



The British Politicians and the Cognitive and Social Manipulation

Ahmed H. Naif

farookhani7@gmail.com

Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia, Nilai, Malaysia

Abstract. Politicians manipulate their people by using long and influential speeches to affect people's minds and actions. They, sometimes, violate peoples' norms when they make people behave against their wills. The aim of this study relies on finding the abuse of power and the strategies of social and cognitive manipulations that were used by some British politicians before the 2003 US led invasion for Iraq. Van Dijk's Framework of social and cognitive manipulation was adopted for the purpose of data analysis. The findings showed that the British politicians, Tony Blair (The British Prime Minister, 1997-2007) and Jack Straw (The British foreign Minister 2001-2006) abused their power and cognitively (by illegal control of people's minds) and socially (by making people support them) manipulated their people to support them and vote for the decision of the 2003 war against Iraq.

Keywords: *Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, power abuse, cognitive manipulation, social manipulation.*

1. Introduction

Discourse analysis looks at what happens when language is used in communication and attempts to identify specific features and specific structures of different types of language use. "The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use" (Alba-Juez 2009:9). Discourse analysis sees language use as being ruled governed. There are rules for "who says what", "who says it when" and "how they say it". Moreover, it attempts to identify those particular rules. Discourse analysis is a very big field and it has been a field of study for about forty years. Discourse analysis can be split into two major areas, the analysis of spoken or written language. They are two distinct varieties of the language; therefore, they follow slightly different rules. Alba-Juez (2009) argues that the concept of "text" has been used by contemporary linguistics that comprises each type of utterance; therefore, a text may be a television interview, a magazine article, a conversation, etc.

Undoubtedly, language is the main political instrument at politicians' disposal. Politicians usually use this flexible means of communication to influence their audience and to impose their ideologies on their addressees. Politicians, by using long and zealous speeches, try to control the minds and actions of people belonging to various social classes. As politicians gain the control over the people's minds, the process of turning people against opponents becomes possible. The biased use of language by the politicians can be considered as a political exercise of power and dominance. Politicians use language (in form of long and bombastic speeches) to make unreal phenomena real within the society so that they can better achieve their aim which is, in fact, to support power and to instill domination. According to (Wodak, 2001:6) "CDA takes a particular interest in the relationship between language and power".

For the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), language is the most important element of communication. The role of the CDA is to study the use of the language in relation to all those elements of communication. Taking various factors in discourse production into account, CDA can expose the attached reality in the produced discourse. CDA builds a connection to other domains of science that assists the analysts find the clues to the hidden realities and ideologies within the texts.

CDA, which is an attempt to disclose the hidden ideologies imposed through manipulation use of language, has proved to be highly effective and useful in the political contexts. Political contexts are always of dominance and power exercise.

According to (Van Dijk 1998:352) "CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context". One of the essential concepts in CDA is manipulation because it implies discursive abuse of power.

Manipulation is usually viewed through a triangular approach: social, is when people are illegally controlled and encounter social disparity, also when people's norms are violated. Cognitive, is when people's minds and understanding processes are controlled. Discursive, is when manipulators in their discourse concentrate on their good things and on their opponents' bad things. (Van Dijk 2006:2) defined manipulation as "communicative and interactional practice, in which a manipulator exercises control over other people, usually against their will or against their best interests". Manipulation implicitly means the exercise of illegitimate power by means of discourse. According to Galasinski (2000) manipulation is an attempt to affect the target in such a way that his behavior and action is an instrument of attaining the goals of the manipulator, who acts without using force but in such a way that the target does the goal of the manipulators' actions. (Saussure & Schulz 2005: 117) echoed Galasinski and defined manipulation as "to manipulate a human being may be about using a person, i.e. have that person adopt specific behaviors to fulfill the needs and interests of the manipulators, regardless of the ones of the manipulated". Manipulation is usually used by politicians to persuade their people to support them to achieve different goals like to win people's voices in an election or to persuade the parliament members to vote for a war decision. The most recent example for that is when the British and US politicians used long and bombastic speeches to persuade the British parliament and the US congress to vote and legitimate the war against Iraq. Politicians usually use covert persuasion and according to Taillard in Saussure and Schulz (2005: 179), "persuasion can be overt or covert and it seems to me that the more it is covert the more persuasion become manipulative. The covert nature of manipulation makes it an act of deception". (Saussure & Schulz, 2005: 173) mentioned some linguistic routes that speaker may select to manipulate and mislead. The following section will discuss that in detail.

1.1 Manipulation by omission and commission

Within a debate or testimony communicators sometimes mould their utterances by concealing information or expressing it in a way that some intended aims. Communicators may use some linguistic ways like omission and commission to manipulate and mislead.

a. Omission

Speakers sometimes hide information which could be relevant to the addressee in a particular situation. Omission can be passive, when the speaker is only hiding information and by doing so, he is reining the addresser from acquiring beliefs he might be able to form without tampering or presenting false reality. Omission also happens in lies, when the speaker reports the addressee something that he knows to be false and he conceals information that is relevant to the addressee.

b. Commission

Manipulation by commission takes place when the manipulator is active. The aim of the manipulator is to make the addressee accepting a belief that he intends the addressee to accept. This can be achieved either explicitly or implicitly. Dodge, telling lies and vagueness fall under explicit commission. While misleading, underspecified, explicators and false implicatures fall under implicit.

