# Ways of Manipulating the Public by Using Euphemistic Expressions within Iraqi Political Context
## A Research Paper in Linguistics
### Done By

**Yaghdan R. Mahdi**
**Lecturer**
yaggienajafi@hotmail.com
**00964 -07814977500**

**Mayada R. Eesa**
**Lecturer**
May_rahim@yahoo.com
**00964-07902187646**

**University of Technology**
**English Language Center**
**Iraq- Baghdad**

## Abstract

People have a tendency to, instead of saying harsh and brunt things, express what they think in suitable mitigatingways to make the communication more smooth and comfort. Euphemism is one of the effective ways of communication for that purpose. In politics, Politicians abundantly employs euphemism to direct people's perspective about the world and to hide facts as well as turn the public attention away from them. This paper probes the euphemistic usages along with their nature, meaning and effects in political discourse. The scope of the study is limited to the usage of euphemism within Iraqi context. It mainly attempts to find how different leaders in world of politics use this technique to manipulate people minds and achieve their purposes regarding Iraqi situations.

The study commences with presenting a sufficient background about euphemism, its meaning, kinds and categories, purposes and so on. Then it deals with the concept of political euphemism as well as its usages in different contexts and situations. To achieve the main objective, a group of speeches that made by different senior world leaders concerning Iraq are selected to represent the sample of the study. These speeches are analyzed according to different methods since they are varied in their nature, language, culture. However, the emphasis is focused on the descriptive method and a content analysis. This analyze emerges from a qualitative perspective since it concentrates on the meaning that exist in specific situations.

The paper objective is fulfilled by locating a lot of and various euphemistic utilizations in political speeches samples. The defined categories of euphemisms have different natures and meaning, and are used for many purposes.However,each speech context is distinguished by common feature, as the British context is distinguished by playing on cognitive and mental factors, whereas American one has feature of patriotism and using historical symbols, regarding the Iraqi, the

speech is dominated by religious garment. To sum up, euphemism is an effective and sufficient technique employed abundantly by Politicians all over the world to achieve their purposes. The Iraqi context is not different from that.

Keywords: Euphemism – (ST) Source Text – (TT) Target Text)- PM (Prime Minster)- Political

**Table of Content**

**Section One**
**Introduction**
**1.1 An Introduction to the term Euphemism**

  Euphemism represents a phenomenon in the field of linguistics which is employed by speakers for the purpose of achieving the perfect influence of communication. Euphemism has origins related to religious taboos; meanwhile it has been progressed and became a reference to the replacements of rude and offensive terms. Euphemism is a linguistic and social phenomenon; we can find them in every aspect of social life.

Rhetorically speaking we can refer to Euphemism as the use of a evasive, mild or reassuring words or expression that exist of one that is taboo (Oxford ,1998: 117).  Euphemism can be found commonly in human languages usage which has become a major concern of human being. Hongrui Wen (2002: 83) referred to Euphemism as the substitution of ordinary expression with the exaggerated ones.

 Ridout and Witting (1964: 81 ) pointed out that the purpose behind using euphemisms is hiding something unpleasant , or even in case of

using a mild and indirect term : " it is prudery or a false sense of refinement that causes us to use paying guests for boarder or lodger ". As stated by Allan & Burridge (1991:14) the euphemism focuses the light on the language change through the occurrence or loss of some sense of lexemes, or appropriate substitution in the higher style. It has been noticed that many euphemisms are figurative, whereas others are seen to be the cause of "semantic change". Such changes in semantics may lead to new meaning to be broader, narrower, more favorable, or less favorable. Additionally, the other type may change because of the exchange of perception or the similarity of characters (Ibid:97).

   There is no doubt that the occurrence of direct straight forward vocabularies that could motivate fear of abnormal powers like death will spontaneously tiger a quest for euphemisms; i.e., substitutions that do not arouse abomination, revulsion or dead (Al-Kharabsheh, 2011:95 ). To put this in other way, using euphemisms is considered an effective technique of cheating people in addition to telling the lies. Moreover, they work as a strong linguistic tool in order to smooth communication and keep interpersonal relationship in non- hostile verbal encounters. Politicians resort to euphemisms as a kind of safe way to deal with disagreeable subjects and criticize their opponents with no need to give a bad impression to their listeners.

## 1.2 Euphemism Categories

There have been many attempts to divide the ways of forming euphemisms into several categories .Interlocutors tendto use certain euphemistic strategies in any polite communication between speakers and listeners. So there is no doubt that people use these strategies orforms of euphemisms in order to describe labels which considered not suitable for use in polite conversation. Thus it has been illustrated that different euphemisms fall into one or more of these sets (Wikipedia, 2006) :

A-Terms of foreign and/or technical origin (urinate,security breach,mierda de toro,prophylactic,feces occur)

B-Abbreviations (SOBfor "son of a bitch, BFDfor "big fucking deal")

C-Abstractions (left the company,do it)

D--Indirections (behind,live together, go)

E-Plays on abbreviations (barbecue saucefor "bull shit",sugar honey ice teafor "shit",Marylandfarmerfor "motherfucker",catch (or see) you next Tuesdayfor "cunt")

F-Phonetic alphabet (Charlie Foxtrotfor "Cluster fuck,BravoSierrafor "bullshit")

## 1.3 Use of Euphemisms

 We can find Euphemisms in different worlds languages and they satisfy special significant functions .Pavlenko(2006:260) mentioned that one of the most important  functions of euphemismsis "to protect

speakers from undesired emotional arousal". Whereas Miller (1999:64) has pointed out that such a function  can be fulfilled by euphemisms through sanitizing the language that is used by  speakers . Agreeing with this idea, Mayfield (2009:270) pointed out   that euphemisms  camouflage events that could be seen as not acceptable in terms of declared values . It has been noticed that there different types of aggressive and restricted things which euphemisms refer to war, intercourse, death , bodily functions and disability are considered important concepts to which euphemisms routinely refer (Stockwell (2002), Brind& Wilkinson  (2008)).

