

A Forensic Stylistics for Facticity Evidentialization in Political Discourse

Moustafa Guezohouezon

Université Nationale d'Agriculture (UNA/ Bénin) ,

Ecole de Sociologie Rurale et de Vulgarisation Agricole,

Laboratoire d'Economie Rurale et de Sciences Sociales pour le Développement Durable (LERSSoDD),

Unité de Recherche en Analyse des Changements Sociaux et de Communication Rurale.

***Corresponding Author:** *Moustafa Guezohouezon, Université Nationale d'Agriculture (UNA/ Bénin) , Ecole de Sociologie Rurale et de Vulgarisation Agricole, Laboratoire d'Economie Rurale et de Sciences Sociales pour le Développement Durable (LERSSoDD), Unité de Recherche en Analyse des Changements Sociaux et de Communication Rurale.*

Abstract: *No evidence is blurred forever. Facts are stubborn and what is is and cannot happen not to be the case in essence. So stands the Cartesian postulation to stick to in our daily social trade to foster fairness in community life. Unfortunately, ideally meant to serve social welfare as politics is, reaching such a promised land remains a plain hallucination to humans. With grandiosity and expediency offing away their common sense, most politicians worldwide take their populaces for easy-mesmerizing simpletons and nincompoops. Thus, politicians often handle whimsical discourse to hypnotize their minds and souls, meanwhile having themselves lavishly lauded. For getting the stretch of such massive cretinity shrink down and awaken social awareness to the dangerousness of the fact, writers often have it dramatized into fictional representations. But pretty possibly, the outer cover of stylish detours hampers access to their backdrop message. Hence, using forensic stylistics as a facticity unpacking toolkit in Discourse Analysis, the current study means to scavenge a few political discourses selected on a trans-continental ground from a comparative stylistic perspective to turn ostensible the insidious contrast between mesmeric political procrastination and the pragmatism of earnest oath in political vicinity.*

Keywords: *Forensic stylistics; whimsical discourse; mesmeric; earnest oath.*

1. INTRODUCTION

All the truer it is that truth stands true, not to be true is also a truth; but both postulations can never hold to the same variables. That is, truth and falsity are two distinct entities and neither can stand for the other. These are just logical axioms of life. Accordingly, no evidence can be blurred away forever. So stands a Cartesian postulation to hook on to reduce fraudulence in social interactions and foster fairness in community life, chiefly in politics and business transactions. Bernecker and Pritchard (2011: 3) claim that "One such truth about truth is that it is objective. To speak truly is to say of what is that it is." Unfortunately, with grandiosity and expediency offing away their commonsense, most politicians worldwide take their populaces for easy-mesmerizing simpletons and nincompoops. They often handle whimsical discourse to hypnotize their audience's minds and souls, meanwhile having themselves lavishly lauded. To fight back the dull fact by awakening social awareness to its dangerousness, literary artists often dramatize it into fictional representations. But pretty possibly, stylish detours hamper access to backdrop message in literary artefacts. Hence, using forensic stylistics as essence unpacking toolkit in Critical Discourse Analysis, this study scavenges a few political addresses from a trans-cultural perspective of comparative stylistics to display some shocking contrast between witty procrastination and the pragmatism of earnest oath in political vicinity.

To attain its fact-clarification purpose, the core of this study centres around five key strands as follows: background of the study and literature review, conceptual clarifications and research methodology, thematical presentation, pragmasemantic analysis and interpretation of corpus data, and, eventually, a trans-discoursal contrastive critical appraisal of the findings meant to showcase the overall developmental and scientific merits of the study.

2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In literature or social trade, discursive language is often stylishly shaped to grant suavity to communication. Oddly, style is also often wittily handled to flout discourse intents. Thus, the trend renders ad hoc meaning subject to contextually situated negotiation. In that vein, Widdowson (1988:16) argues that: “In literary writings, it is common to find instances of language which cannot be accounted for by grammatical rules”. Likewise, Widdowson (1988:44), contends about literary style that “it helps to create expectations in the reader and deny him their satisfaction.” In fact, style is wittily handled by shrewd political communicators to mesmerize their audiences, altering and corrupting facts into their expedient profit, converting snow or cotton into soot or vice versa, at the will of their ad hoc whims and desiderata.