1.2 Manipulation by using propaganda strategies

a. Repetition

Making the addressees exposed to the same information again and again, invites the addressee to think about this information and have it therefore easily accessible. By repetition, politicians instill their ideologies

in the minds of the people and change their beliefs even if their ideologies are wrong and manipulative. Accordingly, wrong beliefs might then lead to action.

b. Emotional appeal

Feelings of the addressees can also be appealed by manipulators. The addressees are often more easily ready to accept, believe, and act upon the propagated information.

1.3 Statement of the problem

The British politicians, Tony Blair and Jack Straw, cognitively and socially manipulated not only their people, but also the international community as well. The British politicians supported the American allegations that the former Iraqi government had developed a number of mass destruction weapons which in turn threatened the stability in the Gulf region and the national security in US and Britain. The British politicians manipulated and deceived their people by concealing the facts and feeding them with false information about the alleged Iraq armament programs. It is worth mentioning here that all the allegations mentioned earlier were lately refuted by the Americans and the British governments themselves. The British people were cognitively manipulated, when their understanding and ideologies were influenced by the speeches and statements of both Blair and Straw by feeding them with wrong information about Iraq. At the same time, Blair and Straw, who represented the dominating group, violated the social norms and made the British people act against their best interests by voting for the decision of the war against Iraq which in turn is a social inequality. The British politicians' speeches of manipulation were on account of millions of Iraqi casualties besides the destruction of the infrastructures in Iraq.

1.4 Research questions

- a. How did the British administration, by its speeches, cognitively manipulate their people?
- b. How did the British administration, by its speeches, socially manipulate their people?

2. Literature review

The purpose of this literature review is to explore the literature on different forms of manipulation in different types of discourses, speeches, newspapers editorials, political statements, political rhetoric, etc. politicians usually abuse the power of language and manipulate not only citizens of their country but also people of other countries to achieve certain political goals.

2.1. Principles of CDA

CDA has a number of beliefs and they were summarized by Fairclough & Wodak as follows (1997, cited in the www.shareeducation.com: 1) CDA addresses social problems, social inequality. 2) Discourse is a form of social action, as language is a social practice. 3) power relations are discursive; CDA investigates the way in which structures of specific discourses are used to control the minds of the social participants. 4) CDA is concerned with the exercise of power in communications through language. 5) Discourse exercises power as they transport knowledge on which the collective and individual consciousness feeds. 6) Discourse is historical, in other words, it is situated in time and space. 7) Discourse constitutes society and culture. 8) the relationship between the discourse and society is mediated by the social acting subjects. 9) Discourse Analysis is interpretative and explanatory. Critical theories aim at producing enlightenment and liberation.

2.2 Research in discourse and manipulation

A study was carried out by Capone (2010) to analyse the victory electoral speech of the American president Barack Obama. In this study the researcher explored the ideas included in the speech and the audience as part of this speech event. The study aimed at drawing number of theoretical conclusions depending on the discussion of data, as far as footing notion is related. Much concern was given to the transcription, as it supplied the researcher with theoretical instruments to understand the relationship between the audience and Obama. Reasonable attention was given to Pauses and predictive power of intonation, expansion, and softening of speech. The researcher used (Goffman's notion of footing connected with Bakhtin's notion of polyphony) as a method to extract theoretical considerations. The results of this

study showed that Barack Obama did not use manipulation in his speech to convince the audience to support him and to accept his views. Obama spoke on behalf of the voices of ordinary people so that they support his campaign, in the same time he incorporated the voices of his opponents which were marked different (anonymous) from those who were his supporters. It is obvious that Obama in his speech took earnestly the role of the politician's people representative and expressed the voices he wanted to represent in order to support his ideas about politics. He presented himself as the stimulant, while ordinary people were given the role of principals. Obama managed to convince his followers that his speech was coming from their own voices. In this speech, both the speaker and the audience participate in the construction of meaning. First, Obama regularly urges the audience to join their voices with his. Second, He invited the audience to complete his statements.

The results in this study are in contrast with the results in the current study. The former showed no manipulation in the Obama's speech, who instead spoke on behalf of the voices of ordinary people so that they support his campaign, while the latter showed clear social and cognitive manipulation. In this study, the researcher used (Goffman's notion of footing connected with Bakhtin's notion of polyphony) to analyse the data collected from Obama's speech, when Van Dijk framework of manipulation was used to analyse the data collected in the current study. If the researcher used Van Dijk framework, which is more accurate and comprehensive, he would find clear manipulation in Obama's speech. Speeches are form of speech act and one of the crucial notions that imply discursive power abuse.

A study was carried out by Al-Sharoufi (2006) to show particular strategies that used by some Arabic newspapers that urge intolerance through antagonistic rhetoric, to serve illiberal aims and their dominant ideology in the Middle East. The researcher used 31 editorials articles from two Syrian newspapers and one Arabic newspaper issued in London. The researcher used Teun Van Dijk's cognitive-oriented approach to find out particular ideological patterns that mobilize people. This approach could definitely help in fixing hidden practices of discourse that take part in the power of mobilization and the manipulation of people. In this study, the researcher investigated four features of discourse that directly affect the formation of ideological patterning in editorials: words, phrases and sentences that reflect the ruling party ideology. Lexical choices that reflect the "us" vs. "them". Words, phrases and sentences implicate extra meanings. The results of this study showed that there are clear patterns that reflect messages of antagonism. The patterns reflect the editorialists' ideologies. Ba'athi ideology is deep-rooted in the Arab newspapers, therefore, and for the sake of this antagonist ideology the editorialists try to move their people by igniting feelings of hatred and animosity. In dictatorial states language through journalism is used to protect the regimes. Manipulating language is used through some ideological ways, like the use of words, phrases, and sentences that show Ba'athi ideologies. The results also showed that Arabic newspapers succeeded, by using certain lexical items, in glorifying the ideology of the ruling party and by doing so they practice ideological trick to mobilize masses against the west. Another element of manipulation used by newspapers, is contested distinction between "us" and "them". The strategy is used to emphasize every good thing "us" and everything bad that characterizes "them".

