Rhetorical Devices of Hate Speech in Kenyan Political Discourse

[1]Chelule June Chebet, [2]Evelyne Mahero, [3]Jacinta Ndambuki
[1,2,3]Laikipia University

Abstract

Rhetoric is useful for its persuasive function in speech. Political discourses make use of rhetorical devices to convince listeners in an effort to get the support needed in democratic spaces or for control and manipulation. The objectives of this qualitative study are to identify and explain rhetorical devices of hate speech in sampled Kenyan politicians' speeches on the YouTube platform and to discuss the devices as used in the political speeches considered as hate speech in Kenya. A purposive sampling of data was carried out and a total of ten political speeches were collected. The speeches were transcribed and translated then thematically analysed guided by the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework, the Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA) approach and Relevance theories. The qualitative study reveals that the speakers employed a variety of rhetorical devices which include repetition, direct address, allusion, rhetorical questions, and symbolism. The findings revealed that the sampled speeches were intended to influence or to persuade the audiences on specific ideologies located in the specific choice of words. The study contributes to the discussion of hate speech from an applied linguistics perspective. The findings are useful to the general public in making informed choices on hate speech and to policy makers who can use the information to understand and control the practice.

Key words: Rhetorical devices, political discourse, hate speech

Introduction

This study is interested in rhetorical devices which has been an area of interest especially in political discourse. Hauser (2002) defines rhetoric as the management of symbols in order to coordinate social action. Symbols may be verbal or nonverbal and they present a meaningful idea, thought, opinion or belief. This is closely related to Leech (1983) who argued that rhetoric is the study of the effective use of language. Although rhetoric has been understood in particular historical traditions as the art of using language skilfully for persuasion, literary expression or for public speaking, this view of rhetoric is the focus it places on a goal-oriented speech situation in which the speaker uses language in order to produce a particular effect in the mind of a hearer.

Hate speech refers to utterances that incite against and exclude others based on their identity as specified in the National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC, 2008) and other relevant definitions. The speech may be construed as a call for action against these groups and may lead to hate crime. The definition of Kenya's National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC Act 2008) Section 13(1) is preferred in this study. It argues that 'a person is said to engage in hate speech if that person uses threatening language, insulting words or behaviour or displays, publishes or distributes any written material, or visual images with intent to stir up hatred based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, age, language and nationality**.'** Hate speech leads to discourse crisis and this study explores the ways that Kenyan politicians use rhetorical strategies to advance it from the videos retrieved from the YouTube platform.

Researchers have studied hate speech through content analysis and close readings of texts that focus on themes, myths, and heuristics that contribute to the strategic use of hate speech. Hate speech is used to recruit and socialize new members to groups that make hatred a primary purpose for their being, that is to say, hate groups (Perry, 2001; Waltman & Haas,

2011). By sharing stories, jokes, and books among themselves, hate groups use hate speech to teach their members the appropriate beliefs for being a proper group member.

Charteris-Black (2011) points out that for one to be a successful speaker, he or she needs to reinforce the attitude and feelings of the receiver. If a listener feels the understanding and support of the speaker, then they are more capable to be influenced. Therefore, performance is an integral part of political discourse. According to Charteris-Black, the effect of rhetorical strategies in political speeches is often a result of them being combined. Therefore, it is as interesting to look at the interaction of various strategies as it is to look at each one separately. This is observed in the sampled speeches as the speakers have appealed to the affective when they excite the crowds with populist comments to ensure that they remain in power.

Political discourse is often linked with the language of deception, persuasion or rhetoric. One of the goals of a political player is to persuade their audience of the validity of their basic claims (Thomas, 1999). Politicians can use coded language such as comparing their opponents to undesirable objects or traits. In Kenya post-election violence was witnessed after the 2007 general elections. It was attributed to some leaders who used inciting language that excluded others based on their identities in particular ethnicities (KNCHR, 2008). Therefore, there is need for sensitization on hate speech in the country. The same word or phrase that is used in a self-deprecating joke can be interpreted as denigrating when uttered by someone of a different ethnicity. Language becomes hate speech when an individual or group uses it to degrade another group or engender discrimination on it. This has been observed in the sampled Kenyan political discourse.