## 1.4 Kinds of Euphemism

  Rawson (1981: 1-3) classified euphemisms intotwo general kinds: positive euphemism and negative one:

1. The positive euphemisms: they magnify and try to make the euphemized objects seen to be of much importantance and larger than they are. Moreover it has been noticed that they contain various occupational titles which are used in order to protect worker's egos by the way of elevating the status of their Job like " access controller" as a substitute to  "doorman". Other types of positive euphemisms such as they use the word  instead of  lawyer and  the term health care professional as a reference to nurse or even the doctor in addition to territory manager as a replacement of salesman.

2. The negative euphemism deflates and diminishes. It is defensive in nature;its function is offsetting thepower of tabooed terms and otherwise eradicating from the language everything that people prefernot to deal with directly. So we can say that negative euphemisms come instead of  avoidable words that are used by people such as the word harvesting that replace the word killing and the word intestinal fortitude instead of guts (Rawson, 1981: 3; Henry, 2006: 1).

  No one can deny the fact of conscious and unconscious use of positive and negative euphemisms. i.e. euphemisms have been used in different social circumstances for the purpose of avoiding embarrassing situations or even for protecting another's ego. A good instance for such a case in  parties such as a formal dinner when the guest may ask  people to direct him to the location of the little girls room to avoid the embarrassment. So he use the previously mentioned word as a replacement of the word toilet , which is itself considered a euphemism that is coined a long time ago that it is known as the version of plain-language of the location being referred to. This kind of  language  is  usually  called  the  unconscious  use  of euphemism (Rawson, 1981: 3).

## Section Two
## Political Euphemism
## 2.1 Political Euphemism

The technique used by politicians in approaching delicate or disagreeable subjects is considered very importance. The main aim in politics is to seen polite and sensitive to people's concerns in order to win their favor or attack a political opponent .They do so by avoiding vocabularies that have unpleasant relations for the purpose of giving a positive impression to the addressees. To justify such an aim, they use the process in which a distasteful concept is stripped of its most offensive or not appropriate overtones which is called *euphemism*, providing a harmless method to deal with certain embarrassing subjects without being politically wrong or even breaking a social convention.

As mentioned by Orwell (1976:266) political language should contain euphemism. Political discourse has been described by Chilton and Schäffner (1997: 207) as a complex form of human activity which is based on the recognition that politics cannot be conducted without language.

Political doublespeak or as it is called "euphemism" may not be considered as a simple substitution of the previous zero-degree signifier. Instead, it had some special qualities which recognize it with euphemistic terms over different fields.  Its creation reflects political leaders' inspiration to conceal the truth , in addition to altering people consideration off it. By utilizing this kind of expression, they try to control people's learning over the universe and also data transmission. Therefore, when perusing political discourse, one should pay attention to the hidden political purposes in euphemism.

## 2.2. Features of Political Euphemism

There is no doubt that the creation of Political euphemism is  formed for political life and for political plans. Furthermore, it is considered as an instrument to political members to conceal scandals, hide the truth , adding to that guiding peoples thoughts when there is a public issue to discuss. There are three distinguished features that political euphemisms have which can be explained in the following points :

## 2.2.1.Greater Degree of Deviation from its Signified

As mentioned by De Saussure language signs can be referred to as a group of the signifier, the phonetic forms of language in addition to the signified, and items in existence characterized by linguistic procedures. Because of the absence of immediate alternately legitimate relations between the two, they bring an optional relationship with each other in order to make euphemism by substituting their signifier .

As stated by Xu (2002:7) the reason behind making euphemism is the transformation of the signifier in order to enlarge  the connotation distance that exists between the signifier and the signified, euphemism implications remain relative to their previous zero-degree ones . Despite the fact that both euphemism and the zero degree signifier have a unique characteristic in that they refer to similar signified, but political one differs ultimately from the commonly used in that it deviates incredibly from the meaning delivered by its former signifier, or even a perfect distortion like the words overweight and fat.

## 2.2.2. More Vague Meanings

 George Owell (1946:40) illustrated a couple of significant properties that exist in political discourse in both Politics and  English Language , that is the uselessness and ambiguity of figure of speech. Euphemism is eventually categorized by substitution of direct vocabularies with obscure and ambiguous ones, plays an important role in demystifying the implication of political discourse when serving political aims. One of the important employed demystifying techniques in political euphemism include the substitution of particular meanings with the ones which are considered general. Moreover,  substituting hyponyms with  super  ordinates  and  replacing  derogatory  meanings  with commendatory ones. For example, people used to call  the atomic bombs in Hiroshima as the gadget, the device, the thing or other vague meanings.