This study is compatible with the current study. In both studies Van Dijk's framework of manipulation was utilised. The results, on the other hand, in this study is compatible to the results of the current study as both of them clearly showed the abuse of power, social and cognitive manipulation of the people. The researcher, in this study, used written discourse as a corpus (newspapers editorials) to investigate the manipulation in discourse, while verbal discourses (politicians' speeches) were used as data in the current study.

A study was carried out by Atawneh (2009) to investigate how the strengths and weaknesses of the Israelis and the Palestinians (the two sides of the conflict) are reflected by the language used by both sides. This study also investigated how the politicians use language during war time in their statements. The researcher collected his data from the some international and local media reported headlines at times of crisis and important events. The researcher covered a period of time extended from 2001 to 2004, the period of second Palestinian Intifada (uprising). The aim of this study was to investigate the types of speech acts reported in the media that reflect offensive or defensive tactics and concentrates on Threats and Appeals, with correlated verbs of illocutionary. The researcher used speech act theory to analyse, specifically, the threats and appeals in the statements of the Palestinian and Israeli politicians. The result of this study pointed out that the language of power was used by the strong party and the language of weakness was used by the weak party. In

their statements the Israeli party used only few appeals and more threat than the Palestinians did, while the Palestinians' most frequently reported speech acts were appeals. Threats that can't meet the real conditions because of the weakness may be called "deception". This kind of Threats was clear in the Palestinian statements, mainly showing the nervous reaction to the assassination of Hamas political leaders by Israel.

The results of this study are expected, that the strong side, which owns all elements of power, uses language of power and the weak side uses language of weakness. This study is in contrast to the current study. The researcher used Speech Act Theory to analyse the collected data, when there is no balance in terms of power between both sides. However, Van Dijk's framework of manipulation was used in the current study to analyse collected data.

Rozina & Karapetjana (2009) carried out a study to explore three linguistic instruments used in political rhetoric, namely, allusion, metonymy, and metaphor. The analysis of data was based on the linguistic manipulation. The researchers used theoretical implications derived from the researches on political discourse conducted by Atkinson, Chilton, Fairclough, and Naciscione. Authentic source materials (published articles) were utilised as data for this research. The results of the study showed that in political rhetoric, the linguistic manipulation is an influential instrument because discourse in politics mainly concentrates on convincing people (manipulated) to take certain actions for the good of the politicians. Language plays an important ideological part which the manipulative purposes of politicians (manipulators) become apparent. Language used in political discourse deals with a wide range of rhetorical instruments at the phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and textual levels. In our life now, politics mainly dominates in the mass media which in turn is a type of linguistic manipulation like press conferences, updated texts in slogans, and the use of rhetorical devices: phrasal allusions, metonymy and metaphor.

The results of this study are compatible with the results of the current study. Both studies showed how politicians use rhetoric language and wide range of rhetorical instruments, (at the phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic and textual levels), to reach some political goals. Politicians usually deliver long and bombastic speeches to affect people's minds and then their essential decisions in life like giving their voices in elections.

2.3 Theoretical framework

The aim of this study relies on finding the abuse of power and the strategies of social and cognitive manipulation that were used by some British politicians. The researcher adopted the Critical Analysis approach that combines the social, cognitive, and discursive elements and Van Dijk's framework of social and cognitive manipulation of CDA was utilised for this purpose. This framework helps in finding hidden discursive practices that lead to cognitive and social manipulation of people. Van Dijk's triangular model is an ideal instrument to recognize and analyse the various discursive dimensions of manipulation, the polarized structures of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation that expresses ideological disagreements. Van Dijk (2006) pointed out a strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation and as follow:

- 1- Overall interaction strategies
 - a. Positive self-presentation
 - b. Negative other-presentation
- 2- Macro speech act implying Our 'good' acts and Their 'bad' acts, e.g. accusation, defence
- 3- Semantic macrostructures: topic selection(De-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them
- 4- Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusations.
- 5- Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions
 - a. Give many/few details
 - b. Be general/specific
 - c. Be vague/precise

- d. Be explicit/implicit
- 6- Lexicon: Select positive words for Us, negative words for Them
- 7- Local syntax: active vs passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility
- 8- Rhetorical figures
 - a. Hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings
 - b. Metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties
- 9- Expressions: sounds and visuals
 - a. Emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings
 - b. Order (first, last: top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meanings

3. Methodology

3.1 Data collection (corpus)

The researcher used some excerpts taken from two articles, "Saddam playing game of hide and seek says PM" and "Saddam lied about weapons, says Straw". Both were published in the Guardian newspaper issued in London to discuss the abuse of power and strategies of manipulation in the discourses of two British politicians, Tony Blair (the former prime minister) and Jack Straw (the former foreign minister). The first example is an interview with Tony Blair about the cooperation of Iraq with the UN weapons inspectors. The article was written by Michael White et al and was published in 20 December 2002, three months before the Anglo-American invasion to Iraq. The second example is a speech delivered by Jack Straw in the House of Commons as an attempt to persuade the parliament members to vote for the war against Iraq. The article was written by the Guardian staff and was published in 18 December 2002. The transcriptions of the interview and the speech are in appendices 1 and 2, respectively.