This study sought to give a deeper insight into the problem of hate speech by analyzing the devices selected by the speakers. The use of rhetorical devices to engage in hate speech is significant because there is need for further research on the practice of hate speech in order to avoid its negative effects. This study discusses rhetorical devices in hate speech and aims to fill in the existing gaps from an applied linguistics perspective. As one of the linguistic strategies, choice of rhetorical devices is intentional and reveals the objectives of the speaker and the expected reactions of the audience. A number of studies have been done on hate speech and they have been reviewed in the literature review section. The gaps are in understanding what exactly constitutes hate speech and how the selected devices are employed in effective delivery of the intended messages. The role of context is investigated in meanings brought out. The cyberspace and in particular YouTube is of interest since it is a vibrant site for fast spread and relatively permanent archive of hate discourses that can be retrieved and shared several times.

Literature Review

The language of politics employs symbols. The meaning is controlled by context. In 'Discourse and Semantics' Norrick (2003) discusses figurative meanings. He notes that the figurative meaning of hyperbole, irony, and some metaphors has sometimes also been seen as context bound, though early attempts to describe metaphor often remained solidly within sentence semantics proper.

In her PhD thesis, Ndambuki, (2010) analyses political speeches at the textual level. She argues that proverbs and figurative speech, notably metaphors, are seen as some of the most important means of peppering rhetoric. Such stylistic features in political discourse often work to emphasize what is considered thematically important at a particular moment in time as well as point out areas of controversy. These approaches will be useful in interrogating rhetorical devices of hate speech.

Michira (2014) applies CDA to analyse linguistic persuasive strategies, concealed meanings and ideologies in the presidential campaign discourses in Kenya leading up to the

2013 elections. He identifies contrastive pairs, grammatical strategies and rhetorical strategies in the selected discourses. He analyses the use of terms such as 'two horse race' which sought to ignore the existence of the other presidential candidates in the country. He also discusses contrastive pairs used in bringing out 'us versus them' and in other differences such as age, race, ethnicity and political affiliations distinctions. The current study is guided by these approaches but adopts a broader perspective in the interpretation of hate speech.

Álvarez-Benito and Mª Íñigo-Mora's study in Fetzer et al (2012) 'Redundancy in parliamentary political discourse' discuss rhetorical repetition under the sub topics simple and complex repetition, rhetorical repetitions, and reiterations. They discuss redundancy as a discursive strategy and define it as saying the same thing more than once by using either the same words or different words. In repetition the same word or words are used within the same sentence or in consecutive sentences. The function of this strategy is twofold: on the one hand, a word or idea is given more prominence and, on the other hand, a connection between sentences is established, achieving cohesion within the text. They argue that the use of repetition is much more extended in spoken discourse mainly because of its dramatic effect.

The two different types of repetition distinguished are simple repetition; repetition of the same word or words while maintaining the same grammatical category, although differences regarding number, tense, gender, etc. can be found, and complex repetition; the same lexemes are used but with different grammatical categories. They define and identify anaphora: repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of clauses, epiphora or epistrophe: the opposite to anaphora, since it is the repetition of a word or phrase at the end of clauses, anadiplosis or conduplicatio: repetition of the last word or group of words of a clause or sentence at the beginning of the next sentence or clause and epanalepsis: repetition of the initial word or group of words of a clause or sentence at the end of the next clause or sentence. This is noted in the current study.

Persuasion and aesthetics are used to attract attention as discussed by Khasandi-Telewa and Barasa (2018:190). The corpus of the study is derived from the language employed by Raila Odinga of *Vitendawili* (riddles) in five of his campaign speeches. Both studies draw data from political discourse of rhetoric, inclusion and exclusion on YouTube. The intention is also important in both studies. However, the difference is in the scope and theoretical frameworks employed. The study argues that traditionally, metaphors are perceived as the use of language in a figurative way. The characteristics of one entity are attributed to another for the purposes of comparison to make it clearer by the image formed in the mind. However, there are a variety of approaches that can be adopted in analysis of metaphors as outlined. These approaches have been used in the current study.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA) approach, and relevance theory provided the theoretical underpinnings for this study. CDA was first advanced by the Lancaster school of linguists of which Norman Fairclough was the key personality. Ruth Wodak also gave her input to the domain of study. Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-280) provide the key principles of this theory. To begin with, Critical Discourse analysis tackles societal problems. Next, the power relationships are discursive and discourse is culturally and societally constituted. Discourse also aids in works based on ideology. Moreover, the discourse is historically themed and the relations between text and the society is mediated. CDA is interpretative and explanatory and discourses are forms of social actions. All these tenets are relevant to this study since it is a sociolinguistic approach and the data are drawn from past YouTube data.