In disapproval of this dull state of fact stands Bernecker’s and Pritchard’s (2011: 3) concept of “Objectivity truism” holding that “beliefs are true just when they correspond to reality”. A logical inference pending from these claims is that truth falls to actuality and ranks beyond any subjective or arbitrary negotiation, and there is no half way about it. Either something is the case, or it is not at all. But a question worth asking about this stance relates to its workability in ever shifting social, cultural and situational contexts. Can rationalization and radicalization of social trades prove constantly operative and oil communal life? A warning contention by Pewissi (2012:146) in relation to radicalization in social critique is that: “Criticism is not devoid of social preoccupation... Because codes and meanings are decided upon in the cultural community, neglecting these codes is placing the text beyond its source of inspiration while the writer’s own world is placed in the text.” By the way, for discourse critiques to sound reasonable in their work, there is a need to consider the discourse producer him/herself as emanating from certain socio-cultural gadgets that can but bear on their production. So, the acceptability or rejection of a discourse would definitely depend on this multi-layer dynamic, considering at a time who produces it for whom, why, for what and in which context. Brief, communication efficacy is tributary to smart adaptability to the prevailing discourse context.

However, It Matters Pretty Well To Highlight That Reckoning The Centrality Of Adaptability Offers Neither Credence In, Nor Apology To, Witty Communicators, To Every ‘Chief Nanga’ To Deploy Their Vile Expedient Talents Of “Men Of The People” (Alluding To Chinua Achebe, 1966). No Applause Is Given Either To Soyinka’s (1973:177) Ironic And Antithetical Claim As Ascribed To His Woeful Character, Prophet Jero That: “To Survive, We Need Full-Bodied Tactics”.

3. CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Conceptual Clarifications

This study is a multi-modal type of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It involves operative toolkits inherent in Critical Applied Linguistics and Forensic Linguistics, including various aspects of Semantics and Pragmatics. For Roohi, Asif & Ali (2021 :1), “CDA is related to the analysis of both spoken and written forms in the lens of elegant and expansive, practicing a particular social setting such as domination, hegemony, racial discrimination, as well as a violation of basic human rights.”

As for Forensic Stylistics, McMenamin (2002: xi) claims it to be “the application of the science of linguistic stylistics to forensic contexts and purposes” or “the application of style analysis to cases of questioned authorship.” He also argues that it is an interdisciplinary field all the more as it builds upon other fields like semantics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, stylistics and phonology.

In a word, Forensic Linguistics consists in a linguistic study meant to sort out hidden stakes for legal perspectives. As for ‘Stylistics’, it relates to the study of linguistic gymnastics. Mireku-Gyimah (2013: 269) rightly argues of irony that “it is the art of saying something without really saying it”; which implicates an ironic style of discourse to be possibly conceived of as a seemingly absurd reasoning process whereby what actually is may be stated as not being the case.

Another operative tool at stake is ‘Implicature’. It relates to Speaker’s intended meaning. It actually proves pragmatics to be “a dynamic, user-oriented activity” (Hoye, 2006:24). It reveals how the complex personal, social, cultural and ideational context bears on meaning negotiation in discourse. ‘Felicity Conditions’ also is one helpful interface of Pragmatics. Premiered by Searle (1969), these are factors of veridicality and appropriateness determination in discourse, revealing falsity, truthfulness, appropriateness or inappropriateness in speech acts.

As regards *Facticity*, it is opposed to *Aspectuality* (Raffoul & Nelson, 2008). Facticity relates to the ontological essence of facts or events, while *Aspectuality* is about the façade or prima facie representation of things, which is open to subjective corruption through grammaticalization.

Regarding Evidentialization, it has to do with discovering hidden facts. It matters a lot in laboratory research. In philosophy of language (Lycan, 2008) and Hermeneutics, a philosophical and theological discipline meant to coax out hidden meaning from discourse. It focuses particularly on understanding the connexion between a text and its interpreter, trying to compensate the gap between the sender’s intended meaning and the receiver’s inferred understanding. As for Forensic Linguistics, Coulthard and Johnson (2007:1) define it as: “The study of language and the law, covering topics from legal language and courtroom discourse to plagiarism. Accordingly, the discipline relates to mind reading and authorship identification for truth restoration in legal context, helping to unpack “invisible meaning” (Yule, 1996:127), or “the meant-but-unsaid” (Horn & Ward (2004/2006:1) in discourse.

About *Presupposition*, Dekker (2008: 25) argues that: “In linguistics, presuppositions are a kind of preconditions for linguistic items (expressions) or acts (utterances) to make sense”. In the very line, Stockwell (2007: 232) contends that the presupposition of a statement *P* is something which has to be true before *P* can possibly be plausible or sensible. As a result, he concludes on the very page that “the presupposition tenure doesn’t vary.” This stance accurately goes along with Yule’s (1996:132) veridicality gauging concept of “Constancy under negation” testifying the stability of truth tenure in a statement through grammatical negativization.