4. Findings and analysis

4.1 Manipulation in Tony Blair's discourse

Momani (2010) argues that politicians, who are expected to be direct and clear in clarifying things, use different discursive strategies when they fail and tend to use discursive strategies to be more effective and influential. Blair's discourse was bulging with social and cognitive manipulation. His people in particular and the international community in general were the targets for his abuse of power. In his interviews and speeches, Blair affected people's social beliefs which in turn affected their actions and attitudes. He tried to convince his people that Britain must go the US led 2003 war against Iraq and as an ally for the US.

The researcher chose some excerpts that reflect manipulation; the first example is an interview with the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair in the Guardian newspaper about Iraq and the UN inspectors. The second example is a speech delivered by the former British foreign minister Jack Straw in the House of Commons. In their discourses, they attempted to convince the members of the parliament to vote for the decision of the war against Iraq. The start will be with Blair's interview.

"The United States, Britain and other members of the UN Security Council will decide the seriousness of Saddam Hussein's breaches of UN resolution 1441, not the UN weapons inspection team which will only establish the facts of any breach"

Blair starts the interview, by legitimizing the Anglo America allegations that Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction when he mentioned that the UN Security Council will decide the seriousness of the Iraqi regime. In the same statement Blair repeated and emphasized the word "breach" as a word of negative sense to convince his people that the Iraqi regime is breaching the UN resolutions. Blair begins his interview in strategy of positive self-presentation, "us" vs. "them", when he emphasized the good thing (that Britain is following the UN resolutions) and the bad thing of the Iraqi regime (that

Iraq is breaching the UN resolutions). Blair cognitively manipulated his people by making them believe that Iraq was breaching the UN resolutions.

"I think that if you look at the numbers of countries that are trying to get hold of nuclear capabilities - these are highly unstable states - and you look at the degree to which this stuff is being traded round the world, and you have got a country like North Korea virtually living off it I think it is really, really worrying,"

In this excerpt, Blair tried to magnify the issue of the weapons in Iraq by comparing it to a real and existing nuclear program and he was very specific "North Korea" as an example for countries that using their nuclear capabilities for business purposes. Blair here cognitively manipulated his people, by feeding them with false information about the real capability of the Iraqi weapons. Expressions like 'nuclear capabilities' and 'really worrying' was an implicit message to those who were reluctant to the decision of the war against Iraq. Blair politically implied that those who were against the war might be accused of supporting 'unstable states' like North Korea and Iraq. Blair showed the well-known polarized opposition between us (stable state) and those (unstable states). He was politically implying that war against Iraq is for the safety of Britain.

*"Saddam Hussein has a "duty to be open and transparent with the inspection"
"the Iraqi president has so far treated it as a bit of a game of hide and seeks".*

In this excerpt, Blair repeated the use of systematic negative representation for the Iraqi former president by using words like "open and transparent" as a reference that the latter was not serious and not cooperating with UN inspectors, although it later became clear that the decision of the war against had already been made the previous year. Blair manipulated his people by concealing the fact that the decision of going to war was already been taken. The metaphoric use "game" is to influence the parliament members' ideologies by depicting his opponent as lacking the enough seriousness and also to persuade them to vote for the war decision against Iraq.

"The honest answer is you can't be sure. There is no doubt that there is huge dissatisfaction and revulsion at Saddam's regime inside Iraq"

Manipulation in this part is quite explicit. Firstly, Blair continued his positive self-presentation by using a word of euphemism like "honest" to show his honesty and "no doubt" to show his certainty to manipulate and mislead his people. Secondly, he used hyperboles "dissatisfaction", "revulsion" to confirm that the Other is evil and not supported by his people.

"As I constantly say, the people that would be most happy if Saddam goes will be the Iraqi people. And it was interesting that in their election they did get a 100% result, but despite everything that they can do, they couldn't get more than a third of the people to actually turn out".

In this excerpt Blair with certainty continued the ideological polarization strategy (Us/ Democracy vs Them /Dictatorship). He spoke on behalf of the people of Iraq which in turn a kind of manipulation as he could not be legitimate defender for democracy in Iraqi. He implicitly implied that those who opposed the war decision were unwilling to resist totalitarianism and less patriotic, which of course clear manipulation.

*"I powerfully agree both with the war against international terrorism
and with the campaign on WMD".*

In this excerpt, Blair used hyperboles by using terms like "international terrorism", "WMD" (weapons of mass destruction) to support his claim that the Other is evil. He also used strategic move of positive self-presentation "powerfully agree" to show that he was confident and that he could take right decisions. In the same excerpt, Blair linked between two crucial and fundamental issues, (international terrorism) and (WMD) as an attempt to use strategic move of negative other-presentation, that the Iraqi regime is terrorist. He also meant to magnify the case in Iraq and to cognitively and socially manipulate his people

for more support in his war against Iraq. By affecting people's attitude, ideologies, and social beliefs, Blair mentally and socially manipulated his people by misleading and distorting the facts about Iraq.

4.2 Manipulation in Jack Straw's discourse

"Saddam Hussein's claims that Iraq abandoned producing weapons of mass destruction long ago is an "obvious falsehood"

Jack Straw began his speech with the use of negative words describing, with a certainty, his opponent's claims as "obvious falsehood". He also used hyperbole to support his claim that the Other is evil "mass destruction".