## 2.2.3 .Strong Characteristic of Times

   As  mentioned  by  Peng  (1999:66)  euphemism  focuses  on  the language reflection of  Social culture, thus any deviation in social growth will propel those in language. It has been noted that political euphemism is  booming in every international vicissitude. Therefore , rich soil is used to create  political euphemism because of  US's role in international politics in addition to its dynamic domestic politics and economy,

All people agree that war has a bad impact in that it didn't only carry death and damage but new euphemistic expressions in that they make death  sound  less  horrifying  (Page,2003:125).  For  example  the Department of Defense in America used to give the name " air attack" in Vietnam asair support  and protective action.

## Section three

## Speeches' analysis and discussion

  Hereinafter three examples of Political speeches made by different senior officials regarding Iraqi context will be euphemistically analyzed and discussed.

## 3.1    George W. Bush, the former president of USA, speech that was released before the second Gulf war Iraq in 2003 will be examined to define political euphemistic usages and their meanings.

Indeed, there is a great similarity between the speech of former President Bush and the previous speech of British PM Tony Blair about Iraq; to avoid repetition in this analysis the concern is concentrated much more on the meaning of euphemistic structures when delivered to the recipient than on meaning of these structures as usages of euphemisms. So the examples will be examined in terms of their denotative and connotative meaning, in other words, their literal meanings and the euphemized ones. Furthermore, since the intended addressee of such euphemisms    could be Arabic or foreign ,the meaning of Source Text (ST) and Target Text (TT), audience, difference in cultures and ideologies will be taken into consideration.

Knowing that the pubic judgment including American would never accept the Gulf war, Bush employs euphemistic structures. These usages are utilized to vague the intentional actions towards Iraq. For that, He makes promises to the people of Iraq of liberation and freedom against the regime which Bush describes as "dictatorial ship and tyranny". Moreover, his speech also includes other promising acts such as getting rid of torture, rape, executions and of course building new country. No one can tell about his goal or intention then, yet he positively directs the public of prosperous matters and faraway from catastrophes of war.

Even though such structures are given the euphemistic meaning into Arabic as previously discussed, their true and hidden meaning are kept away from the public, which are mere acts of invading and occupying. It is for euphemistic reason that such confession needs not to be declared by American officials, however, the distortion and falsification are deadly and euphemistically confirmed. Furthermore, invading and occupying operations of Iraq are labeled as "liberating" and the occupying forces are titled as " Fighters of freedom or liberating" (G. W. Bush, 2017). These structures can be seen as the political euphemisms since they possess characteristics of political orientation such as a response to perceived exigency ( Gulf war), designed straightforward to address certain persons and groups (American &Iraqi people) to deliver a message, and pragmatic to convince a party (US Army) to conduct certain acts(fighting) regarding to the operation of public governing  ( taking over Iraq) (Enos 1996) .

The meaning of such usage is delivered to Arabic receivers literally to get the original message in a direct way. In fact, the formal equivalence is properly employed to convey the meaning of these structures. Nevertheless, via taking in consideration the declaration of Bush as far as 2003 operations against Iraq is concerned, in addition to the situation in Iraq, once can argue that euphemistic structures are intended by Bush to beautify the true acts towards Iraq which are acts

of invading and occupying. These structures are utilized to rationalize and obscure the real intents of this war. Literal meaning of these euphemisms would definitely misinform the audience or public.

Hence, the euphemistic meaning must be firstly understood so as to be handled in skillful way and a suitable perspective must be considered when conveying political euphemistic expression. If not, these structures would stay hidden whereas the influence would be similar to that of the source text (ST). As such, the form is considered not the content of vocabularies or utterances. Along with Baker (1992), the implicature, which represents a technique of euphemistic usage, refers tothe intended meaning of a speaker not his/her spoken words (p. 223). Neither the quality nor the manner of the meaning delivered above are satisfied because the former is insufficient for the intended receivers along with culture, whereas the latter is inappropriately expressed. The meaning is interpreted in favor of the text maker, that is Bush, not the receiver, the public.

Similarly, communicative meaning, presented by Newmark (1981), can also be vital and assumed when handling political euphemisms because it is so close to the target text (TT) as well as TL culture more than ST. In this way, the message contents plus the factual data can be crucial rather than the form. Incidentally, these structures must be conveyed in communicative way to give the suitable semantic, contextual and functional features for what is intentioned and to perceive the meaning with clarity by the targeted addressees.

Eventually, euphemistic structures must cope with the target language and culture by presenting the real meaning as well as info of the euphemism so as to be accepted by the target society. Besides the intent or the objective of the speaker embed in the euphemistic structure and the context of using the euphemism have to be considered.

From another of view, the meaning of euphemistic structures must be covertly conveyed.  Hence, proper functional equivalence in lieu of literal one should be adopted for the euphemistic vocabularies "liberating operations, freedom operations, and free fighters". Functional equivalence known as dynamic or a re-contextualizing process deals with the deep meaning of the euphemistic structures. In such meaning, idea(s) of the speaker in SL are interpreted not the vocabularies and/or form. The utterance along with neighboring unit(s) of thoughts must be understood,  after that  the thoughts in TL should be reflected. The SL forms should not be given the same weight as ideas because any way they are not the same as those of TL. Conveying literal meaning may reflect different euphemistic one, consequently obfuscates the real ideology and purpose of the speaker. Therefore, a meaning could be proposed that reveals the euphemistic

structures utilized by Bush to submit the correct meaning to the targeted public and culture since literal meaning obscures and misleads the expressions in Arabic.

