Russian troops once occupied. Backed by U.S.-led coalition of more than 50 countries around the world, all doing its part to support Kyiv. (Biden Oct. 19, 2023)

In this utterance, Biden uses a distortion tactic to call attention on a supposedly failure of Russia in Ukraine: "Well over a year later, Putin has failed, and he continues to fail", "Ukraine has regained more than 50 percent of the territory Russian troops once occupied." There is a wrong account of the situation by Biden. He does so, in order to distort his audience thought, idea about the military situation in Ukraine. The purpose is to tell the world how the US implication favors this situation. It is a therapeutic reasoning that consists in persuading others of our good actions and denouncing evil doing. Mercier and Sperber (2011) qualify such an argumentation, an "argumentative reasoning." It is a reasoning that provides arguments supporting claims in order to convince the interlocutors, and evaluate opposing arguments. The evaluation of Russia's aggression shows that there is no more than the initial

state. More, instead of progressing and reaching the assigned objective, Russia has made no move; it is the status quo. This purports to persuade the audience of the weakness of Russia army which is considered by the common person as a very powerful one capable of destroying any army in the world. Moreover, Biden is focusing on the crucial role played by the USA in helping Ukraine to resist to the aggression. He does this to win support in the audience and instigate in people's mind that Russia's army is weak and America is a country that is entitled to preserve freedom and protect weak nations. Biden Distorts the perception of reality at his advantage.

Manipulation with Biden fulfills a healing function of language as it is used by the latter to meet ends: the demonization of Russia for the sake of satisfying personal interests. In this end, language use is intended to cure one's frustration and gain sympathy through the manipulative gaslighting.

2.4. Proposal Arguments to Look for Sympathy

Proposal arguments are an argumentation in which one unveils his intention when denouncing some actions. Proposal arguments are scattered in Biden's utterances as follows:

(4) So, if we don't stop Putin's appetite for power and control in Ukraine, he won't limit himself just to Ukraine. On Ukraine, I'm asking Congress to make sure we can continue to send Ukraine the weapons they need to defend themselves and their country without interruption, so Ukraine can stop Putin's brutality in Ukraine. (Biden, Oct. 19, 2023)

The analysis of these arguments reveals that, they are used for the sake of a manipulative gaslighting of the audience. It can be seen that in Biden's mind, Russia is intervening in Ukraine because they want to control and extend their power "Putin's appetite for power and control". This denunciation is the reverse of the situation since Russia's power is already established in the area. Such an argumentation is a deception of the audience to look for sympathy and create hostility towards Russia. Moreover, as a solution to stop Russia imperialism, is the military help to Ukraine "I'm asking Congress to make sure we can continue to send Ukraine the weapons they need to defend themselves and their country without interruption". Biden and his allies consider themselves as saviors of the world. They are invested with the power of defending nations in the world or good causes. Thus, they present themselves as countries of peace whereas Russia is presented as imperialist. By offering help, it is to tell everyone that USA and their allies have good intentions and love for oppressing people that

they defend wherever they are. There is here a heap of shame on Russia to cause America's sympathy.

Through Biden's words, language use is motivated by a specific objective. It turns the wrong actions into good ones and the bad actions into good ones. As such, language through manipulative gaslighting has a restorative function that helps one fulfill a goal.

3.The Stakes of Manipulative Gaslighting in Biden's Speech.

In the mind of Foucault (1994), any reality in the social world is mediated by a mode of representation, and that representations are not descriptions of a world of facticity, but are ways of making facticity. It can be asserted that behind Biden's argumentation hides some unsaid motives that are perceptible in the speech acts and perlocutionary effects. They are seen in both in the structural and historical aspect of Biden's speech. It is what emerges with Shapiro (1989) who stated that in analyzing a text, two types of analysis can be made: structural analysis and historical analysis. Thus "The historical focuses on the emergence of the phenomena in language, while the structural examines how a particular text is put together, the devices, strategies, tropes and rhetoric through which social reality is manufactured"

3.1. Silencing to Better Legitimize Actions

Gaslighting undermines a person's confidence in his or her judgment. It deprives the gaslightee from self-appreciation that is why Stephanie Sarkis (2018) affirms that gaslighting is an act of undermining self-trust, rendering individuals vulnerable to manipulation and control. This lies in the fact that the objective of gaslighting is to make the individual reject his own beliefs to take for granted what is said. As a consequence, the person becomes vulnerable and is subject to manipulation and is influenceable and under control of the gaslighter. Biden makes no exception. His narrative is made to gag the audience or more precisely to lull the audience into a false sense of security in order to reach goals:

(5) You know, history has taught us that when terrorists don't pay a price for their terror, when dictators don't pay a price for their aggression, they cause more chaos and death and more destruction. They keep going. And the cost and the threats to America and the world keep rising. Oct. 19, 2023

The following statement of Biden is made of a glittering generality that reveals America's intended action on the ground. It has an illocutionary effect on the audience whose

perlocutionary act is to keep them silent and observe. Acting without obstruction necessitates winning over one's audience so that they remain silent in order to give the impression of endorsing one's actions. Biden extols the virtues of this approach, using the metaphors “terrorists” and “dictators” to discredit Russia in the eyes of the world in view of convincing and getting the support of his audience. He is showing the goodness of his actions “, history has taught us that when terrorists don't pay a price for their terror, when dictators don't pay a price for their aggression, they cause more chaos and death and more destruction. They keep going” It is humanely known that terrorists are the enemies of good morality and combating them is praiseworthy and it is the same for dictators.