As far as agency is concerned, it relates to determining the semantic role of the grammatical subject in a sentence either as a conscious doer or an undergoer, its activeness or activeness in relation to the event under depiction: say *Agent Vs Patient*. It consists of syntactic or semantic configuration of discourse displaying or hiding/ discarding actors’ responsibility for some subjective purposes. So, the concept of *Agency* calls for intentionality, control and volition (Aheam, 2001).

3.2. Research Methodology

This study is a trans-disciplinary qualitative discourse analysis focusing on Critical Applied Linguistics (Pennycook, 2001; Davies, 1999/2007) and Forensic Linguistics (Coulthard, 2007 & 2010; McMenamin, 2002). It centres on selected official addresses by the following four Presidents:

- Muhammadu Buhari (Nigeria, at the National Assembly Open Week on Monday 16th July, 2018);
- Donald Trump’s (USA) post-electoral campaign protestant speech at the Capitol, January 6, 2021;
- Nelson Mandela’s “An Ideal for Which I am Prepared to Die » (Pretoria, South Africa 20 April 1964); and
- Barack Obama’s Farewell Address, (January 10, 2017).

From each of these speeches, six short sequences are systematically culled and variably explored through the multi-tier sieve of Implicature, Inference, Felicity Conditions, Critical Pragma-Semantics and Agentive Functions. Eventually, findings are critically appraised from a comparative perspective to reveal some stakes of ethics in politics and give way to worthy suggestions for community welfare enhancement.

4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. presentation, analysis and interpretation of president muhammadu buhari’s address

4.1.1. selected data presentation and inherent implicatures

Table 1. *Illustrative Excerpts from President Buhari’s Address with Their Pragmatic Implicatures*

N ^o	Selected sequences from President Buhari’s address	Inherent Implicatures
A ₁	I also want to thank all the Distinguished Senators and Honourable Members of the national Assembly for their unwavering support for our nascent democracy.	Audience lulling
A ₂	The primary objective of Government, as enshrined in our Constitution, is the security and welfare of the people. However, this objective can only be achieved when all arms collaborate and work together.	Brooding about open secret for audience bamboozling

A ₃	By 2016, the economy of our dear country had gone into recession. Again, MY administration swung into action with your support, by coming up, first with the Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) for the 2016 Budget and by 2017, with Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) to serve as the medium term economic plan of the country from 2017-2020.	Self-bragging for audience lulling
A ₄	The Senate President, Mr. Speaker and members of the National Assembly, this administration has introduced some Bills and policies to achieve good and open governance.	
A ₅	While MY desire was premised on the need to bring about better development outcomes in 2018 using the budget, it was regrettable that the required Executive-Legislative collaboration was not reflected in the time it took to pass the Bill.	Self-bleaking for liability declining
A ₆	The point to underscore firmly is that, a stronger and more cordial Executive-Legislative relationship must exist in the interest of the nation and the people that elected us into office.	Witty condescendence & procrastinial political promise for Audience mesmerizing

Sequences tabulated here are labelled from A₁ through A₆. Typical implicatures inherent in these sequences include audience lulling, brooding about an open secret for audience bamboozling, self-bragging for liability declining, witty condescendence for audience mesmerizing.

4.1.2. Pragmasemantic Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Data in Table A are all indicative of propagandist personality traits in political discourse. Manifold supportive clues can be identified. In Sequence (A₁), for instance, “Honourable Members of the National Assembly” bears a pointing function meant to celebrate the addressees as is evidenced through the laudatory phrases “to thank” and “for their unwavering support”. In the phrase “our nascent democracy”, the inclusive *our*-deictic form serves to magnet the attention and sympathy of the audience, while “nascent democracy” features a condescending call for a come-together to preserve a common legacy: the Nigerian nation. Actuality, this phrase is symbolical of the orator’s strategic intention to cool off and stifle any potential dissidence in his audience with a view to being lauded. Indeed, taking for granted that the term “democracy” premiers freedom enjoyment while “nascent” points to its recency or fresh coming into being, the phrase can logically but attract attention and ignite deep interest in the audience. However, history claims that Nigeria acceded to independence since October1, 1960 (see <https://britannica.com>) and became a Republic on October1, 1963 (see <https://en.wikipedia.org>). Given that the address under consideration was pronounced on July 16th, 2018 there is good ground to wonder whether such an over-half-a-century-old democracy has not benefited enough time and accumulated sufficient experience yet to mature into adulthood. Thus, the statement sounds like just horning for mind numbing.