Other euphemistic usages in Bush's speech can be defined in anaphoric structures. Anaphora is defined as the repetition in linguistic term for the purpose of establishing power of emphasis.(Enos 1996:10). Bush uses this technique intentionally to show the power of his messages. Anaphora herein is of two faces, the first is meant to encourage his people, troops, officials to engage in the act of war against Iraq, for example " we will pass… we will defend ….we will prevail…." . Another face is intended to justify the message of the president, that is to say the legitimacy and honesty of the gulf war. This is can be witnessed in repeating the bad actions done by the old regime, also in repeating goals of the war "freedom and justice"

In the same vein, euphemism, as a way of directing the public, evokes certain feeling amid the people to achieve a certain end. This is accomplished in the current speech via metaphorical Images to arouse feeling of patriotism where he describes people of America as great people and great nation, or by creating long lasting threats image for terrorist acts, or to bring courage to his troops and let them feel proud by fighting for the right cause. He makes his people wants this war through making image of "unfinished war". Another clear metaphor is by symbolizing the fall of the regime and the end of its era by throwing image of "the falling of the statute". One more metaphor is used to make people alert of likely expected danger from Iraq by mentioning the phrase "heart of middle east".

Last but not least, it is a fact that the rhetoric and euphemism in America is closely connected with religion and historical symbols. God and his mission represent the religious symbols, while the early settlers stand for the historical ones. (Lejon 1994:41 and Enos 1996) Both kinds of these symbols are found in Bush speech regarding the Iraqi context.  Regarding religious symbols, they refer to the idea that God chooses people of America to make good things for peoples around the globe, as for this context to bring justice and liberation for the Iraqi oppressed people. Whereas creating images of pride and victory to American nation and to give hope along with faith to the people.

In brief and as discussed above, it can be evidently sum up that the former president, George W. Bush, consciously euphemizes different structures to achieve his political objectives, in that he desperately depends on the concept of patriotism to wage  the war on Iraq.

**3.2 The speech of the former British Prime Minister (PM)** at the beginning of the war against Iraq in 2003, 2nd Gulf War, represents the data of this analyze. The speech, which includes statements of

interviews, conferences, releases and others, has been taken from the net. It consists of 19 statements of 16,116 words; however, those are carefully reduced to just 7 to suit the military action in 2003.

As for this analyze, the socio-cognitive method of CDA is employed to find euphemistic usages being used by PM to manipulate the public, therefore, to accomplish certain ideological as well as political objectives. Such technique effectively explains the role that political discourse plays in the political process by focusing on the socio-cognitive interaction via connecting the discourse to the social and political symbols and cognitive models which monitor political actions and systems (van Dijk, 1997b).

The aim of this analytical focus is thus to prize out the different constructions of euphemism so as to be accounted for by the theory of the cognitive models and construe their impact on the production and reception processes. To this effect, a modified version of Warren's (1992) model was adopted, as illustrated in the following figure.

Euphemistic constructions or expressions seemed to abound in Tony Blair's political discourse relating to issues raised in the outbreak of the second Gulf war on Iraq. Indeed, out of a total of 18 statements, 48 euphemistic constructions were prized out. The linguistic realizations of euphemisms were asymmetrically distributed as far as the modified version of Warren's (1992) model is concerned. Such euphemisms were presented in quantitative terms in Table 1 below in the word formation and semantic levels.

**Table1. Distribution of the euphemistic constructions based on their corresponding methods**

| Word formation devices | Frequency % | Semantic devices | Frequency % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Compounding | 12 | Circumlocution | 8 |
| Acronym | 1 | Reversal | 5 |
| | | Understatement | 23 |

As can be seen in Table 1, there was a clear discrepancy in euphemistic realizations. The quantitative analysis showed that euphemism was mainly realized as semantic devices, with 36 occurrences. So pervasive among these was understatement (23 occurrences), followed by circumlocution and its eight tokens, such as the liberation of the Iraqi people and the liberation of Iraq from Saddam. Reversal trailed behind, showing just five occurrences amid they are doing a superb job and removing Saddam will also be a blessing for all the Iraqi people, which has a metaphorical origin. Relevant within the euphemistic understatement was that 16 out of the

23 tokens referred to conflict which has been resorted to by Tony Blair to substitute the expression war.

As regards word formation devices, there were two methods used to construct euphemism. These were compounding and acronym. What was noticeable in these formation devices was that compounding was, by far, the most frequent mechanism in the formation of euphemisms for questions related to the Iraqi war, with 12 cases detected. Indeed, the imposed interim government was substituted by post-conflict administration (four occurrences), war was euphemized as peace-keeping (one occurrence), and British soldiers were replaced by British servicemen (one token), for instance. The mechanism of acronym was the least frequent, being realized by means of only one expression referring to the Weapon of Mass Destruction. What transpired from these data was that euphemism tended to constitute a potent source of transgression when tackling politically-loaded topics. Such a transgression by the former British PM was no more than a by-product of a cognitive makeup (Ariel, 2008) meant to create hegemonic effects. In the following, a contextual analysis, rooted in the theory of cognitive models, of the conscious use of euphemism by Tony Blair is presented.