There are highly valued ideas in Biden's words which are emotionally charged to attract people attention, approval and acclaim. Biden intend to bring security so he wants to make terrorists “pay a price for their terror” and dictators “pay a price for their aggression”, it is an allusion to show that the USA will defend Ukraine and stop the aggression of Russia. Biden therefore prepares people's mind on America's actions in Ukraine when he stigmatizes Russia in order not to have recriminations or protests vis a vis their actions. There is an expression of ethos in Biden's words: defending Ukraine that is being attacked by Russia. Ethos expresses values shared both by Biden and his audience.

Considering Russians as terrorists is tantamount to convincing the public of the appropriateness and justness of American action, and preventing popular ingratitude. In fact, public ingratitude is a feeling of hostility people may have towards their governments when they are not sufficiently informed about the merits of their actions. In order not to face the unpredictable attitude of American people; and in view of the Biden administration's future initiatives in Ukraine, Biden makes a smear campaign on the Russians, to justify his actions. This is what gaslighting is all about: numbing the critical mind and letting the other side act without reaction. That said, any action taken against Russia is legitimate, because no one wants to get along with terrorists. This assertion legitimizes and will legitimize the role the USA play in the conflict. It shows that the USA is taking sides in the conflict, rather than seeking a peaceful resolution through conciliatory action.

3.2. Phraseology of Showing the Image of Great Power Politics

Biden's discourse transposes an affirmation of power. By gaslighting his audience, he intends to show USA's responsibility as a power which has a word to say in the world.; a

divine role to play in the world. One can notice that for him, America is endowed with the right and responsibility of defending the weak nations as can be seen in the following:

(6) What would happen if we walked away? We are the essential nation. Meanwhile, Putin has turned to Iran and North Korea to buy attack drones and ammunition to terrorize Ukrainian cities and people. Oct. 19, 2023

Presenting the USA as the essential nation refers to consider America has the protector of all the nations in the world. In (5) when Biden says “What would happen if we walked away?” it is to show the role the US plays in the resistance of Ukraine. Ukraine still exists on account of America’s support and help. It is an appeal to public recognition. The notion of great power politics, is an expression of the images of the powerful nations of the world competing to maximize wealth, territory and military influence across the globe. Thus, in international relations, the term great power politics refers to the pursuit of material power by powerful states in the international system to achieve security; and this is the role the USA intends to play in the conflict in Ukraine.

Biden demonstrates that the USA is a superpower, “What would happen if we walked away?” which plays an important role in the conflict that is impeding Russia's efforts to achieve its objectives. It is therefore understandable that the current situation is largely due to the actions of the USA, hence Biden's bragging about his self-satisfied actions when he views his country as an “essential nation”. Being an essential nation means being economically, politically and militarily indispensable. A deterrent nation that prevents and counters the expansionist ambitions of some nations against those that are weaker. Such power no longer needs to be proven, as Russia is obliged to turn to other countries for military aid: “Putin has turned to Iran and North Korea to buy attack drones and ammunition to terrorize”. This referentiation is a criticism that presupposes the weakness of Russia in the words of Biden who states that Russia can only hold out militarily with the help of some of its allies.

Biden praises his country, and presents it as a superpower capable of baffling the great Russia. It's a manipulative maneuver to make his audience believe in the fragility of the aggressor and show how powerful the U.S. protector is. This power no longer needs to be demonstrated, as Russia is forced to turn to other countries for military aid: “Putin has turned to Iran and North Korea to buy attack drones and ammunition to terrorize”. The aim is to



make the American people believe that the American army is strong and that the country is a military power capable of combating any other power and serving the needs of the powerless.

3.3. Viewing Change in Established Political Order

Gaslighting is a manipulative maneuver designed primarily to persuade the audience to believe and trust one's words as the most credible and unblemished. Using manipulation, Biden intends to portray himself as a defender of a legitimate cause in Ukraine, whilst at the same time ignoring or flouting geopolitical rules. Tindale (2015, p.25) informs us that context plays a prominent role in a dynamic understanding of arguments. Moreover, he adds that it is not only the structural (internal) features of an argument (i.e., the premise-conclusion link) but, crucially, also its reception by an audience that needs to be considered: "a dynamic sense of argument sees arguments as social events, personalized by those engaged in them". Therefore, a glance at history his helpful to understand the Biden's attempt to rewrite history and make the audience believe in his good offices.

