

POLITICAL MANIPULATION IN NIGERIAN PRESIDENTIAL DISCOURSES

Ngozi U. Emeka-Nwobia

Department of Linguistics and Literary Studies, Ebonyi State University Abakaliki - Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This paper examines excerpts of Presidents Olusegun Obasanjo and Goodluck Jonathan's political discourses to determine how language is utilized as instrument for manipulating the electorates by politicians. Working within the tenet of Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, the paper seeks to explore the workings of power in the Nigerian presidential discourse and to unravel the concealed meaning in the utterances under study. Findings reveal that the two presidents grossly utilized manipulative languages in marketing their agenda, ideology and programme to their audience. These were achieved in their portrayal of self as humble servants, political redeemers, alignment with the suffering of the vast majority of the people and statement of government reconciliation. While Obasanjo took time to narrate his walking through the valley episode, Jonathan painted his picture of humble childhood experience, and concluding that he is one of the suffering majority. These are manipulative strategies geared towards entreating and appealing to ideological sense, controlling the people's thought and perception, and manipulate the unsuspected members of the public towards accepting their candidacy.*

KEYWORDS: Language and Power, Political Discourse, Manipulation, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

INTRODUCTION

Language has remained one of the dominant and pervasive problems in Africa in general and Nigeria in part. Language is one of the indispensable resources of man, necessary for his day to day transaction and activities. The gift of language is the single human trait that marks us all, genetically setting us apart from the rest of life. Language is, like nest building or hive making, the universal and biologically specific activity of human beings. We engage in it communally, compulsively, and automatically. We cannot be human without it; if we were to be separated from it our minds would die assuredly as bees lost from the hive.

Language makes us human; it is inseparable from the users (society). It does not exist in vacuum but lives in the lips of the speakers (language is used to meet one of the basic daily needs of the speakers. Language plays varied functions ranging from phatic communion, assertives, declaratives, commissive and referential functions. Language also provides means of accessing our thoughts. This can be done by text (written) or talk (verbal or oral channel). Eyisi (2000) notes we use language to express love, hatred, anger, happiness, praise, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, to comment on the political, social, educational or economic situations in the country; to confirm or express religious beliefs, to comment on the weather and even to fill a vacuum when there is nothing else to do especially in the exchange of pleasantries. Human beings, therefore, are naturally endowed with the tendency to always talk, to use words, to employ language for a mutual social relationship with their fellow individuals and for the achievement of their daily objectives for their well-being and for the well-being of their community.

Language remains a unique and quintessential gift of man. It permeates into almost every aspect of human existence. Its resources are grossly utilized by every speech community to instil peace or trigger acrimony. Its appropriate or inappropriate use; or proper or improper use, or misuse can bring desired or undesirable effect. This aligns with Jija (2012) assertion that language is perceived universally as venom which ignites some kind of conflict; and at the same time functions as a panacea for conflict management. This therefore situates language as the central focus of human existence and the paradigm of expression of intent, thought, and actions. It is an instrument for insurgence, conflict escalation and resolution, socio-political and religious expressions and performance. Onuigbo (2013:9) says that language is not just a tool for communication but can be manipulated to be instrument of “offence and defence”. The power of life and death are in language both written and spoken; and through the instrumentality of language, a politician can split the universe into two halves of “me and you” instead of “you and me”. In his words, “the split is achieved as these politicians juggle with the language of material resources in order to become what they want”. Language according to him remains a rich and adaptable tool for configuration of life events. If properly utilized, it can bring solidarity, harmony and brotherhood, but if it wrongly applied it can ignite/ provoke animosity, conflict, violence and ultimately under-development. Wodak (2005) also notes that “language indexes power, expresses power and is involved where there is contention over power and where power is challenged”. Power ordinarily manifests by means of physical exertion or coercion, or through ideological manipulations for the shaping of consciousness to accept desired values and belief (Onuigbo 2013:9). The interdisciplinary, multifaceted and extraordinary role of language situates it as indispensable in human existence and relationship. The paper examines the use of political manipulated language as instrument of mind control by politicians in Nigeria.

Theoretical Framework

The paper anchors on anchors on Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 1989, 1995a, 1995b, 2001; Fairclough and Wodak 1997), which has been greatly influenced by the French post-structuralist philosopher Michelle Foucault’s social theory. It explores the workings of power in politician language.