As suggested earlier, euphemistic constructions in Tony Blair's political discourse were persuasively selected as a function of both his context models and his definition of the current political situation in Iraq, UK, and the world. Put differently, being ideologically based, Blair's context model endeavored to control the understanding of discourse by adapting the articulation of the semantic mental models - including content, information, ideology, attitudes, norms and values, etc- to the ongoing communicative situation. This contextual control over discourse was also fostered by such components of context models as setting, participants, action, intention, and shared knowledge. Considering the present study, setting category embraced the war time which was 2003, local and abroad TV viewers, British troops, MPs, Iraqi people and of course Tony Blair as the dominant participant; action referred to the political speeches; intention concerned Tony Blair's attempt to persuade his audience of the righteousness of the war and shared knowledge entails British foreign policy, war in Iraq, alleged WMD, among others. Contextually relevant here was the role of the epistemic cognitive device in monitoring the use of the different euphemistic constructions and their functions.

Knowing that there was a large-scale objection to the war on Iraq, Tony Blair opted for euphemizing war as a conflict (16 occurrences), an action (three tokens) a job (one occurrence) a battle (two occurrences). Such euphemization was a function of the K-device

which elected to transgress the cultural and political norms by using such understatements instead of war to achieve persuasive ends. Indeed, these euphemistic understatements could have a somewhat positive effect on the psyche of the audience, for the dreadful connotations of war and its tragedies would be lessened or concealed and the seriousness of the situation would be minimized. Further, the circumlocution device was constrained by the K-device, so that the invasion of Iraq was branded liberation of the Iraqi people, liberation from Saddam or liberation. The use of these circumlocutions, aside from possibly obfuscating the legal boundary to warrant the illegitimate war, might trigger a host of cognitive representations and evoke some fundamental values and ideologies for the audience, such as the importance of liberty and rule of democracy. The outcome of such a cognitive framing could be a positive opinion and thereby support of the current war.

Blair's discourse was marked by the euphemistic portrayal of removing the Iraqi leader as a kind of blessing through the use of the strategy of reversal. Such a strategy palpably reflected that the former British PM, through his K-device, extracted from the socio-cultural knowledge of the participants some religious beliefs and adapted them to the present political situation. The implication of this was twofold. First, the Iraqi people were led by a chairman who was devoid of morality. Second, it was the religious duty that underlied Britain's engagement in this war, that is, Britain undertook to help the Iraqi people savor and practice their freedoms. This pragmatic function was buttressed by the other euphemistic reversals which could be classified under the rubric of security and liberation. Regarding the euphemistic construction of compounding, it encompassed peace–keeping which, being grounded on the democratic values, was meant to be a gloss over the allegation of usurpation raised against the British troops. Post-conflict administration or government was deployed by Tony Blair to deflect the attention of the participants and lead them to focus on post-war issues. These constrained euphemistic choices mirrored the British PM intention and proclivity to shroud the sheer substance of the war to achieve his political and ideological purposes.

Probing into the rhetoric of euphemism beyond what was actually said by Blair and interpreting it in light of the political and ideological functions, it was found that what the former British PM did was, politically speaking, vindicating himself and legitimizing as well as defending the legitimacy of the war (Chilton &Schäffner, 1997). He made use of such euphemisms to sidestep any potential discomfort and mitigate face-threatening acts, such as accusation; and to ascribe the ongoing and controversial war a positive and emancipatory aspect.

To this effect, Tony Blair had recourse to a set of values and beliefs which constitute the socio-cultural or political representations stored in the episodic memory. These political representations were activated where relevant, such as the democratic values and notions of freedom and liberty which were drawn upon by Tony Blair when referring to war. The overall purpose of this was to influence the structure of the mental model of the recipient so as to construct the "preferred model" targeted, i.e., a model which is in line with the government policy and interests. Implicit in this was that inequality of social power persisted and dominance prevailed, given that recipients were seemingly made willing to accept the ideological beliefs entailed in the different euphemistic structures and importantly more vulnerable to do things they otherwise would not do, such as the support of the Iraqi war as well as the belief in its Legitimation.

  As far as the ideological practices of the euphemistic constructions deployed were concerned, they were geared to promoting the negative-other presentation and positive-self presentation (van Dijk, 1992). Put shortly, the OTHER category which included Saddam and his regime were cast as criminals and evil whereas "US" category was afforded the brunt of liberators and peace keepers. The pursuit of such a business was made possible through contextual parameters, namely, access and control over discourse. Throughout the whole corpus, Tony Blair was found to have an active and dominant access to discourse sources (38 times), which could be explained by his political power as a Prime Minister or "the high personal standing in the party" (O'Malley, 2007: 5). He was also the one who initiated and set the agenda of his discourse, mainly in statement and speeches. One implication of this was that the former British PM managed to focus on the activation or modification of more general, socio-political representation, including attitudes, ideologies, and beliefs in a view of winning audience's acquiescence and back up of the ongoing war.

  These ideologically grounded constructions seem to have helped the former British PM convey his political purposes and pass on his ideologies:
1- Legitimization of the ongoing war;
2- Avoidance of any potential political discomfort and mitigation of face-threatening acts;
3- Promotion of the positive-self presentation and negative-other presentation;
4- Permeation of audience cognitive models and construction of "preferred mental models" (van Dijk, 1996) as the major requisite for upholding the asymmetrically existent institutional and social power.