Critical discourse analysis examines the form, structure and content of discourse, from the grammar and wording employed in its creation to its reception and interpretation by a wider

audience. The communicative event is presented under text, discourse practice and sociocultural practice. In the last level of the communicative event of CDA which is the sociocultural practice, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) explain that this means the social and cultural goings-on which include the communicative event. The analysis of sociocultural practice is based on the examination of what is happening in a particular sociocultural framework. It explores the ways in which discourses operate in various domains of society and in relation to power and dominance. This study adopted the principle of language as social action in the analysis of discourse used by the speakers. The specific local conditions are of interest since they help in the interpretation from the contexts.

The relevance theory is also utilized in this study. In 1987, Sperber and Wilson used Grice's idea that communication is based on intentions and interpretations to propose a framework for looking at communication from a cognitive perspective, starting with the assumption that people tend to pay most attention to what they perceive as most relevant in a given situation (Sperber and Wilson 1995:156). Instead of the simple process of encoding and decoding information, Sperber and Wilson postulate that the very act of sending a message implies that the sender assumes that the message is relevant. In other words, when someone says something, they must think that what they have to say is important enough to try to communicate it. This is relevant in this study particularly in exploration of hate speech in political speeches because, once an utterance is made, it creates an expectation of being relevant and it should capture the hearer's attention in order for it to fulfill the role of being maximally relevant.

Research Methodology

A purposive sampling of data was carried out and a total of ten political speeches were collected. The speeches were transcribed and translated then thematically analysed guided by the theoretical frameworks. Vinay & Darbelnet's (1995) approach to translation was adopted. The descriptive design was mostly used as the study is qualitative (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2012). The data were collected from the Kenyan political discourse online. Therefore, the discussion focuses on Kenya but other countries may be mentioned for comparative purposes.

The study population is online. The sample and sampling procedures preferred were purposive sampling. Purposive sampling was carried out after the retrieval of hate speech videos from YouTube. Preference was given to the most viewed clips especially of prominent politicians, and therefore the number of views was important. There existed close to a hundred clips and ten politicians' speeches; one clip each was sampled. This was guided by the proposal that ten to thirty per cent is enough for a sample less than ten thousand Mugenda and Mugenda (2012). The instruments for data collection and the data collection procedure of electronic data searches to obtain the main data and library research for the gaps are discussed. The data analysis and interpretation was carried out guided by the theoretical frameworks and research objectives. Thematic content analysis as advanced by Braun and Clark (2006) was employed in this study. The names of the speakers were omitted as part of the ethical considerations which is a part of the research process. They were replaced by L1 to L10 in order of the oldest to the latest discourse.

Rhetorical devices in hate speech

In this study, it was observed that the personalities identified in YouTube speeches often begin by personal attacks then progress to the identity associated with the subject, group or individual(s) they refer to in their speech. The leaders seek to advance their interests and those of either the individual or group they purport to represent. The data are drawn from ten political speeches presented in the following table. It gives summaries of the selected leaders' personal details, dates the speech was posted, and the speech titles as presented on YouTube. The

leaders' utterances provide the data for the subsequent discussion on the rhetorical strategies used.

Table 1: Speakers' Profiles and Specific Speech Titles

Serial Number	Date posted	Speaker's Current position and region	Gender	Age	Speech title
L1	20.10.2015	MP Makadara constituency Nairobi	Male	52	**Lazima watu wakufe kiasi (a few people must die)**
L2	30.11.2016	MP Gatundu South constituency Central	Male	51	**L2 takes hate speech to a whole new level; "refers to Raila and his people as devils."**
L3	26.9.2017	MP Embakasi constituency Nairobi	Male	32	**L3 SHAMES Matiangi**
L4	09.09.2017	Deputy President	Male	55	**L4 in Uhuru Park Rally**
L5	30.01.2018	Leader of the official opposition	Male	77	**L5 Sworn in at Uhuru Park**
L6	2018	Governor Kitui County Eastern	Female	70	**L6 in Matha Kitui**
L7	25.6.2019	MP Kamukunji constituency Nairobi	Male	39	**L7 *Warudi Kwao***
L8	17.08.2019	Senator Nandi County North Rift	Male	33	***WAPENDE WASIPENDE* (Whether they like it or not).**
L9	22.2.2020	Senator Narok County South Rift	Male	48	**L9 warns outsiders against meddling in Maasai affairs**
L10	7.9.2020	MP Emurua Dikir constituency South Rift	Male	49	**L10 Deconstructs Uhuru**