Indeed, history tells us that Ukraine presents a geopolitical position in the frame of cold war. As a result, positioning rules were established and had to be respected by both blocks. The violation of this rule with Ukraine's desire to draw closer to the Western bloc and the desire of the latter to welcome it with open arms, despite the tacit rules that exist, has led to the deterioration of the situation. The USA's unconditional financial, logistical and military support for the Ukraine has resulted in a break with the tacit rules established between the two blocks. The determination to rewrite a new political order without being held responsible has led Biden to demonize Russia and its president in order to drown the worm and win the support of American people. This is echoed in his declarations:

(7) On Ukraine, I'm asking Congress to make sure we can continue to send Ukraine the weapons they need to defend themselves and their country without interruption, so Ukraine can stop Putin's brutality in Ukraine. Oct. 19, 2023

This bias by Biden and his allies' stems from their willingness to establish a new order by providing support to Ukraine. The support is logistical: "send Ukraine the weapons they need" at any time "without interruption". To prevent this action from going down badly with

public opinion and to achieve their objectives, Biden and his henchmen are trying to lull people into silence by means of defamatory and manipulative language, so as to make them doubt their own perception of the situation. The use of the word “brutality” is an illustration of this implicit aim. They manipulate the people into believing they are carrying out a rescue operation in the face of oppression. It's a manipulative gaslighting just to cover up their crimes and get away with it; in other words, to avoid being accountable to the people. Biden utilizes language to construct a good image of his country and demonize Russia. Rather than be a string of words, language has a double face: one of repair and one of destruction. The two functions are found in political manipulative gaslighting because to convince people to adopt one thing at the expense of another is to deny the desirability of that other thing.

Conclusion

Gaslighting is a manipulative tactic of speech act that connects speech and action. In this context, as a locutionary act, it envisages illocutionary goals and perlocutionary effects on the gaslightee. Indeed, a person, in order to gain power and control of another person, seeds uncertainty in the mind of another person. In so doing, the gaslighter drives the gaslightee to action by depriving him of any confidence in his ability to analyze and discern to the detriment of what is proposed to him. In a word, Gaslighting undermines reason, making it ridicule and self-doubting.

Gaslighting is incredibly rooted in societal practices or human relationships. In this respect, it reveals two types of language function: the healing function and the destructive function. The healing function is one of victory, as it enables the gaslighter to achieve a goal: to disrupt the other in order to achieve existence and one's thoughts to be accepted. As for the destructive function, it is related to the psychological destruction of the manipulated, whose thought becomes free-floating and without reference points. As its negative effects are more serious than the positive ones, it is crucial to contain it so as not to undermine or psychologically destroy others.

Bibliography

AL-GUBLAN Badriah Khalid, 2015, “A Pragmatic Study of a Political Discourse from the Perspective of the Linguistic Adaptation Theory”, *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 5, No. 2; ISSN 1923-869X E-ISSN 1923-8703



Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

CHILTON Paul. and SCHAFFER Christina, 1997, “Discourse and politics” . In T. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Vol. 2 . London: Sage, 206-31

CHRISTOPHER W. Tindale, 2015, *The Philosophy of Argument and Audience Reception*. Cambridge University Press

HUGO Mercier and DAN Sperber, 2012, “Argumentative Theory of Reasoning: From the Psychology of Reasoning to Argumentation Studies?” Vol, 32, No 1
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v32i1.3536>

HUGO Mercier & DAN Sperber ,2011, “Why Do Humans Reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory”. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 34(2), pp. 94-111.

Kenneth Neal Waltz, 1979, *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw-Hill, University of Michigan

KURALAY Kenzhekanova, 2015, “Linguistic Features of Political Discourse”

Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy Vol 6 No 6 S2 November 2011

MATTHEW J Cull ,2019, “Dismissive Incomprehension: A Use of Purported Ignorance to Undermine Others,” *Social Epistemology*, 33(3), pp.262-271.
DOI : [10.1080/02691728.2019.1625982](https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2019.1625982)

OLIVIER Reboul, 1991, *Introduction à la rhétorique : théorie et pratique*. Paris, PUF.

RUTH Amossy, 2005, « L’argumentation dans le discours », Armand Collins, 75005 Paris p. 164-165)

SLOANE Thomas O’Conor, 2001, *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

STEPHANIE Sarkis, 2018, *Gaslighting: Recognize Manipulative and Emotionally Abusive People – and Break Free*, Da Capo Press , New York, First Edition

VAN Eemeren et ROB Grootendorst, 1996, *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory* New York, Routledge. 1st Edition