**3.3      The Speech of the Iraqi Prime Minister, Dr. Haider al-Abadi**,

known as the victory speech, delivered in December 9,2017, will be examined by employing a descriptive method and a content analysis. This analyze emerges from a qualitative perspective since it concentrates on the meaning that exist in specific situations. Actually, political language does not carry romantic meaning as literature or precise one as that in foreign deal, however it is purpose-oriented (Tian, 2002:24).It should be noted that such an attempt neither reflects nor supports any political ideology; it is  merely a linguistic point of view that tries to define euphemistic occurrences.

According to (Enright, 2004)), Euphemism utilized for religious purposes is prompted by respect for God or otherwise fright of evil forces; politicians use this technique to win the favor of their electorates. PM's speech was started with Quran verse and ended with religious saying. This technique becomes so important if you are addressing a religious and emotional public such as the one exists in Middle East and Iraq. Moreover, the Verse"And on that day, the believers will rejoice in the victory of Allah,who is the Most Merciful" was chosen carefully as it contains the vocabularies, namely: "believers, rejoice, victory," which express precisely the situation and have a great effect on the public. The speech also includes other religious wording, such as "from Allah, with the help of Allah, by will of Allah", which greatly supports this meaning.

In fact, the majority of speech text is dressed with a religious garment, beside what is mentioned above, various words and phrases that have religious indication are inserted in the speech, such as Mujahedeen(holy fighters) and Jihad(holy fighting), forces of evil and darkness, some Quranic terms "and foretell the patients" and many others. Such usage plays an important role by directing and affecting on the public, specially the religious one. According to euphemistic perspective, this method is known as overstatement in which certain words and phrases are overstated; also this usage shows the covering up function of euphemism as a specific reliable and elegant feeling, here the religious one, is intensified (Jačková , 2010).

It was explained by Rawson (1981) that euphemism can also be of stylistic or exaggerating type, Such one inflates and magnifies, activating the grander meaning of the euphemized phrases which will become more significant than they actually are, this usage provides honorific personal attribute .This can clearly be seen in the abundant usage of Plural addressee pronouns in the speech, such as (your land, your triumph, your liberation, your victory, etc.). This usage that gives a sense of inclusion substitutes the singular addresser pronouns that give a sense of exclusiveness. It is a smart way to let the public accept the actions along with their consequences simply because they are theirs. On the other hand, the absence of using the personal pronoun

"I" in the entire speech explains the euphemistic usage of the speaker who desires to be regarded within the social context in a positive face rather than to be imposed and independent, the thing that will show a negative face, similarly, the usage of the plural speaker pronoun "we" is way to escape personal responsibility, however it plays the role of mystery, unity and solidarity. In the same sense, through the usage of pronoun "we" instead of "I", the concept of autocracy will be cancelled and the concept of democracy will be established, (Holder,2008).Differently, The repetition of plural pronoun can be explained in light of another phenomenon known as anaphora. In this phenomenon a linguistic vocabulary or phrase gets repeated in a text to institute power of emphasis or domination (Enos 1996:10). Accordingly, in his speech Iraqi PM repeatedly mention such pronoun to emphasize powerfully his message, i.e. the triumph. On other hand, he intends to show his dominating status as a result of the enemy defeat.

Political euphemism can be considered as an affecting means in the hands of politicians to control the amount as well as kind of information to be transmitted to their people, by such a number of disgraceful behaviors or motivations could be glorified or otherwise made hidden, this is done in order to avoid public accusation,. For that purpose, several positive adjectives have abundantly been employed to add a color of joy and to hide any negative impressions in the speech. Examples of such adjectives are luminous, fruitful, cheerful, bright etc. In fact, this usage of adjectives is a good defensive expression to draw away the public attention from any mistake, misuse, negligence; etc resulted from any action or omission against others.

The linguist de Saussure explained the relation between the signifier (phonetic form) and the signified (linguistic form that represents any object) as arbitrary. The distance exists in this kind of relation allows to imply a certain intended meaning to be sent to others. Implication represents one kind of euphemism, particularly in politics. As for the speech subject of this analysis, the meaning of the unity and division is implicated by the relation between the victory and defeat, to put it differently, there will be unity if there is a victory and vice versa, there will be division if there is a defeat.

In his writing regarding the political discourse" Politics and the English Language", GeorgeOwell (1946) shed light on two important euphemistic features, these are obscurity or vagueness and generalization. In such usages there will be replacement of direct expressions with implicative ones, replacing specific meanings with general ones. Of course that will be done to achieve specific purposes and to avoid embarrassment and criticism. These features are fulfilled

in the speech since the method of obscurity and generalization about the losses of the army and Iraqi forces was employed, where PM did not mention the number of dead and wounded or the amount of losses, instead he described those whom got killed in the battle as martyrs, which is a victory itself.

Moreover, referring to the victims of Iraqi fighters, whether they are soldiers, policemen or volunteers of popular mobilization, as martyrs represents another function of euphemism. This type of function can reduce the gravity and unpleasant sense of a word or notion. In politics, it is normal that the government will frequently utilize such alternative to understate the facts. (SAMOŠKAITĖ, 2011).