"It seems that Saddam Hussein has decided to continue the pretence that Iraq has had no WMD [weapons of mass destruction] program since Unscop [inspectors] left in 1998"

In this excerpt straw used negative other presentation to show the members of the parliament that his opponent (Saddam Hussein) conceals the WMD. By demonizing Saddam regime, he was trying to convince them that they should support his government and vote for the decision of the war against Iraq. Straw provided the members of the parliament with knowledge and evidences about Iraq, knowledge that later turned out to be false. Straw manipulated his people, and he abused his power, cognitively, by influencing the members' minds and ideologies for his interests using false knowledge. Socially, when he tried to persuade them to act and vote for the decision of the war and violated the members' human or social rights.

"This will fool nobody. If Saddam persists in this obvious falsehood, it will become clear that he has pretence the pathway to peace laid down in resolution 1441."

Manipulation in this excerpt is when Straw used macro speech act by accusing Saddam (the Iraqi former president) in persisting on cheating them. He also used negative words to describe his opponent "falsehood", "rejected". It is an indication that the Iraqi regime was rejecting the pathway to peace. At the same time he used positive self- presentation "pathway to peace" to show the parliament members that he was seeking peace and that any military action will be through the UN resolutions.

"Saddam's tactics all along have been to prevaricate in the hope that by exploiting people's natural anxieties he can string out the process for ever and keep his arsenal for good"

Straw implied that the Iraqi regime was trying to deceive the UN inspectors to keep his prohibited weapons forever. This excerpt also contained an accusation, by Straw, that the Iraqi regime was a dodger, tricky and manipulated the Iraqi people. He also used negative words "prevaricate" and "exploiting" to describe his opponent's attitude to affect the minds of the parliament members.

"He has allowed only three private interviews with scientists"

By giving an example about the attitude of the Iraqi regime, Straw tried to prove for the parliament members that the Iraqi regime was not cooperating with the UN inspectors. At the same time, he used this example as a negative other- presentation without giving any details about the rights of the Iraqi scientists as human being and submitting them to an interrogation was a clear violation for human rights. Straw statement is vague and it contained no detailed information.

" he would use a further 120 days to bring the authority of the UN lower week by week, to tie the weapons inspectors in knots, and to create further divisions within the international community."

In this excerpt, Straw accused the Iraqi former president that he was trying to exploit time to weaken the authority of the UN and to divide the international community. By doing so, he discredited his opponent. Moreover, he used negative other- presentation by depicting his opponent as a dangerous man and implicitly implied to those who refused the decision to go to war as being supporters to the dictatorship in Iraq.

"We are not today seeking a mandate for military action because the government has not yet got to that point, and if we get to that point, we will come back and seek"

a vote through a debate in this house on a substantive motion."

In this excerpt Straw tried to emphasize his government's fundamental value "democracy" and that his government would vote before going to war against Iraq. Also he utilised positive self- presentation by depicting his government as a democratic one by using a positive word like "vote".

"Sometimes conflict is necessary in the short term to achieve peace through the threat of aggression, and sometimes it is the threat of conflict which can establish peace,"

Apparently, this excerpt comprised a clear manipulation and an implicit fallacious debate when Straw associated between "conflict", "aggression" and "peace".

5. Discussion

Research question 1: How did the British administration, by its speeches, cognitively manipulate their people?

In this study, and through the excerpts the researcher chose and analysed, we can see the influence of the cognitive and social manipulation in the political speeches and its catastrophic consequences on the people like the case in Iraq. The British government represented by Blair and Straw played a crucial role in escalating the hostility against the Iraqi former government by manipulating media, their people, and the international community as well. Both Blair and Straw successfully exploited the forcefulness of language to convince their people represented by the members of the parliament to vote for the decision of the war against Iraq. People were cognitively manipulated when their understanding and ideologies were influenced by the speeches and statements of both of Blair and Straw. Through their discourses, they used ideological polarization strategy (Us/ democracy vs Them/ dictatorship) to emphasize their struggle against dictatorship and their commitments to the international legitimacy and the UN resolutions, *"The United States, Britain and other members of the UN Security Council will decide the seriousness of Saddam Hussein"*. *"it will become clear that he has rejected the pathway to peace laid down in resolution 1441"*. They also used the negative other- presentation strategy to discredit their opponent (the Iraqi former president) by depicting him as a dictator, dismissive and shows no compliance to the UN resolutions, *"there is huge dissatisfaction and revulsion at Saddam's regime inside Iraq"*, *"the people that would be most happy if Saddam goes will be the Iraqi people"*. They also used hyperboles in describing the Iraqi former government by using negative and effective words, ("regime") ("revulsion"), ("huge dissatisfaction"), ("campaign on WMD"), ("falsehood"), ("pretence"), ("prevaricate").

Research question 2: How did the British administration, by its speeches, socially manipulate their people?

Blair and Straw socially manipulated their people by affecting their minds first and then their attitudes. They made their people to act and behave against their will to support the war decision against Iraq. "Blair manipulated his country into supporting a foreign military adventure led by an American Republican president", (Roberts 2003). Blair and Straw violated the social norms and made the British people act against their best interests as dominated groups, which in turn was a social inequality. According to Khodr (2010) "Tony Blair's lies to the British people, despite their immense opposition to the war, and to Parliament have been aptly documented". The Anglo- American invasion for Iraq has been and still resulting in tragic casualties. No need to mention here that manipulation of the British politicians, as manipulators, resulted in massive losses for their people (manipulated), when many British families either lost their relatives in the war or had others disabled. "Iraq casts a long shadow over public life in Britain, haunting domestic politics in the present and setting limits for what will be possible in the future", (Freedland, 2010).