Source: Authors 2022

After purposive sampling, ten politicians' speeches were selected guided by the study objectives. The selected political speeches are those of L1 (2015), L2 (2016), L3 (2017), L4

(2018), L5 (2018), L6 (2018) L7 (2019), L8 (2019), L9 (2020) and L10 (2020). These are prominent and popular Kenyan politicians and they represent or have represented their regions at one point either in Parliament or in the Senate. Some of the leaders are frequent users of inciting language and often suggest that they are representing an individual such as the president, the deputy president, the leader of the opposition or political parties. These individuals are among the major players who influence the political landscape in the country.

In this study, rhetorical strategies refer to the techniques employed to advance rhetoric. Rhetoric has been utilised for its persuasive function, which may act as either intensifying or mitigating the semantic content of a text. In this study, it is used in various ways as discussed next.

Repetition

Repetition is divided into rhetorical repetition, simple and complex repetition, and reiterations. These have been employed in the sampled speeches. Redundancy is another discursive strategy that occurs by saying the same thing more than once by using either the same words or different words. In repetition, the same word or words are used within the same sentence or in consecutive sentences. The function of this strategy is twofold: on the one hand, a word or idea is given more prominence and, on the other hand, a connection between sentences is established, achieving cohesion within the text.

In his speech L1 uses the phrase 'fire fire' to suggest that there will be violence if his preferred leader will not be declared president. The repetition aims at exciting the audience and also enforcing his message.

Text 1: *Wangapi wanakubaliana na mimi? Tumekubaliana …fire fire. Raila ndio akue president lazima watu wakufe kiasi.* (How many agree with me? We have agreed. Fire. Fire. We agree for Raila to be the President it is a must for a few people to die.) L1

This is a threat to the government and a call for action for his audience to engage in chaos if the election results will not favour his preferred candidate. In his opening remarks, L3 recalls former cabinet secretaries who have died by repetition of the phrase 'where you are we had' and the question 'where did he go?' He asks where the former cabinet secretaries who served in a similar position went to repeatedly. This is meant to emphasise the fact that they are dead.

Text 2: *Marehemu Matiangi penye uko kulikuwa na Saitoti akaenda wapi?*
Penye uko tulikuwa na Nkaiseri akaenda wapi?
Penye uko tulikuwa na Michuki akaenda wapi?

(The late Matiangi. . .Where you are there was Saitoti, where did he go? (Points to the ground). Where you are there was Nkaiseri, where did he go? Where you are there was Michuki, where did he go?) L3

He addresses Fredrick Matiang'i then Cabinet Secretary (CS) Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government. Apart from referring to the leader who is alive as the late to suggest that he is already dead, the leader employed non-verbal signs to show where the others are; they are buried. He repeatedly asked where they went to remind the Cabinet secretary that he will also face a similar fate.

The various forms of repetition are employed by the speakers for instance when L5 begins his speech. As a way to capture the audience's attention L5 uses repetition. Text 3. *'Haiya. Haiya. Haiya.'* (Alright. Alright. Alright). There was a lot of commotion as he stepped on the dais as he had been sworn in. He repeats the refrains when they do this…We will…to show that they have a counter plan for every move the government will make.

Text 4. *Tulisema, hapo mapema eti wakipiga tutapiga. Wakihesabu… Wakijumlisha… Wakirusha… Wakiiba… Wakitangaza… Wakiapisha… Leo, tumekamlisha ahadi yetu kwa wanainchi wa Kenya.* (We said earlier on that when they vote we will vote. When they count… When they compile… When they throw… When they steal… When they announce… When they swear in… Today we have fulfilled our promise to the citizens of Kenya.) L5

He also repeats the phrase 'for the…' when he enumerates the reasons, he appreciates the people of Kenya.