Furthermore, according to (Warren, 1992) euphemism can be used for overstating purposes, consequently things and persons and so on would be presented in a more overstated status than they actually are in order to achieve certain purposes that serve a certain party. This usage can be found in calling and referring to State armed forces fighters along with the popular mobilization as volunteers, holy fighters (mujahideen), believers and etc. such usage of overstatement has positive impacts on the people. Against that, enemy troops are overstated in negative way to be resented and hated by the public, they are called "Da'esh" not "ISIS", rapists not even enemy fighters, their state is named as "state of myth", their actions are described as rape, occupation, and dreams. All that is done for the purpose of raising the public against them by creating feeling of anger, hatred, grudge towards that enemy. Also the distortive and persuasive functions of euphemism are employed in PM speech; in one hand the enemy image is tactically distorted via intensifying unpleasant and inelegant feeling, on other hand and as a result, the people are persuaded by charging their emotion against that enemy.

Finally, in stylistic and pragmatic studies, language is connected to usage, social and cultural context. Euphemism, as being defined as one function or usage of language, reflects well the Social culture, (Peng, 1999. p66). Accordingly, changes that happen in social development will propel those in language. In international societies, especially of developing countries, vocabularies such as terrorism, terrorists, libration , jihad and the like have been recently spread to be spoken of  in various fields of life. Aforementioned terms have been imported to our society to be used by different groups, including the Politian's. The victory speech includes these words. The military operation against the enemy "Da'esh" is titled as libration, the acts of enemy are named actions of terrorism, its fighters are called terrorists, and many others are similar to that. So our social culture is affected and becomes a mirror to the world's consumption of these terms, and hence the language of our society is developed accordingly. The

victory speech as being included to these terms proves outstandingly this point.

To sum up, euphemism is effective tools that can be employed by the politicians when addressing their societies, Iraqi society is not different from that, previously mentioned examples that represent the most prominent ones give clear clues of euphemism in political speech made by senior Iraqi official.

## 3.4 Conclusion

This analysis has been commenced and conducted to define and explain the techniques employed by politicians to orientate their masses towards certain objectives. These techniques are known as euphemism. To be more specific, this paper is limited to usages of euphemism that concerns with Iraqi situation and context. Number of speeches is chosen to constitute the samples of this investigation. These speeches represent different sources and sets, languages and cultures, explicitly British, American, Iraqi, yet share one feature that is the Iraqi situation. Aforementioned samples were made by senior officials, namely: former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, the former president of America George W. Bush, and current Iraqi Prime Minister Mr. HaiderElabadi. Due to the diversity which exists in the speeches, different methods of analysis have been applied; however, the focus is directed towards the content analysis through employing descriptive method.

The usage of euphemism is proven by defining many and various utilizations of it in politics. Such usages have different names, meanings natures, and purposes, nevertheless, each context is characterized by common general feature, where the British context is distinguished by playing on cognitive and mental factors, whereas American one has feature of patriotism and using historical symbols, regarding the Iraqi, the speech is dominated by religious garment.

To be brief, regardless the context of the event, culture and language of addressor and addressee, situation and setting or even time or occasion of the speech, euphemism is an effective and sufficient technique used abundantly by Politicians all over the world to achieve their purposes; the same thing is done within Iraqi context.

## References

- Al-Karabsheh, A. (2011). Arabic Death Discourse in Translation: Euphemism and Metaphorical Conceptualizations in Jordanian Obituaries; In Across Languages and Cultures Volume .12 (1) PP. 19-48
- Allan, Keith. 1991. *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as a Shield and Weapon*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Alego, John. 2005. *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Boston: Wadsworth.
- Austin, J L. (2002). *How to Do Things with Words*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas. (1967). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bedroll, Linda. 2007. *A Very Nice Ways, How to Say Very Bad Things*. Naperville: Sourcebooks.
- Burridge, Kate. 2004. *Blooming English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2002. *The English Language*. London: Penguin Books.
- Dong, Hongle. Gu, Ping. (2000). Methods to Hide Motivation in English. *Foreign Language Teaching.*
- Enright, Dominique. 2004. *In Other Words.* London: Michael O´Mara Books Limited.New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Enos, T (ed.)(1996). Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from ancient time to the information age .London. Garland Publishing
- He, Ziran. (1997). *Pragmatics and English Learning*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Holder, Bob. 2008. *Dictionary of Euphemisms.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hornby, Albert, Sydney. 2005. *Oxford Advanced Learner´s Dictionary of Current English.*
- Hudson. R. A. (2000). *Sociolinguistics*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Keith  Allan& Kate Burridge (1991) .Euphemism and Dysphemism language Used as Sheild Weapon. New York: Oxford Uiversity Press.
- Katamba, Francis. 2005. *English words: structure, history, usage.* New York: Routledge.
- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking Power: the Politics of Language in Our Lives*. USA: Basic Books.-
- LAURA SAMOŠKAITĖ  (2011), "21ST CENTURY POLITICAL EUPHEMISMS IN ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS: SEMANTIC AND STRUCTURAL STUDY", M.A. paper, VILNIUS PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY, Vilnius.
- Lad, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. . University of Michigan Press. Ann Arbor.
- Liu, Yinqi. (2000). English Euphemism: features, Composition and Application. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching.*