Likewise, propagandist communication permeates all other statements. As such, the starter statement in (A₂) functions to just brood about an open secret. Protecting the “security and welfare of the people” is logically the ontological mission known to any legal constitution. Accordingly, this is not much worth pounding over in a solemn presidential address. But, a central point mattering considerably here lies in the second statement in (A₂): “However, this objective can only be achieved when all arms collaborate and work together.” With its semantic essence of direction shift, the however-conjunction by its contrast-oriented semantic load causes the statement to relate to an excuse predicting alibi. So, the statement is alertly used to predict an inescapable obstacle to goal achievement. With the tautology purposefully infused in “collaborate” and “work together” and their being made a sine qua non condition as is shown in the exclusivity featuring adverbial “only”, one can easily figure out that the orator has made of an impossibility-variable the lone master key for a constitutional promise to turn realistic. In actuality, there exists no human community where “all arms collaborate”, “work together” or stay in unison at a nationwide scale. The sequence just features building a castle in the air all the more as it grounds realism on a plinth of unattainable idealism.

As a result, all other sequences from (A₃) through (A₆) are plainly accusative and self-bragging. Thus, “By 2016, the economy of our dear country had gone into recession” (A₃) and “... a stronger and more cordial Executive-Legislative relationship must exist in the interest of the nation and the people who elect us into office” (A₆) are all condescending, accusative and self-boasting. In this regard, the deixes *our* and *your* in “our dear country” and “with your support” are meant to attract the affection of his audience. The *my*-deixis in “my administration swung into action” is self-centred and makes the whole

sentence highlight boastfulness in the orator. The same trend of grandiloquent and propagandist self-bragging shows up in (A₅) as: “My desire was premised on the need to bring about better development outcomes in 2018 using the budget”. The straightaway adjacent annexation of the hampering barrier to this achievement is quite strategic for liability declining: “...it was regrettable that the required Executive-Legislative collaboration was not reflected in the time it took to pass the bill.” This presupposes once again that his development plan in aid of the nation is handicapped by some functional lethargy or morbidity in the Legislative.

The emphatical semantic value in the *must*-modal and the qualifier-phrase *a stronger and more cordial* in “A stronger and more cordial Executive-Legislative relationship must exist in the interest of the nation and the people that elect us into office” stands for another strong accusative form pointing to some failure of inter-institutional collaboration and cohesion. The inherent propagandist dose here lies in the overstatement or semantic repetition in “the nation” and “the people that elect us” as though they were two distinct entities. Even if considered to be the case, the statement bears a tacit recognition by the speaker himself of the impossibility in his inhibiting condition as “when all arms collaborate and work together” (A₂). Altogether, throughout the analysis and interpretation of these sequences, one can coax out that President Buhari deems himself clear of all blames. In cleansing himself and his governmental team of all blames, he discharges the liability for all woes and sufferings of the people on the preceding government (A₃) and the lethargy of the meantime Legislative (A₆).

Overall, data analysis and interpretation display boastful traits in President Buhari. Building on the popular axiomatic claim that “there exists no perfect human”, there is legitimate ground to maintain that the whole address just features political procrastination or mere horning for mind numbing. Now, let’s explore Trump’s protestation address to appreciate how language use contributes to revealing personality traits in him.

4.2. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Donald J. Trump’s Protestation Statement

4.2.1. Selected Data Presentation and inherent Implicatures

Table 2. *Selected Sequences from President Trump’s Protestation statement and Their Inherent Pragmatic Implicatures*

N°	Selected sequences from President Trump’s Address	Inherent Implicatures
B ₁	America is crumbling, and Democrats have no solutions. Our nation has no hope of change for the better under Democrat leadership. People are desperate	Gossiping and blackmailing
B ₂	Our nation is suffering. Our economy is in the gutter. Inflation is rampant. Gas prices have reached an all-time high. Ships are unable to unload cargo. Families cannot get needed baby formula. We are an embarrassment around the world.	
B ₃	We have a White House in shambles, with Democrats, just this week, declaring that Biden is unfit to run for reelection.	Denigration campaign
B ₄	A certain Democrat once said, “It’s the economy, stupid.” Well, Democrats now seem to think that Americans are “stupid.” They are not.	Discoursal confusion for incitement to anger & rebellion
B ₅	During my time in office, our nation was thriving, our economy was strong, and the price of gas was very low. Above all else, we were respected, perhaps like never before. America prospered under the Trump Administration.	propagandist Self-bragging
B ₆	The illegal ballot harvesting operation is an insult to the democratic process, but the kicker is the media feeding us the bogus line that this was the most secure election in U.S. history... With just Georgia, Arizona, and Pennsylvania, and there were others, the Electoral College vote would have been Trump 279 to Biden 259. But they cheated. And now look where we are as a country!	Accusation for Electoral fraudulence and Incitement to folk rebellion

Data in Table B embody such implicatures as gossiping and blackmailing campaign, discoursal hodgepodge for folk anger igniting, propagandist self-bragging and suspicion of electoral fraudulence for incitement to folk rebellion. These implicatures are all symbolical of invective and vindictive language, all which claims the coming section can help better demonstrate.