The interest of CDA is not only on the workings of language as a form of social practice but also on the idea that social and political dominion is reproduced by “text and talk. It studies the illegitimate form of control probably by politicians, journalists, judges, professors or managers, who prevent others access to legitimate forms of text and talk. This could come in form of threatening of immigrants by immigration officers or threatening a female student with a bad grade for failure to consent to sexual advances by a professor.

According to Kamalu and Agangan (2007) “Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on the hidden relationship between the discourse practice, events and text on the one hand and the wider socio-cultural context on the other hand”. They observe that meaning exists in that hidden relationship because it is all about the “unsaid said” concealed in a text or talk. That “hidden agenda” of any text must be seen from the socio-cultural background that informed the construction of that text or discourse. van Dijk (1988) says that the core of Critical Discourse Analysis is the study and analysis of both written texts and spoken words in order to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias, and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political

and historical contexts. By so doing, it explores ways in which the dominant forces construct texts that favour their interest. Supporting this view, Thompson (2002) asserts that Critical Discourse Analysis helps to make clear the connections between the use of language and the exercise of power. Emeka-Nwobia (2014) notes that Critical Discourse Analysis lends voice to the deprived members of the society by helping to legitimize the voice of the marginalized or abused and by extension, questioning the voice or speeches of the powerful member of the society (those in power). The foregoing therefore suggests that the goal of CDA is to explore how linguistic resources are utilized in divers form in the expressions and manipulations of power. CDA explores on what is wrong within a society (an institution, an organization etc); “and how wrong might be ‘righted’ or mitigated from a particular normative stand point” (Fairclough 2010). Critical Discourse Analysis just like Pragmatics is therefore aimed at demystifying the text and speeches of those in the possession of power. Fairclough (2000) outlines three central tenets of CDA, according to him, discourse is shaped and constrained by: (a) Social Structure, (b) Culture, and (c) Discourse. He explains that Social Structure includes age, class, status, ethnic identity, and gender; while Culture could be considered as the generally accepted norms of behaviour in the society. Discourse on the other hand refers to the words we use. The goal of Critical Discourse Analysis is to determine the relationship that exists between these three central tenets. The construction of ones identity in the social structure is reflected in the way one speaks, behaves and reasons thus, text is produced by socially- situated speakers. There are a number of crucial concepts in Critical Discourse Analysis which require special attention because they imply discursive power abuse. Van Dijk (2006) examines some properties of manipulation, within the “triangulation” framework. This provides links between the trio: discourse, cognition and society. A discourse analytical approach is necessary because most manipulation, according to van Dijk, takes place by text and talk. However, insight from van Dijk’s approach shows that the subjects being manipulated are human beings (who are the custodian of discourse forms and patterns). This normally occurs through the manipulation of their “minds” which is (the domain of cognition). Manipulation implies “power and power abuse”, van Dijk recommends a social approach to the study of Critical Discourse Analysis. He however notes that a consideration of “cognitive dimension is important as well, since manipulation always involves a form of mental manipulation”. Manipulation, according to van Dijk (2006) not only involves power, but precisely, abuse of power, that is, subjugation or domination. Manipulation can imply the exercise of a form of illegitimate influence over another by means of discourse, where manipulators make others believe or do things that are in the interest of the manipulator and against the best interests of the manipulated (see Wodak, 1987). O’Keefe (2002) observes that manipulation can equally be a form of (legitimate) persuasion. van Dijk’s notion of manipulation is really insightful and incisive to a clearer understanding, interpretation and analysis of political speech

Language and Political Discourse

Politics in its classical meaning is referred to as the art of governance and power. Chilton and Schaffner (2002:5) define it as “a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it. Language which is referred to as the primary archive of man provides a means of communicating the very essence of man (Onuigbo 2004). It is utilized by politicians as an instrument for conveying political agendas and ideologies which most often are unattainable. These unattainable agendas is what Orwell (1969) noted to be “largely the defense of indefensible”.