Despite the fact the British people enjoy a high level of awareness, they were vulnerable and less resistant to manipulation. They complied and were manipulated and used by their government. By considering the case in Britain, we can imagine how great the influence of manipulation is in the political discourse. Saussure and Schulz (2005) stated that it is likely for sometimes individuals in the Western world were more permeable to manipulation.

According to Freedland (2010) “the observers of the future will surely conclude that it was the Iraq war that broke the bond of trust between this government and the nation”. The relationship between the British government and the British people was weakened and also people’s faith and trust in their government was shaken due to the clear cognitive and social manipulation practiced by the politicians during the period that preceded the 2003 war against Iraq. “Faith in the power of citizens to affect events was badly dented by the experience of Feb. 15, 2003”, (Freedland, 2010).

6. Conclusion

Summing up, in this paper, the researcher has discussed one of the important notions of CDA, discursive manipulation. In particular the researcher has shown that the British politicians, Tony Blair and Jack Straw abused their power and cognitively (by illegal control of people’s minds) and socially (by making people support them) manipulated their people to support them and vote for the decision of the 2003 war against Iraq. They violated their people’s norms and made them behave against their interest. They used different strategies of manipulation in their speeches like the positive self- presentation and negative other presentation. The paper also showed how tragic could be the consequences of political manipulation and its bad effects on people.

This study has contributed to the existing knowledge. The findings can be used by students of political sciences, media, sociology, and anthropology. This study simply showed how the students of various disciplines can use CDA in their research. Saussure and Schulz (2005) stated that the hypothesis lying behind the necessity of identifying the indices of a manipulative discourse is that analysis helps to provide a higher degree of awareness, which can in turn prevent the hearer from being the victim of such a discourse.

References

- Alba-Juez, Laura (2009). *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice*.Uk. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Retrieved 8 October 2010 from www.c-s-p.org/flyers/978-1-4438-0597-1-sample.pdf.
- Al-Sharoufi, H.(2006). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Editorials in Arabic Newspapers*, Eleventh Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, Japan: 8-27 July
- Atawneh, A. M. (2009). The discourse of war in the Middle East: Analysis of media reporting. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **41** (2): 263-278. Retrieved 1 October 2010 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/issue/5965-2009-999589996-934076>
- Capone, A. (2010). Barack Obama’s South Carolina speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **42** (11): 2964-2977. Retrieved 1 October 2010 from: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_cdi=5965&_pubType=I&_acct=C000050221&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=10&md5=7d71d49180498c24db4761b40811409e&jchunk=42#42.
- Chouliaraki,L and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.
- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In T. A. van Dijk. (ed.) *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, pp.258-84. Newbury Park: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Fairclough, N.(1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Freedland, J. (2010). *How the Iraqi war has poisoned British people's faith in politics*. *The Guardian*. 16 January. Retrieved 20 Novermeber 2010 from <http://www.taipetimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2010/01/16/2003463576/4>
- Galasinski, D. (2000). *The Language of Deception: A Discourse Analytical Study*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Khodr, M. (2010). With Blair-Bush Lies, Muslims Died. *Sabbah Report*. 2 February. Retrieved 25 November 2010 from: <http://sabbah.biz/mt/archives/2010/02/02/with-blair-bush-lies-muslims-died/>
- Momani, K., Badarneh, M. and Migdadi. (2010) Intertextual borrowings in ideologically competing discourses:The case of the Middle East. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, **22**. Retrieved 3 November 2010 from <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/>.