4.2.2. pragmasemantic analysis and interpretation of data

Table B enshrines pessimistic, invective and vindictive statements. Considering for instance the segment “America is crumbling” (B₁) and “the Democrats have no solution” (B₁), they function to

highlight some incapacity of the Democrats to face blazing issues confronting the fate of America. Indeed, the US Constitution does promote an absolutist patriotism, a sort of Nation-priority as is sloganeered into “America first” by Donald Trump himself in his propagandist political campaigns to impact on social psyche. Accordingly, chanting in the meantime that some leaders of such a long-established democracy are unable to preserve the integrity of the nation amounts to a sabotaging call for popular revenge, enticing people for the restoration of their common national honour, their shared legacy.

The very seemingly condescending but essentially demeaning trend keeps on in B₂ and B₃ involving the following: “Our nation is suffering; our economy is in the gutter. Inflation is rampant. Gas prices have reached an all-time high...” (B₂). These claims are quite pessimistic and denigrating. Adding up to them is: “Our nation has no hope for change for the better under Democrats’ leadership” (B₁) featuring some absolute nullification of the Biden regime. Such a roundly desperate depiction shows America as a nation blocked in a sorrowful deadlock or jettisoned into a dark abyss, with no retrieval chance for any possible survival as long as the Democrats are in office. The Democrats are thus claimed just to be good for nothing, holding no effective leadership capability to be heading such a nation.

Into the bargain, B₃ comes in to cap it all with a visibly fake news coined by Trump to debase his opponent as: “We have a White House in shambles, with Democrats, just this week, declaring that Biden is unfit to run for reelection.” One immediate question worth asking at this point is: “How can a party stand to canvass against its own candidate?” Building on the hodgepodge or semantic anachronism borne in the statement, one can conclude of it to be a plain lie, a nonsense which affords supporting credence to Toolan’s (1996:50) quite telling pun-based claim that: “The world fails to match the words as the words fail to match the world.” Meanwhile, B₅ is meant for propagandist self-bragging. As such, the *my*-deixis in “During my time in office” bestows on the speaker a self-privileging attribute. He prides himself about some presumptuously salutary achievements. So, “Our nation was thriving”, “Our economy was strong” and “The price of gas was very low” are all temptingly positive and laudable deed alleged to be the speaker’s own credit.

Besides, the characteristic outmodedness inherent in the past tense marking all these actions insinuates that America experienced times of glory only under Trump’s leadership. Reversely, the trend accusatively insinuates some round mediocracy of the Biden regime. Thence, a logical inference pending from such allegations relates to political propaganda since the speaker claims himself to be the lone “Man of the people”, the unique Messiah of his community, the lone able builder of some American paradise.

Overall, the narrative sounds too much alluring to be realistic in essence. Definitely, one has to beware such political discourses so as not to let oneself hypnotized and wantonly ensnared by witty politicians.

4.3. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of President Nelson Mandela’s Address

4.3.1. Selected Data Presentation and Inherent Implicatures

Table 3. Selected sequences from President Nelson Mandela’s Address and their Inherent Implicatures

N ^o	Selected sequences from President Nelson Mandela’s Address	Inherent Implicatures
C ₁	I have done whatever I did, both as an individual and as a leader of my people, because of my experience in South Africa and my own proudly felt African background, and not because of what any outsider.	Liability recognition and bearing
C ₂	I admit immediately that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkhonto we Sizwe, and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August 1962	
C ₃	Some of the things so far told to the court are true and some are untrue. I do not, however, deny that I planned sabotage. I did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness, nor because I have any love of violence.	Agency bearing and commitment to human freedom
C ₄	I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation, and oppression of my people by the whites.	
C ₅	All lawful modes of expressing opposition to this principle had been closed by legislation..	Dangerosity of political oppression
C ₆	and we were placed in a position in which we had either to accept a permanent state of inferiority, or to defy the government. We chose to defy the law	

Sequences tabulated here are labelled from C1 through C6. They are paired into three implicature groups as follows, grounding on their semantic essence: Liability recognition (C₁ & C₂), 'Agency bearing and commitment to human freedom' (C₃ & C₄) and Dangerosity of political oppression (C₅ & C₆). Further insights into their pragmasemantic load will help better highlight their actual discorsal essence.