Speech making is a requisite part of politician's role in announcing policies and persuading people to agree with them. According to Graber (1993:305), political communication is the , "life- blood of mother's milk of politics because communication is the essential activity that links the various parts of society together and allows them to function as an integrated whole". This confirms Charteris-Black (2005:1) observation that, "within all types of political system, from autocratic, through oligarchic to democratic; leaders relied on the spoken words to convince others of the beliefs that arise from their leadership". The doing of politics and political activity does not exist without the use of language. Politics involves relationship building and reconciliation of differences through discussion and persuasion. Communication is therefore central to politics. The negative and pejorative images attached to politics are strongly linked to the relationship between politics and the affairs of the state. Ordinarily politics is closely associated with the activities of politicians. Heywood (2007:7) succinctly opines that, "politicians are often seen as power-seeking hypocrites who conceal personal ambition behind the rhetoric of politics service and ideological conviction. Indeed, this perfection has become more common in the modern period as intensified media exposure has more effectively brought to light examples of corruption and dishonesty, giving rise to phenomenon of **anti-politics**. This rejection of the personnel and mercenary of conventional political life is rooted in a view of politics as a self-serving, two-faced and unprincipled activity, clearly evident in the use of derogatory phrases such as 'office politics' and 'politicking'". This portrayal has been age-long, and aligns with Orwellian (1946)'s *Politics and the English Language* and Harold Lasswell (1939)'s classical view in his book *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How, that politics is power and "the ability to achieve a desired outcome, **through whatever means**". In *Politics and the English Language*, Orwell opines that, "political language is.... designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidarity to pure wind. This so called "Orwellian Speech" refers to words and behaviours classified as undemocratic but used by the politicians and the political class. He noted that in the western countries, when serious political scandals or great political events happen, the government and leaders usually employ political language to hide the truth and commit fraud against the public. Reiterating Plato's view in line with Shakespeare's description in *King Lear*, Awonusi (2003: 94) captures it thus; "Get thee glass eyes , And like a scurvy politician seen, To see the thing that does not...". Awonusi (2003: 94) captures Orwell's opinion of politics as a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred, and schizophrenia. He opines that for the fact that one of the avenues of exercising power or authority is through coercion, it does not make it better.*

The fore going portrays politicians as selfish and corrupt crew, who utilize their position to exploit the masses for their personal advantage at the expense. This they crudely pursue through any means geared toward actualizing their obnoxious desires. This assertion is attuned with Lord Acton's (1834-1902) aphorism in a letter expressing his opinion to Bishop Mandell Creighton in 1887: "power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men". This negative and pejorative representation of politician and political activities notwithstanding, politics and politicking is an inevitable and permanent feature of social communication and existence. The paper does not in any way condemn politics and political practitioners, neither does it solicit an end to and / or abolishment of politics, but rather suggests that politics should be conducted with constrains within the framework of checks and balances in their speeches and activities to ensure that their authority and power are not abused.

The main purpose of politicians is to persuade their audience on the validity of their political claims. That one possesses political influence implies that he utilizes power at his disposal to shape beliefs and behaviours of others. Linguistic resources and practices are instruments to establish and conceal relations of power, dominance and sovereignty. Adolf Hitler's political ideology states; 'I use emotions for the many and reserve reasons for the few.' This validates the role of language in reaching the different classes of individual within the same eco-space. It stresses the pivot of emotions and mind management over reasoning. The emotional / sentimental can be triggered and provoked by means of manipulative use of language. A successful political speech therefore is not anchored on the statement / correctness of the fact, but rather an outcome of result of valid argument by the politician (Beard 2000). Politicians rely heavily on manipulation as a form of interaction between them and voters.

Manipulation in Political Discourse

Linguistic strategy refers to the strategy that one group of people adopt in order to make the other group do what it intends to be done. This involves the manipulative application of the language. Manipulation here is a communicative and interactional practice, in which a manipulator exercises control over other people, usually against their will or against their best interests. Therefore, '*linguistic manipulation* is the conscious use of language in a devious way to control the others' (Fairclough 1989, p. 6). Manipulation is one of the discursive social practices of dominant groups geared towards the reproduction of their power. Such dominant groups may do so in many (other) ways as well, e.g. through persuasion, providing information, education, instruction and other social practices that are aimed at influencing the knowledge, beliefs and (indirectly) the actions of the recipients.

Pragmatically speaking, linguistic manipulation is centred on the use of indirect speech acts, which are focused on perlocutionary effects of what is said. There are a number of institutional domains and social contexts in which linguistic manipulation can be systematically observed. For instance, in cross-examination of witnesses in a court of law. Linguistic manipulation can be considered also as an influential instrument of political rhetoric because political discourse is primarily focused on persuading people to take specified political actions or to make crucial political decisions. To convince the potential electorate in present time societies, politics basically dominates in the mass media, which leads to creating new forms of linguistic manipulation, e. g. modified forms of press conferences and press statements, updated texts in slogans, application of catch phrases, phrasal allusions, the connotative meanings of words, a combination of language and visual imagery. To put it differently, language plays a significant ideological role because it is an instrument by means of which the manipulative intents of politicians become apparent.