Text 5. I thank the people of Kenya for the courage, for the patience and for the fortitude that you have shown the rest of the world. That a people united can never be… defeated.

He chants 'A people United…' three times to which the crowd responds 'Can never be defeated'.

Text 6. A people united….
A people united….
A people united….

The repetition serves to reiterate his message. He also uses it to make the message a collective one by including the audience.

Where seeking affirmation, L4 asks a question.

Text 7. *Tunakubaliana hatukubaliani?* (Do we agree or don't we agree?) Repeatedly.

This is to capture the attention of the audience. He also seeks to portray his stand as a popular one. L4 projects himself as a charismatic speaker since his claims are backed by a variety of rhetorical strategies. He also has a lot of confidence since he believes that he has the backing of the current government. He repeats the sentence,

Text 8. "We are unapologetic about our position" several times.

Repetition is often used to emphasise a message and to enforce an idea. It is also used to ensure that there is participation of the audience when they are involved in refrains.

Allusion
Allusion occurs in the biblical allusions of L10 and L2 whereby L10 refers to a New Jerusalem that might be found once the land on earth is depleted similar to the Biblical promised heaven. For him, Mau is in the Kipsigis land and God had a reason for placing it there. L10 claims that the Rift Valley regional commissioner George Natembeya incited other communities when he claimed that the Kipsigis should stop giving birth in large numbers.

Text 9: *Na tutazaa tukijaza hii mwenyezi Mungu atateremsha mbingu ingine tunakuja ishi huko tena. Obore kigale mi Jerusalem ne lel? (*We will give birth and when we fill this world God will bring down another from heaven then we go live there too. I thought they had said there is a New Jerusalem?) L10

This is in response to the claims of George Natembeya that his community have a high birth rate and some would not afford to provide for their children. Kenya is a highly religious nation and the politicians quote and misquote the Bible to serve their intention of pleasing the audiences. The shared knowledge of the Bible enables the audience to understand the speeches. Therefore, the audience can compare the two based on their Biblical knowledge.

In his personal attacks against leaders of the opposition, L2 alludes to the Bible story of Abel and Cain in Genesis.

Text 10: *Maanake wakati Mungu alifukuza Cain huko, Cain hakuenda mbali alienda Bondo. Ndiyo huyo mnaona sasa, huyo.* (Because when God chased Cain there, Cain did not go far. He went to Bondo. He is the one you are seeing there now) (L1).

The leader suggests that Raila Odinga has no backing from God and has lost favour. He also mentions heaven which is a Biblical concept. According to the Christian faith, the wicked will not go to heaven. Thus, when he tells his audience that should you find yourself in a place where Raila is, know that is not heaven. Therefore, he suggests Raila does not qualify to go to heaven.

Direct address
Several of the sampled speeches employ direct speech to give messages. Even though the receivers of the messages are not at the venues, the speakers employ the second person 'you' pronoun to give them messages. They are sure they will get the message mostly from the media. The choice of direct speech over indirect is a way to clarify the specific recipient of the message. It is also used to release pent up emotions and anger towards the utterances' recipients.

Direct address is employed when L1 sends messages to specific leaders. The speaker's tone and facial expression is of a man who is annoyed. He specifically mentions the legislators he targets with his message. They are Moses Kuria (Gatundu South MP), Aden Duale (Garissa Township MP) and Kithure Kindiki (Tharaka-Nithi senator). He warns those who keep mentioning Raila and threatens that they shall deal with them properly if they meet along the streets. He says:

Text 11: *Atakayeita jina Raila ovyo, tukikuta yeye kwa streets tutadeal na yeye properly.* **(L1)** *(*Whoever will be mentioning Raila's name anyhow (without respect) and we meet along the streets, we shall deal with them properly). L2

He also addresses Uhuru and Ruto about their hypocrisy in carrying out national prayers for their implication in the postelection violence. Through use of the pronoun 'you' L2 addresses Raila Odinga directly when he is reminding him that he has been involved in demonstrations for so many years. L2 also tells Raila the coming elections will be no better for him. L2 claims that the opposition leader does not mind corruption from his side. He suggests that the opposition leaders are trying to meddle with the electoral commission tendering process.