- Rozina, G. And Karapetjana, I. (2009). *The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistic Manipulation. Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*. **19**: 111-122. Retrieved 10 October 2010 from <http://www.esosder.org/eng/?sayfa=arsiv>
- Roberts, P.C. (2003). *War Against The Nation-State (contd.): Blair Lies Betray Britain. VDARE*. 8 July. Retrieved 22 September 2010 from <http://www.vdare.com/roberts/blair.htm>.
- Saddam lied about weapons, says Straw. (2002). *The Guardian*. 18 December. Retrieved 10 October 2010 from : <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/dec/18/iraq.politics> (10 October 2010).
- Saussure, L. and Schulz, P. (2005). *Manipulation and Ideology in the Twentieth Century*. (ed.) Uk. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Discourse and manipulation. Discourse & Society*, **17**(3), 359-383. Retrieved 3 September 2010 from <http://das.sagepub.com/content/17/3.toc>. (3 October 2010).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1999). *Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis. Discourse and Society*, **10** (4): 459-450. Retrieved 1 October 2010 from <http://das.sagepub.com/>.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Critical Discourse Analysis. in Schifffrin, D. et al.(ed). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. pp. 352-372. USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved 6 September 2010 from: [http://books.google.com.my/books?id=EdKmih-
iuVsC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Deborah+Tannen,+Deborah+Schifffrin+%26+Heidi+Hamilton++Handbook
+of+Discourse+Analysis&hl=en&ei=cZu4TOSnD4zBccr83bwM&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=book-
thumbnail&resnum=1&ved=0CCsQ6wEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com.my/books?id=EdKmih-
iuVsC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Deborah+Tannen,+Deborah+Schifffrin+%26+Heidi+Hamilton++Handbook
+of+Discourse+Analysis&hl=en&ei=cZu4TOSnD4zBccr83bwM&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=book-
thumbnail&resnum=1&ved=0CCsQ6wEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false) . (6 October 2010).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In: C. Schöffner & A. Wenden (ed.). *Language and Peace*. pp. 17-33. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
- White, M., Kettle, M., Toynbee, P. and Wintour, P. (2002). Saddam playing game of hide and seek says PM. *The Guardian*. 20 December. Retrieved 8 October 2010 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2002/dec/20/uk.world> (8 October 2010)
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (ed.). London. Sage Publications Ltd. Retrieved 15 November 2010 from [http://books.google.com.my/books?id=tNRWsrPiNQoC&pg=PT16&dq=Wodak,+R+and+Meyer,+M.\(2001\).
+Methods+of+Critical+Discourse+Analysis&hl=en&ei=b6i4TK2IKY7cvQOJ5qTHDQ&sa=X&oi=book_result
&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CC8Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=Wodak%2C%20R%20and%20Meyer%2C%20M.\(2001\).%20Methods%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis&f=false](http://books.google.com.my/books?id=tNRWsrPiNQoC&pg=PT16&dq=Wodak,+R+and+Meyer,+M.(2001).
+Methods+of+Critical+Discourse+Analysis&hl=en&ei=b6i4TK2IKY7cvQOJ5qTHDQ&sa=X&oi=book_result
&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CC8Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=Wodak%2C%20R%20and%20Meyer%2C%20M.(2001).%20Methods%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis&f=false) (25 September 2010).
- Wodak, R. (2001). Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis. in Wodak, R and Meyer, Michael (ed.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. pp.34-62. London: Sage Publication Ltd. Retrieved 20 September 2010 from [http://books.google.com.my/books?id=tNRWsrPiNQoC&pg=PT16&dq=Wodak,+R+and+Meyer,+M.\(2001\).
+Methods+of+Critical+Discourse+Analysis&hl=en&ei=b6i4TK2IKY7cvQOJ5qTHDQ&sa=X&oi=book_result
&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CC8Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=Wodak%2C%20R%20and%20Meyer%2C%20M.\(2001\).%20Methods%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis&f=false](http://books.google.com.my/books?id=tNRWsrPiNQoC&pg=PT16&dq=Wodak,+R+and+Meyer,+M.(2001).
+Methods+of+Critical+Discourse+Analysis&hl=en&ei=b6i4TK2IKY7cvQOJ5qTHDQ&sa=X&oi=book_result
&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CC8Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=Wodak%2C%20R%20and%20Meyer%2C%20M.(2001).%20Methods%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis&f=false)

Appendix 1

Saddam playing game of hide and seek says PM

- [Michael White, Martin Kettle, Polly Toynbee and Patrick Wintour](#)
- [The Guardian](#), Friday 20 December 2002 01.25 GMT

Article history

1-The United States, Britain and other members of the UN Security Council will decide the seriousness of Saddam Hussein's breaches of UN resolution 1441, not the UN weapons inspection team which will only establish the facts of any breach, Tony Blair said yesterday.

"The inspectors have to be clear that he is in breach," the prime minister said.

"They will be looking for evidence which could come in lots of different forms and again I am not going to speculate on that."

Washington and London have "no doubt", that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction and are "perfectly entitled to express an opinion on it," he said in an interview with the Guardian which also stressed how "frightening" he finds the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

2- "I think that if you look at the numbers of countries that are trying to get hold of nuclear capabilities - these are highly unstable states - and you look at the degree to which this stuff is being traded round the world, and you have got a country like North Korea virtually living off it, I think it is really, really worrying," he admitted.

On Iraq he was very specific. "The work that is done by the inspectors, that is the purpose of having them there. The inspectors will, as it were, state the facts. The judgement as to the seriousness of the facts is obviously a matter for the nations at the UN," he said.

The Foreign Office has stressed that a pattern of behaviour, rather than a material breach of resolution 1441, would be required to justify military action against Iraq. Mr Blair's words again suggest greater flexibility of interpretation by No 10 - matching the White House's difference of emphasis with the State Department.

3- president has so far treated it as, "a bit of a game of hide and seek." Insisting that Saddam Hussein has a "duty to be open and transparent" with the inspection, the prime minister said that the Iraqi

When the inspectors go into Iraq looking for illegal weaponry, "he tries to hide it and if they find it they win, and if he conceals it, he wins. It is not supposed to be like that. The original concept of the inspection regime was that [the team] would go in, he would then say 'Look, this is what I have got' and they would go on inspecting that it was properly closed down.

"That is their job, inspectors are actually people who aren't detectors, they are actually people who are experts in rendering harmless or destroying these weapons of mass destruction material ... His duty is to be open and transparent about what he has. Now he has made his declaration, if the declaration turns out to be false then he is in breach," he argued.

Asked about the stability of the Iraqi regime and its ability to withstand current levels of international pressure, Mr Blair replied: 4- "The honest answer is you can't be sure. There is no doubt that there is huge dissatisfaction and revulsion at Saddam's regime inside Iraq.

5- "As I constantly say, the people that would be most happy if Saddam goes, will be the Iraqi people. And it was interesting that in their election [the plebiscite on the regime] they did get a 100% result, but despite everything that they can do, they couldn't get more than a third of the people to actually turn out".

Mr Blair brushed aside suggestions that defence chiefs across Whitehall are complaining that they do not yet know what the military options are for an invasion.

"All the options are being considered ... at the moment there are all sorts of discussions you would expect going on, but this is all contingency planning... for the eventuality that you find he is in breach."

Mr Blair also refused to be drawn on yesterday's Guardian report that Britain is informally discussing the possible location of interceptor missiles in Britain as part of the Bush administration's controversial commitment to national missile defence.