4.3.2. *pragmasemantic analysis and interpretation of data*

In (C₁), 'I have done whatever I did' is a plain recognition of liability or agency bearing. The repeated *I*-deixis bears an agentive function of proving the speaker to hold the responsibility of his deed. What is more, the phrase "both as an individual and as a leader" offers a twofold view of his personality trait as a mentally strong person, a responsible personality, a committed and headstrong leader. The affectionate dose infused in the repeated *my*-deixis in "my people", "my experience in South Africa" and "my own proudly felt African background" indicates his intimate sense of advocacy for the well-being of otherness and the depth of his patriotism. The frontal nature of these statements proves him to actually be a leader committed to fighting for the welfare of his nation as a whole.

The straightaway tone of his declaration shows up more overtly in (C₂), (C₃) and (C₄). So, in (C₂) "I admit immediately" is a hedge-free head clause announcing the subordinate "that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkhonto We Sizwe." Throughout these statements, Mandela plainly reckons his membership to, and activism in, the protestant or dissident group. Better, the next coordinated subordinate further itemizes his activism acceptance within the group: "and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August 1962." The inference leaking from this utterance is that although he has happened to be arrested at least once in 1962, no fright has affected his determination to go fighting for the liberation of his people. In (C₃), "I do not however deny that I planned sabotage" offers further evidence of his bravado and strong commitment to achieving the patriotic goal of setting his people free from the settlers' yoke.

By the way, Mandela's frontal actions and straightaway recognition of his agency or authorship is spurred by his airtight commitment to human freedom. Supportive evidence to this claim is offered in (C₄) as: "I planned it (sabotage) as a result of calm and sobber assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation, and oppression of my people by the Whites." This claim insinuates that whatever he has done, risking to sacrifice his own freedom – and possibly his life – essentially grounds on his patriotic sense: advocating for the freedom of all South Africans, setting them all free from the shackles of white settlers.

Besides, Mandela has repeatedly proved that his actions were not meant to sire chaos in the country. For instance, phrases like "I did not plan it (sabotage) in a spirit of recklessness, nor because I have any love of violence" (C₃) and "... a result of a calm and sobber assessment of the political situation" (C₄) allude to his inclination to attaining a pacific restoration of his nation's freedom. Unfortunately, (C₅) and (C₆) feature a deadlock having ignited violence against his own expectation.

Indeed, "All lawful modes of expressing opposition to this principle had been closed by legislation" (C₅) accusatively points to some legalised mutiny of the people, with no possibility to deviate from the politically established straight-jacketing mainstream. It is then a forceful steamroller reducing the whole nation to some lizard fate of yes-noddors. (C₆) shows that violence has happened to break out during the combat because no breach has been left by the colonizers for pacific negotiation, whereas the Blacks got fed up with being subjugated. Accordingly, the statement "And we were placed in a position in which we had either to accept a permanent state of inferiority, or to defy the government. We chose to defy the law." (C₆) is indicative of social explosion. The *We*-deixis in the very last sentence indicate the collective indignation and revenge of the Blacks. This scenario legitimizes Femi Johnson's article whose title is: "A man is either master of his trade or should quit the world" (as is quoted by Adelugba, D., 1987, p. 11).

4.4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of President Barak Obama's Farewell Address

4.4.1. *Selected Data Presentation and Inherent Implicatures*

Table 4. Selected sequences from President Obama’s Farewell Address Inherent Implicatures

N ^o	Selected sequences from President Obama’s Farewell Address	Inherent Implicatures
D ₁	President Obama: My fellow Americans — [APPLAUSE] — Michelle and I have been so touched by all the well wishes that we’ve received over the past few weeks. But tonight, it’s my turn to say thanks. [APPLAUSE]	Recognition of the people’s contributions to oiling power governance
D ₂	President Obama: Whether we have seen eye-to-eye or rarely agreed at all, my conversations with you, the American people, in living rooms and in schools, at farms, on factory floors, at diners and on distant military outposts — those conversations are what have kept me honest, and kept me inspired, and kept me going. And every day, I have learned from you. You made me a better President, and you made me a better man. [APPLAUSE]	
D ₃	Audience: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! President Obama: I can’t do that. Audience: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!	Showing respect to the vitality of the American democracy
D ₄	President Obama: This is where I learned that change only happens when ordinary people get involved and they get engaged, and they come together to demand it. After eight years as your President, I still believe that. And it’s not just my belief. It’s the beating heart of our American idea that We, the People, through the instrument of our democracy, can form a more perfect union.	
D ₅	Audience: You were the change. You answered people’s hopes, and because of you, by almost every measure, America is a better, stronger place than it was when we started. [APPLAUSE] In 10 years, the world will witness a hallmark of our democracy.	
D ₆	President Obama: Nooo —No, no, no, no, no — the peaceful transfer of power from one freely elected President to the next. [APPLAUSE] I committed to President-elect Trump that my administration would ensure the smoothest possible transition, just as President Bush did for me.	