Text 12: *Na wewe Raila ufisadi ya watu wako hauoni* (And you Raila. You do not see the corruption of your people). L2

In his threatening message, L3 addresses Matiangi directly. He tells him to stop harassing the opposition leaders. He asks him to stop feeling so great when he is as worthless as a used bread spread tin. This is also metaphorical use of language since L3 compares his referent to another object directly.

Text 13: *Sasa wewe ni nani? Wewe ni mkebe wa blueband.* (So, who are you? You are a blueband tin.) L3

In a commanding tone, L7 also tells Matiangi he has twenty-four hours to deport all foreigners. These are like commands and suggest that they feel powerful enough to challenge the cabinet secretaries. His choice of language demonstrates his confidence and authority.

Both L8 and L10 address the President. They want him to give the deputy president his place in the government. This is after the handshake between former Prime Minister Raila Odinga and President Uhuru Kenyatta. The leaders aligned to the deputy president felt that he was side-lined.

Use of direct address is a clarification of the intended recipient of the messages. It is a bold act and also a kind of threat as there is no doubt of the speakers' intentions. It is also sometimes used to reveal the anger the speaker has towards the person or people addressed.

Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions are those that do not require an answer but are used to emphasise or to activate the listeners' thoughts. An example is L5 Text 13: *tunakubaliana?* (Are we in agreement?). The leader does not expect a contrary answer but seeks to portray that his thoughts are the collective decisions. He also wants to get the responses that encourage him to speak and portrays his sentiments as popular. In a crowd which he is sure of their political inclinations, L1 also uses rhetorical questions when he asks those present if they want Raila to be the President. It is obvious he seeks to impose his ideas on the audience.

Text 14: *Wangapi wanakubaliana na mimi? Tumekubaliana fire fire. Raila ndio akue president lazima watu wakufe kiasi. Kwani kuna makosa?* (How many agree with me? We have agreed. We agree for Raila to be the President it is a must for a few people to die. Is there any mistake?) L1

This is an attempt to convince the crowd to agree that what he suggests is the right thing to do. He seeks validation for his idea, and he portrays the claim as the collective decision by use of the pronouns and the question and answers.

L6 incorporates her speech with the question, "Are we in agreement?" She wants to adapt her views as the collective decision made in the rally. For example, she says that they have agreed to get bows and arrows to protect their resources. She implies that everyone in the audience has agreed and that it is the collective and not a personal decision. The leaders employ rhetorical questions to get attention, create excitement and to create a sense of solidarity.

Symbolism

The language of politics employs symbols. Norrick (2001) discusses figurative meaning. He notes that 'the figurative meaning of hyperbole, irony, and some metaphors has sometimes also

been seen as context bound, though early attempts to describe metaphor often remained solidly within sentence semantics proper.

Text 15: *Sisi kama ODM tumebaki na risasi moja* (as Orange Democratic Movement (ODM), we have remained with one bullet). L1

The phrase last bullet as used by L1 symbolises a means he proposes for the opposition to get power by letting a few people to die which means causing chaos. The leader also mentions fire which is symbolic of destruction. L3 uses the word smoke to symbolise fire; *Moshi.* He says that there will be smoke if their leaders are arrested. This is a symbol of fire meaning that there will be chaos. This is a symbolic way to give a threat. The word smoke is symbolic since there cannot be smoke without fire. This is a warning to the government to stop mistreating leaders.

Symbolism also occurs when L1 says that they have 'the balls.'

Text 16. *Sisi tuna makende mbili kama hao. Tupambane umundu khumundu umundu khumundu.*   (We have two balls each like them. We shall fight man to man) L1.

This is synecdoche in which part is used to represent whole. It is a significant part of the male physique since it represents the gender. The leader introduces the masculinity to show they are not weak or cowardly. He suggests they should be taken seriously because they are male in every sense.
        The use of the word bull is another symbol of strength. L8 claims that the deputy president should not be taken lightly since he is not an ordinary person but a bull.

Text 17. *Awache kuchezea bwana Naibu wa rais, si mtu hivihivi lakini. Yeye ni ndume, ukiona ndume zote wamekaa corner moja na yeye ako corner moja na bado kichwa inawachanganyisha si huyo mtu ni ndume? Eeeh ingen mechei kemwa en pswahili sigonai kole Kalenjin is part of Kenya. Sisi si squatters.* **L5**

        *(*Let them stop playing with the deputy president. He is not a mere person. He is a bull. When you see all the bulls seated at one corner, he is also seated at one corner and still the head confuses you. Is this person not a bull eeh? You know it should be said in Kiswahili for them to know that Kalenjin is part of Kenya. We are not squatters).