"We have received the request from the US. Geoff Hoon [the defence minister] has set out a process of discussion about this ... we are simply not in a position yet to give a considered response to that request and all these issues will be looked at in that context."

But, when asked if he would ever refuse a request from Washington, Mr Blair replied: "I am prepared to say no to the Americans or to anyone else whenever I think it is in our national interest to do so ... what about Kyoto, what about agricultural subsidies, steel subsidies?"

He conceded that to have a breach with America, "would be a major event for this country with enormous consequences," adding "it is not something you should ever do lightly. But I am afraid it is worse than people might suspect in relation to defence and security.

"I powerfully agree both with the war against international terrorism and with the campaign on WMD.

"My concern with US policy is to say that the agenda however has got to be broader than terrorism and WMD. That is my point."

Appendix 2

Saddam lied about weapons, says Straw

- Staff and agencies
- guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 18 December 2002 17.29 GMT
- [Article history](#)

The government today indicated that it believes Iraq has made a "material breach" of the UN resolution requiring it to declare its weapons of mass destruction.

Saddam Hussein's claims that Iraq abandoned producing weapons of mass destruction long ago is an "obvious falsehood", the foreign secretary, Jack Straw, said.

Mr Straw was giving his initial reaction to the Iraqi declaration of its weapons programmes demanded by the United Nations security council resolution 1441.

"We have not completed a full analysis of the Iraqi declaration," the foreign secretary said in a statement. "But it is clear, even on a preliminary assessment, that this is not the full and complete declaration requested in resolution 1441."

Mr Straw said there were "obvious omissions" from the huge dossier produced by Iraq, which weighs in at around 10 stone.

"It seems that Saddam Hussein has decided to continue the pretence that Iraq has had no WMD [weapons of mass destruction] programme since Unscm [inspectors] left in 1998," the foreign secretary said.

"This will fool nobody. If Saddam persists in this obvious falsehood, it will become clear that he has rejected the pathway to peace laid down in resolution 1441."

Mr Straw said: "Saddam's tactics all along have been to prevaricate in the hope that by exploiting people's natural anxieties he can string out the process for ever and keep his arsenal for good. In place of active voluntary cooperation, we have had a string of cynically timed concessions calculated to divide and delay."

Iraq would be in "material breach" of the resolution if it provided false information and then failed to cooperate with the UN weapons inspectors who have now returned to Iraq under the conditions set out by the security council.

Mr Straw said: "We are not today seeking a mandate for military action because the government has not yet got to that point, and if we get to that point, we will come back and seek a vote through a debate in this house on a substantive motion."

Mr Straw said: "We have always said that we would want the declaration tested by hard questions and robust inspections.

"As that process continues, we will complete a full analysis of the Iraqi documents.

Spurning the French and German call for more time, Mr Straw asked why the Iraqi leader should comply with weapons demands over the next 120 days. "No, he would use a further 120 days to bring the authority of the UN lower week by week, to tie the weapons inspectors in knots, and to create further divisions within the international community."

"Saddam can be in no doubt by now that resolution 1441 offers him the final opportunity to comply honestly and openly."

President Saddam's tactic was to "dribble" out small concessions to delay military action. Mr Straw pointed out that he has allowed only three private interviews with scientists.

At a prime minister's questions this afternoon dominated by the topic of Iraq, Tony Blair told MPs that most people who had studied Iraq's declaration on its weapons programmes were "pretty sceptical" about the claims it made.

Mr Blair also announced that the government would make a formal response to the massive document shortly after the Christmas recess.

Mr Blair also ruled out following the US in ordering a mass smallpox vaccination programme for every British citizen to counter any possible terrorist attack.

Meanwhile in Washington, the White House spokesman Ari Fleischer said president George Bush was "concerned" about gaps in the Iraqi report.

Back at Westminster - following PMQs - the defence secretary Geoff Hoon outlined the "contingency preparations" being made for possible military action against Iraq.

In a Commons statement, he said there had been no change in the government's "primary objective" of securing a peaceful solution to the situation.

But it would be "foolish" to believe Saddam Hussein would meet the UN's disarmament demands unless he was faced with a "credible threat of force".

That was why the government had begun preparations to ensure it could call on a "range of military options" should they be required, he said.

Programmes were being brought forward, new equipment bought earlier than anticipated and ships sought to move troops and military hardware, he said.

Lessons were also being learned from the Saif Sareea II exercise in the gulf where British equipment, including tanks, artillery and clothing, were found unsuitable for desert use, he added.

He said members of the reserve forces were being informed they may be required - and information being supplied for their employers.

The fact that some troops had been put on shorter notice for action did not mean military intervention was inevitable nor that they would be involved.

"The purpose of these preparations is to provide the necessary range of options not a specific plan," he told MPs.

He said a six-strong task group of Naval vessels - including a nuclear submarine - being deployed to the Gulf in the New Year was part of routine operations but would be available for action if required.

Further maritime forces could be sent to the region to ensure "the readiness of a broad range of maritime capabilities", he added.

He concluded: "These are contingency preparations, aimed at increasing the readiness of a range of options.

"This process does not lead inexorably to military action.

"But as long as Saddam Hussein's compliance with UN Security Council resolution 1441 is in doubt, the threat of force must remain and must be real."

Tory spokesman Gerald Howarth said the "bland" statement did not provide enough details and accused Mr Hoon of briefing the press before parliament.

Mr Howarth also requested that MPs should be advised if there were to be deployments during the Christmas recess.