Tabulated data here are labelled from (D₁) through (D₆). They are classified into two groups of implicature as: “Recognition of the citizens’ contributions to oiling power governance” (D₁ & D₂) and “Showing respect to the vitality of the American democracy” (D₃ through D₆). The subsequent in-depth insight means to better showcase personality traits in the orator.

4.4.2. *pragmasemantic analysis and interpretation of data*

Data maintained and compiled in this table are quite symbolical of the speaker’s patriotic attachment to his nation, America. Firstly, in (D₁) and (D₂) the orator celebrates the facilitating contributions of the citizens to his governance as a President. Thus, the affectionate dose in the vocative “My fellow Americans” and the declarative “Michelle and I have been so touched by all the wishes that we’ve received” (D₁) are expressive of his recognition of some good contributions benefited from his folk. Better, the segment “but tonight, it’s my turn to say thanks” (D₁) is an overt show of gratitude”, a straightaway inner-self-revelation of humility.

Further, the assistance benefited as are provided in (D₂) relates essentially to communication as is highlighted through such phrases as “my conversations with you” and “Those conversations are what have kept me honest, and kept me inspired, and kept me going.” These phrases showcase a good dose of humility in the man. They also reveal the centrality of communication and participative power management to successful leadership building. Indeed, Obama reckons through these sequences that the American citizens have brought positive ideas to keep him in the right track and oil his power management. Thus, the vocative “The American people” adds up to the subsequent series of location circumstantials to insist on his show of thankfulness towards his benefactors, his power management facilitators. This gratitude is overtly stated as he confesses: “And every day, I have learned from you. You made me a better President, and you made me a better man” (D₂).

Accordingly, humility and gratitude have sired folk support to, and approval of, the man as can be noticed in (D₃) and (D₅). Folk affection for Obama has ignited in the hectic audience the claim to overlook and violate the long-established constitutional lock of mandate limitation. Though pretty aware that Obama was ending his second presidential governance, they have called on him to overstep the legal threshold. Supporting evidence to this claim lies in their leitmotiv chant as “Four more years; four more years; four more years” as well as the laudatory statements like “You are the change”; “You

answered people's hope" and "America is a better, stronger place than it was when we started" (D₅). These claims indicate their collective acclaim for Obama's leadership.

Notwithstanding the hectic and euphoric attitude of the audience, Obama has remained unmoved in his stance as an outward president. He has shown no propension to turn expedient in grabbing the bait as is proposed by his folk. He has proved his earnest allegiance to the American constitution. Thus, his repeated "I can't do that" (D₃) and playful "Nooo – No, no, no, no" (D₆) are striking testimonies. Any way contrariwise can cause a degeneration of the social tissue and possibly sire national turmoil, opening the way to some national chaos. Preferably, Obama rather gives primacy to preserving the prevailing national peace, as is insinuated through this verbless clause: "The peaceful transfer of power from one freely elected president to the next" (D₆). What is more, the trend proves his trustworthiness and dignity. His statement as "I committed to President-elect Trump that my administration would ensure the smoothest possible transition, just as President Bush did for me" (D₆) affords credit to the claim. This also offers evidence that he has benefited a legacy of peaceful power transition that he does want to transfer to his successor, President Trump.

Overall, if all political leaders can be of such a fair-play type, no crises could arise and most politics-spurred civil wars can be discarded. In conclusion, abiding by constitutional prescriptions is a legitimate guarantee to preserving communal peace and oiling societal welfare enhancement.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Findings feature unbalanced bi-polar realities in politics at large. Overall, data analysis proves that the four orators can be paired into two binomials by their personality traits. Presidents Obama and Mandela match up into a socially inclusive causal relation founding the Ubuntu philosophy: "I am because we are". Buhari and Trump rather substantiate a reverse position as "We are because I am", with a quite abrasive load inherent in their discursal trends. While statements in Buhari's and Trump's speeches stand overtly boastful, frontal, invective and divisive, Obama and Mandela share traits of humility, altruism and social unity, adding up to an audacious sense of agentive responsibility bearing. Actually, the first trend pays no good service to greasing human bliss.