The mention of the word 'bull' symbolises strength and masculinity.

Additionally, the word devil as implied by L2 is a symbol of evil.

Text 18. *Na ndo mimi nasemanga, ukikufa uende pahali ukute Raila Amolo Odinga ujue huko si binguni umepotea.'* (And that is the reason I usually say if you die and find yourself in the same place as Raila then know that you are not in heaven. You are lost.) L2

The leader suggests that Raila is wicked when he says if students are asked who the worst person on earth is, then the answer is Raila Amolo Odinga. Knowledge of the Bible is necessary for comprehension. He suggests that the leader of opposition Raila Odinga is evil and capable of causing all the harm the devil does. He tells his audience by alluding that the angel who was kicked out of heaven landed in Bondo which is the home of the leader.

These symbols aim at creating comparisons that will disparage the subject. They are derived from the discourse of the communities, the Bible or from former Kenyan political discourse.

Conclusion

In the sampled speeches, hate speech manifests through the various exclusions on the genders, ethnicity, political, and others as discussed. Rhetorical strategies were intentionally employed to engage the audience and to communicate coded messages. Some occurred naturally due to the sociolinguistics practices but most were conscious choices. The leaders who engage the audiences and excite them are very popular based on the YouTube views and comments. The findings revealed that the rhetorical strategies are very powerful and often become entrenched as part of the discourse in the country. Talking about hate speech will create awareness among potential users and audiences. There exists unique discourse that includes nicknames used both in positive and in derogatory ways. They are associated with each campaign season and each political transition. The contexts and intentions qualify or disqualify.

References

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3(2), 77-101.

Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* Longman.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis in T van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Sage.

Fetzer, A., Weizman, E., Reber, E (2012). Proceedings of the ESF strategic workshop on follow-ups across discourse domains: A cross-cultural exploration of their forms and functions, Würzburg (Germany), 31 May – 2 June 2012. - Würzburg: Universität Würzburg, 2012.

Government of Kenya (GoK) (2010). The Constitution of Kenya 2010. Government Printer.

Hauser, G. A. (2002). *Introduction to rhetorical theory*. Waveland Press.

Irimba, M. (2021). *Hi-Tech hate in the online narratives of violence in Kenya: A Forensic Linguistics Approach to Hate Speech in Facebook and Twitter. (*Unpublished PHD Thesis). Laikipia University, Kenya.

Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) (2008). *On the brink of the precipice: A Human Rights Account of Kenya's Post-2007 Election Violence.* KNCHR

Khasandi-Telewa, V., & Barasa, M. (2018). 'Jamaa wa vitendawili' discursive construction of opponents in political campaign discourse in kenya using metaphors. *Coretrain Journal of Languages, Humanities, Social Sciences and Education* Vol. 1(2018) 190-198

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* Longman.

Michira, J. (2014). Language of politics: A CDA analysis of the 2013 Kenyan political campaign. *International Journal of Education and Research Vol.* 2. pp 132-143

Mugenda, A. G. & Mugenda, O. (2012). *Research methods Dictionary.* ACTS Press.

Ndambuki, J. (2010). Discursive representation of women's interests and needs in Makueni District – Kenya*.* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Norrick, N. R. (2003). Issues in conversational joking. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*(9), 1333–1359. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00180-7

Perry, B. (2001). *In the name of hate: Understanding hate crimes*. Routledge.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Thomas, L. (1999). *Language, society and power*. Routledge.

UN Security Council, *Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (as last amended on 13 October 2006)*, 8 November 1994, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3952c.html [accessed 31 May 2022]

Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995*). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.11

Waltman, M. S. (2015). *Hate on the right: Right wing political groups and hate speech*. Peter Lang Publishers.

Waltman, M. S., & Haas, J. W. (2011). *The Communication of hate*. Peter Lang.

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2012). *Meaning and relevance*. Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). What is CDA about: A Summary of its history, important concepts and its development in R. Wodak and M. Meyer, *Methods of critical discourse analysis.* Sage.