A more pragmatic approach to such norms and principles are the conversational maxims formulated by Grice (1975), which require contributions to conversations to be truthful, relevant, relatively complete, and so on. In actual forms of talk and text, however, such maxims are often hard to apply: People lie, which may not always be the wrong thing to do; people tell only half of a story for all kinds of, sometimes legitimate, reasons and irrelevant talk is one of the most common forms of everyday interaction. Language mechanisms operating the processes of speech manipulation have appeared spontaneously, as the language itself to a certain degree facilitates distortion of objective reality offering not only specific designations, but also imprecise, blurred, ambiguous denominations. Manipulative discourse takes position between two extreme points – the legitimate (true, full) information and a lie. A lie and manipulation are opposed to different types of truth: a lie stands up against "semantic truth";

manipulation opposes “pragmatic truth”. Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker’s covered intentions behind what is actually being said. As one of the key parameters of manipulative utterance is specific intentionality, in order to discriminate manipulation, one has to analyze such parameters as aim of verbal communication, communicative intention, reason, and motive. Manipulation is pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of communicative intention: the speaker wittingly chooses such form of utterance that lacks direct signals of his intentional condition. By increasing the level of inadequate perception of information field, manipulation widens illusionary subjective reality. Manipulation is a negative social psychological phenomenon exercising destructive effect upon an individual and the society as a whole.

This means that the definition is not based on the intentions of the manipulators, nor on the more or less conscious awareness of manipulation by the recipients, but in terms of its societal consequences (see also Etzioni-Halevy, 1989). In other words, manipulation is not (only) ‘wrong’ because it violates conversational maxims or other norms and rules of conversation, although this may be one dimension of manipulative talk and text. We therefore will accept without further analysis that manipulation is illegitimate in a democratic society, because it (re)produces, or may reproduce, inequality: it is in the best interests of powerful groups and speakers, and hurts the interests of less powerful groups and speakers. Language mechanisms operating the processes of speech manipulation have appeared impulsively, as the language itself to a certain degree facilitates distortion of objective reality offering not only specific designations, but also imprecise, blurred, ambiguous denominations. Manipulative discourse takes position between two extreme points – the legitimate (true, full) information and a lie. A lie and manipulation are opposed to different types of truth: a lie stands up against “semantic truth”; manipulation opposes “pragmatic truth”.

Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker’s covered intentions behind what is actually being said. As one of the key parameters of manipulative utterance is specific intentionality, in order to discriminate manipulation, one has to analyze such parameters as aim of verbal communication, communicative intention, reason, and motive. Manipulation is a pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of the speaker’s communicative intent: the speaker wittingly chooses such form of utterance that lacks direct signals of his intentional condition. By increasing the level of inadequate perception of information field, manipulation widens illusionary subjective reality.

Verbal manipulation can be stretched in time presenting both a complex, multistage, phase-by-phase procedure (as in case of informational propaganda and project promotion companies), or it can be a singular, relatively simple act of influencing the recipient in the course of interpersonal communication. Vicarious character of manipulation preconditions guidance by such linguistic units and categories as foreign (lacking inner form) words, euphemisms, figures of speech of different content and composition. At that, proper linguistic characteristics of distinctiveness of manipulative discourse are difficult to identify, as generally they do not trespass the framework of regular speech practice. Active usage of manipulative discourse of certain grammatical forms and syntactic constructions does not create specific “manipulative grammar”, as the same linguistic means are used to fulfil other functions. At the same time, consideration of linguistic means typical for manipulative texts is important for identification of the fact of manipulation. A discourse becomes manipulative not due to usage of specific lexical or grammatical units, but, first and foremost, through association with the speaker’s intentions, unclear influential character of the utterance, conditions of communication (social context). Language offers to speakers a whole arsenal of means to realize manipulative aims.

Linguistic manipulation is marked by language signs of different levels that help interpret the speaker's intentions.

