

**The Rhetoric of Mental Health Advocacy in Prince Harry's Public Interviews**

Name

Instructor's Name

Course Code

Date

## **The Rhetoric of Mental Health Advocacy in Prince Harry's Public Interviews**

A rhetoric of mental health advocacy in the public interviews of Prince Harry is a strategic mixture of personal account, institutional critique and moral appeal that aims at normalizing psychological frailty whilst pushing against established stigmas. By making mental health an issue of health, rather than an issue of personal weakness, he uses well-structured revelations to rebrand the discussion of masculinity, trauma, and help-seeking behavior.

One of the key elements of the advocacy of Prince Harry is autobiographical narration to build on credibility and emotional appeal. On the interviews he has given to media houses like the CBS and the ITV he has mentioned freely on the psychological effects of losing his mother Princess Diana and the subsequent delay in the grieving process. Re-creating the experiences of panic attacks, repressed emotion and, ultimately, treatment, he creates what Aristotle would call *ethos* and *pathos*: ethical credibility based on lived experience and emotional appeal that can inspire identification. His rhetoric approach contradicts the cultural norm, especially in the culture of royalty and military, that men are expected to be stoic. Rather, vulnerability is re-conceptualized as strength hence disrupting the conventional standards of masculine restraint.

In addition, Prince Harry puts his individual predicaments in a wider institutional and societal context, broadening his rhetoric beyond a personal witness. Being the co-founder of Heads Together with Prince William and Catherine, Princess of Wales, he has stressed the collective responsibility in respect of dealing with stigma. In his popular discourse, he often brings into the limelight how a systemic silence, in families, institutions, and media structures, propagates suffering. This action is a shift of individual pathology to collective responsibility. His rhetoric also fits into the framework of prevention, open discussion, and community-based

help of the models of the public health because he frames mental health as a communal problem and not a personal one.

The other convincing aspect of his interviews is the combination of advocacy and action oriented programs. Prince Harry's cooperation with the Oprah Winfrey Network in the documentary series *The Me You Can't See* will help amplify the voices of various people and will help to normalize therapy as a legitimate resource that is needed. The testimonial stories of the series are used by people of different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, which strengthens the idea of the universality of mental health issues. He places his own narrative within others, preventing the emphasis on his ego as something special, but rather creates a communal narrative of mutual difficulty and perseverance. This rhetoric will increase inclusivity and expand audience participation.

Notably, his discussion also includes an implied commentary of institutional adherence more so in the British monarchy and tabloid society. On BBC and other media, he has associated the aspect of media intrusion with psychological distress since public figures are not resistant to trauma. These statements are rhetorical, both as explanation of the person and as indictment of the structure. Through the mental health expenses of endless examination, he redefines celebrity stories as being about glamour to human vulnerability, making the understanding of privilege a complicated affair in the minds of the people.

Summing up, the rhetoric of mental health advocacy in the series of public interviews by Prince Harry is described as strategic self-disclosure, institutional critique, and collective framing. His emotionally charged storytelling and advocacy with a policy component reinvigorate the definition of vulnerability as a demonstration of bravery and rebrand mental

health as a societal issue. Not only does he argue against stigma but his discussion demonstrates a kind of open, accountable, and healing public masculinity.

## References

- Andersson, L., Blennow, E., & Tyledal, E. (2022). The Royal Family,... And they lived NOT so happily ever after. *LBMG Corporate Brand Management and Reputation-Masters Case Series*. <https://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/search/publication/9077995>
- Englund, L. (2025). Reclaiming and redeeming the narrative in *Harry & Meghan* and *Spare*. *Popular Communication*, 23(2), 119–131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15405702.2025.2495810>
- Gilson, D., Grehan, H., & Wilson, J. (2022). ‘Do We Need to Talk about Prince Harry?’: Thoughts on care and the politics of critique. *Performance Research*, 27(6–7), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13528165.2022.2198867>
- Grubb, A. R. (2025). Deal or No Deal: Using “Megxit” to Teach Negotiation Strategy Planning. *Management Teaching Review*, 23792981251389868.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23792981251389868>
- Klementovičová, A. (2025). *Media Portrayal of the British Royal Family between 2020 and 2025*. <https://dk.upce.cz/entities/publication/18b5e896-665a-4898-bd83-8791642963d1>
- O’Reilly, J., Bonaccio, S., Li, Y., & Lapierre, L. M. (2025). The “room to share”: An ecological perspective on mental health disclosure at work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 30(4), 255. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2026-55598-002>
- Weidhase, N. (2025). Crisis and capitalism: Discourses of British royal celebrity in the 21st century. *Celebrity Studies*, 16(4), 579–593.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2025.2575685>