- *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. 2009. Harlow: Pearson/Longman.
- Martina Jačková , 2010 "Euphemisms in Today´s English", Bachelor Thesis, Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Faculty of Humanities.
- Orwell, George. (1990). Politics and the English Language. In Paul Eschholz etc. (eds). *Language Awareness.* NewYork: St. Martin's Press.
- Page, Clarence. (2003), Another War. Another Euphemism to Disguise the Horror of War. The Salt Lake Tribune, March
- Pan, Qiliang. (2004). A Brief Analysis on the Social Functions of English euphemism. *Journal of Ningbo University( educational science edition)*. 3.
- Peng, Wenzhao. (1999). Euphemism: Language Reflection of Social Culture. *Journal of Foreign Lnguages.*
- Shu, Dingfang. Xu, Jinyuan. (1995). Study on Euphemism: Retrospect and Prospect. *Journal of Foreign Languages*. 5.
- Spiegl, Fritz. 1987. *In-Words and Out-Words*. London: Elm Tree Books.
- Wen, Hongrui. (2002). Motivation of Euphemism Used and Its Features. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal.*
- Warren, B. (1992) What euphemisms tell us about the interpretation of words. StudiaLinguistica 46/2.
- Xu, Lina. (2002). Euphemism Interpretation Strategies in Intercultural Communication. *Foreign Languages and T*.
- ***On-line Sources:***
- Alkire, Scott. 2002. "Introducing Euphemisms to Language Learners". The Internet TESLJournal.
- http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Alkire-Euphemisms.html
- McGlone, Matthew. Batchelor, Jennifer. 2003. „Looking Out for Number One:
- Euphemisms and Face". Journal of Communication.
- https://webspace.utexas.edu/mm4994/www/looking%20out%20for%20number%20one.pdf
- Ostermeier, Eric. 2009. "What Euphemism for Tax Increase Do You Prefer?".SmartPolitics.
- http://blog.lib.umn.edu/cspg/smartpolitics/2009/03/what_euphemism_for_tax_increas.php

طرق التاثير على الجمهور باستخدام التعابير التلطيفية ضمن السياق السياسي العراقي

يقضان رضا مهدي                    ميادة رحيم عيسى
مدرس                              مدرس
٠٧٨١٤٩٧٧٥٠٠                      ٠٧٩٠٢١٨٧٦٤٦
مركز اللغة الانكليزية
الجامعة التكنولوجية

**المستخلص**

يحاول الناس عند التعبير عما ما يفكرون به أستخدام طرق تعبير مخففة مناسبة لجعل التواصل أكثر سلاسة بدلا من أستخدام تعابير قاسية وذات وطاة أكبر حيث يستخدم لهذا الغرض التلطيف اللفظي وهو من الأساليب الفعالة في التواصل مع الأخرين. يقوم السياسيون فس عالم السياسة بتوظيف هذا الأسلوب بشكل كبير لتوجيه منظور الناس حول العالم وإخفاء الحقائق وكذلك تحويل انتباه الرأي العام بعيدا عن ما يجري. أن هدف هذا البحث هو التحقيق في عملية أستخدم التلطيف اللفظي جنبا إلى جنب مع طبيعته ومعناه وآثاره في الخطاب السياسي. يقتصر نطاق الدراسة على استخدام التعابير الملطفة ضمن السياق العراقي حيث تحاول الدراسة بشكل رئيسي تحديد الطرق المستخدمة لهذه التعابير من قبل القادة المختلفون في عالم السياسة للتلاعب بعقول العامة وتحقيق أهدافهم فيما يتعلق بالأوضاع العراقية. تبدأ الدراسة بتقديم خلفية كافية عن التلطيف اللفظي ومعناه وأنواعه وفئاته وأغراضه وما إلى ذلك. ثم تنتقل الى شرح مفهوم التلطيف اللفظي في السياسة وكذلك استخداماته في السياقات والحالات المختلفة. لتحقيق الهدف الرئيسي ، تم اختيار مجموعة من الخطب التي أدلى بها مختلف قادة العالم الكبار بشأن العراق لتمثيل عينة الدراسة حيث تم تحليل هذه الخطب وفقا لطرق مختلفة لأنها متنوعة في طبيعتها ولغتها وثقافتها. ومع ذلك ، يركز البحث على المنهج الوصفي وتحليل المحتوى حيث ينشأ هذا التحليل من منظور نوعي لأنه يركز على المعنى الموجود في مواقف محددة.

لقد توصلت الدراسة إلى تحديد الكثير من استخدامات التعابير الملطفة المختلفة في عينات الخطب السياسية حيث وجدت تلك التعابير المحددة بأنها تتصف بطبيعة مختلفة ومعاني متباينة كما أنها استخدمت لأغراض متعددة . هذا وقد تميز كل خطاب بسمة عامة حيث أتصف السياق البريطاني بالتلاعب على العوامل المعرفية والعقلية، في حين كان السياق الأميركي له ميزة الوطنية وأستخدام الرموز التاريخية ، فيما يتعلق بالعراق فإن الخطاب يهيمن عليه الطابع الديني. خلاصة القول ، إن التلطيف اللفظي هو وسيلة فعالة ووافية تستخدم بكثرة من قبل السياسيين في جميع أنحاء العالم لتحقيق أغراضهم وأن السياق العراقي لا يختلف عن ذلك.

الكلمات الرئيسية: تعبير ملطف -    النص المصدر – النص المترجم - رئيس الوزراء – السياق السياسي