Manipulative strategies in two Nigerian presidential Discourses

The work focuses on Presidents Olusegun Obasanjo and Goodluck Jonathan's political speeches. Excerpt were drawn from Obasanjo's 1999, 2003 inaugural speeches and Goodluck Jonathan's speech on declaration of interest to context for presidency. The paper applies the Norman Fairclough Critical Discourse Analysis to showcase how politicians employ manipulative skills, using English language as a means of communicating their political intent to their audience/ listeners

Reference to God and Portrayal of Self as a Messenger and Saviour

This is a major rhetorical strategy utilized by politicians to manipulate their audience. In our analysis, Presidents Olusegun Obasanjo and Goodluck Jonathan presented themselves in the form of political messiah who are endowed with the skill and also ready to offer solutions to Nigerian perennial socio-political problems. Each of the two presidents took time to catalogue the seemingly intractable socioeconomic and political problems facing Nigeria in key sectors such as education, health, energy, agriculture, the economy, transparency and accountability.

Obasanjo commenced his first public speech as a newly sworn in president of Nigeria, with reference to God - the divine being, as his source of strength and the giver of power and authority to whom He wills. He claims that his election is by destiny as designed by God. This is a manipulative strategy aimed at enticing the audience into accepting him and his speech.

FELLOW Nigerians, we give praise and honour to God Almighty for this day specially appointed by God Himself. Everything created by God has its destiny and it is the destiny of all of us to see this day.

And that is why he 'humbly' offers himself as the man needed to correct the failures of past administrations. This strategy affirms Beard's (2000:41) submission that politicians often claim humility and service to the people as their motive for wanting power as humble in order to justify the confidence of the populace as well as portraying themselves as down to earth, having listening ears and worth listening to because of their humility.

Obasanjo portrayal himself as a messiah and gave a positive image of self as a saviour that has come to rid the country of the decadence of military rule and its consequent outcome of corruption; Just as Jesus Christ who came to redeem mankind from the bondage of sin.

Again Obasanjo assures Nigerians that his administration has come to salvage the country from the pang of corruption. In his words;

our leadership regards corruption as the antithesis of development and I would like to assure you that we are determined to fight the evil to a standstill. For starters, we have been able to put in place an anti corruption commission which unfortunately has had to cope with legislative and constitutional hurdles.

As a manipulative strategy he paints a picture of himself as a messenger sent to rid Nigeria of corruption. He boasts that thirty nine cases of corruption were brought to court for prosecution as against none ever recorded for twenty years preceding his administration. This therefore put him in positive light as having a zero tolerance for corruption and corrupt officers.

In his inaugural speech “We will Heal Nigeria”, the president portrays himself as a healer, physician, saviour and messiah that the ailing country needs to restore her ailing economy, security, education, infrastructure, agriculture and the entire masses from the hurt inflicted by past administrations and the just concluded electioneering process. He further notes that Nigerians breathed a sigh of relief to usher in the new dawn with “never again”. The president boasts that his administration has come to enthrone transparency, accountability and responsible leadership. This he feels can be achieved by appointing people of reputable character to man the different ministries in order to ensure that due process was upheld in the award of contracts, supplies and purchases.

Three years after Obasanjo’s administration, President Goodluck Jonathan came up to declare his intention to contest for presidency after completing Y’Adua’s tenure. He towed the same line in portraying himself the messiah needed to fix Nigerian’s problem.

I have come to say to all of you, that Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan is the man you need to put Nigeria right.

Goodluck with manipulative language distanced himself from the “.....divisive tendencies of the past, which have slowed our drive to true nationhood.” He claimed that the “new Jonathan administration” will “...herald a new era of transformation of our country”. Kamalu and Aganga (2008) observed that the underlying ideology behind the phrase, “new Jonathan administration” is quite tricky, and an attempt to discriminate between the “new (future) administration which will be under his firm leadership from the one that is a fill-up of the late Yar’Adua regime. This is a manipulative mean of distancing himself from the failures or shortcomings of previous administration.

Another strategy of manipulation deployed by politicians is the quotation of bible passages and religious references. In the sample speeches, Obasanjo made reference to a biblical quote in Psalm 23;

Thereafter, you the good people of Nigeria elected me, a man who had walked through the valley of the shadow of death, as your President, to head a democratic civilian administration. I believe that this is what God Almighty has ordained for me and for my beloved country Nigeria and its people. I accept this destiny in all humility and with the full belief that with the backing of our people we shall not fail.

I wish, at this point, to thank all you good Nigerians for the confidence reposed in me.