As a matter of fact, all involvements by Mandela and Obama feature their deep sense of patriotic commitment, bravado and gregarious mind. The leitmotiv use of the first person – *I; my* – in their involvements is symbolical of their solid audacity in authorship recognition. Mandela does not hedge at all about accepting his liabilities. Anyway, the very title of his address is quite supportive of this contention: "An ideal for which I'm prepared to die." Accordingly, such claims as "I admit immediately that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkhonto we Sizwe" (C₂) and "I do not, however, deny that I planned sabotage" (C₃) offer evidence to his bravado. In (D₃), when emulation has caused the audience to invite Obama to take an extra-constitutional mandate ("Four more years! Four more years!"), his reply stands quite sharp as "I can't do that", though he is still in power and may force expedient arrangements. This ethical sense gets further displayed in "I committed to President-elect Trump that my administration would ensure the smoothest possible transition, just as President Bush did for me." This is quite revealing of his respect for the American constitution.

Contrariwise, Trump's address is full of accusations and invectives. Reactions marked with intoxication and denigration campaign, and self-glorification unveil his bitter discomfort against the outcomes of the electoral ballots. His speech sounds utterly divisive, unlike the unifying trend in the Obama and Mandela cases. Even though some common personality traits show up between President Buhari and him as to self-bragging and audience bamboozling, the first shows no inclination to igniting popular revolts. Such a claim of his as: "A certain Democrat once said, "It's the economy, stupid." (B₄) is a semantic hodgepodge deliberately meant to provoke anger in the audience. By the way, this discourse segment is wittily handled for some malicious purposes.

First, the qualifier 'stupid' may relate to the phrase "It's the economy", but it has no plausible connection with the Americans. Quite oddly, Trump infers from the statement that it is abusive to all Americans. So his statement as "Well, Democrats now seem to think that Americans are stupid" (B₄) is quite infelicitous, all the more as it is incongruous, unfair and unconversant with any high-rank personality; let alone, a president. Besides, he delves into some show of mesmeric condescension as "They are not" (B₄). This adds up to his self-bragging in (B₂) to reveal the invective essence, ethical voidance and humility break in the man.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Altogether, the current study aims to showcase stakes of ethics in politics worldwide with a view to enhancing or oiling communal welfare in humanity. The operative eclectic methodology adopted has permeated several research fields. Overall, findings can be bipolarized into socially negative and positive attitudes, with their respective corresponding actor-tandems paired into Buhari-Trump and Obama-Mandela, basing on their personality traits as are revealed by their own discursual language.

Empirically, the scarcity of such Mandela-and-Obama-match golden specimens in political arenas causes successive changes of political regimes to epitomize an on-spot relay race within fundamentally static and rotten systems, offering credit to Soyinka's (1973:61) sloganeering contention that: "ism to ism for ism is ism." It urges lay populations get awake and start, as is willed by Soyinka (1973:168), rebuking political defrauders as: "Go and practice your fraudulences on another person of greater gullibility." Definitely, for the good of mankind, there is a blazing need for attitudinal revolution in political vicinity worldwide. Findings leaking from this study such as Obama's adamant show of airtight respect for constitutional prescriptions as well as Mandela's earnest patriotism and audacious commitment to freedom restoration offer good epitomes of ideal change expected in political arenas all over the world. Vivekananda (2001/2009:43) rightly claims that: "The only remedy to bad habits is counter habits."

REFERENCE LIST

- Achebe, C. (1966). *A Man of the People*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Bernecker, S. & Pritchard, D. (2011). *The Routledge Companion to Epistemology*. New York & UK: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Bussmann, H. (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge
- Coulthard M. & Johnson A. (2007). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Davies, A. (1999/2007). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: From Practice to Theory*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Hoye, L. F. (2006). "Applying Pragmatics" In Mey, J. L. (Ed), *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics*. Oxford & UK: Elsevier Ltd, pp.24-27.
- Lycan, W. G. (2008). *Philosophy of Language: A Contemporary Introduction (2nd Ed.)*. New York & UK: Taylor and Francis Group.
- McMenamin, G. R. (2002). *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*, London & New York: LLC CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Pewissi, A. (2012). "Response as a theory in the making", in *Mosaïque (Revue de Philosophie, Littérature et Sciences Humaines)*. Lomé: ISPSH
- Don Bosco).
- Roohi, S. Asif, M. & Ali, I. (2021). "Critical Discourse Analysis of Nelson Mandela's Political Speeches". *Global Education Studies Review VI (IV)*, 151-162.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soyinka, W. (1973). *Collected Plays 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Toolan, M. (1996). *Language in Literature: An Introduction to Stylistics*. UK: Hodder Education (Hachette Company). Vivekananda, S. (2001/2009). *Personality Development*. India: Kolkata. 2nd edition.

Citation: Moustafa Guezohouezon. "A Forensic Stylistics for Facticity Evidentialization in Political Discourse." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*. vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 12-21, 2025. Available: DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.1310002>.

Copyright: © 2025 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.