Obasanjo in order to curry sympathy as well as appeal to the emotions of Nigerian who are very religious in nature, referred to himself as having walked through the shadows of death. He was only unwinding history and recounting his life experience of being close to death and surviving the pang of death. It is worthy to note that Obasanjo was condemned by the former military dictatorship of Abacha to death but was later reversed to fifteen years imprisonment. Obasanjo was granted bail/ amnesty and from there he contested for the seat of Nigerian presidency. The analogy is not far from reality, because he would have been dead if providence did not take its toll with the sudden death of Abacha.

The use of this biblical reference is to appeal to the conscience and emotions of the listeners and to make them believe that it is God that has kept him thus far in order to fulfil the sole

purpose of salvaging the decadence perpetrated by the military juntas. This is a strong strategy especially with the religious vulnerability of Africans especially Nigerians.

This speech is replete with references to God and the use of religious imageries. “We thank God that their sacrifice has not been in vain”. Obasanjo also recognizes and eulogizes the creative and supremacy of God when he noted that, “Nigeria is wonderfully endowed by the Almighty with human and other resources”. According to him the abundant natural resources found in Nigeria are free gifts from the creative might of God.

Extolling Good Virtues

Just like most politicians, Obasanjo in his speeches extolled the good virtues. He decried the activities of past leader who promoted evil and avoided men of integrity (he referred to them as good men). In his words, Good men were shunned and kept away from government while those who should be kept away were drawn near.

Obasanjo is so prolific in his referrals to God, good, bad and other biblical virtues like patience, morals, spirituality, revival, makes references to good, bad and evil. To the general public that elected him, he sees them as good.

Alignment with the Masses

I am one of you and will never let you down!”

Obasanjo also gave an impression of aligning with the masses. He echoes that the

task of governance is an onerous task which he cannot pursue alone, but requires the cooperation of all the citizenry. He notes,

I am not a miracle worker. It will be foolish to underrate the task ahead. Alone, I can do little.

This statement has a biblical undertone where Jesus says that “without me you can do nothing”.

Obasanjo went on to make references to God as his guide. This is a rhetorical strategy common to politicians as a means of exonerating themselves from future mistake and pushing blames to God whom they recognise as the supreme being who was there to guide; and the leader was just a mere mortal following the guidance and dictates of God .

This time, however, the results of your sacrifice and patience will be clear and manifest for all to see. With God as our guide, and with 120 million Nigerians working with me, with commitment, sustained effort, and determination, we shall not fail.

The Nigerian president utilizes religious references as a means of legitimizing the acts and ends of political actions.

Alignment with the suffering majority of the country

President Jonathan in his rhetoric tried to establish common ground with the poor of the country, express an understanding and respect for their socioeconomic position, reassure them of his goodwill to them, and highlight the similarity of their present situation with his past. The President informed the audience that his concern is the “...immediate needs and priorities of

our people and to solve the everyday problems that confront the average Nigerian". He recalled his childhood experiences as a metaphor of hope and regeneration is to motivate or manipulate the minds of people within his target audience that he is one of them and that hence, "...my story symbolizes my dream for Nigeria". President Jonathan carefully chose words and phrases that connect and endear him psychologically with the audience. He informed them that "I was not born rich; never....imagined that I would be where I am today"; was raised by "... my mother and father with just enough money to meet our daily needs...had no shoes, no school bags; had to carry", "... my books in my hands", etc. The President used these rhetorical strategies to construct affinity and commonality with the masses and to reassure them that he understands the meaning of poverty and suffering. He gives the impression that he identifies with the plight of the "...ordinary Nigerian and assures them of his friendship and understanding: "You are all my friends and we share a common destiny...I am one of you and I will never let you down".

Restoration of Confidence in Government

Nigeria had been faced with many years of military dictatorship, interim government and various forms of political instability. The governed had lost faith in the government. The newly sworn in president cries out soliciting for the cooperation of the masses, promising that his song is going to be different from the norm.

I am very aware of the widespread cynicism and total lack of confidence in government arising from the bad faith, deceit and evil actions of recent administrations.

The president went further to categorize how he was going to restore the people's confidence in the government. He noted that he was going to use men and women of proven integrity. An analogy is here drawn from the bible in the book of Daniel when king Nebuchadnezzar deployed some Hebrew men of proven integrity in the form of Daniel, Shedrack, Meshach and Abednego.

"I will need good men and women of proven integrity and record of good performance to help me in my cabinet"

Public Reconciliation

I am determined to stretch my hand of fellowship to all Nigerians regardless of leanings.

CONCLUSION

English is part of Nigeria and it is a strong fabric that holds the most lingual nation in Africa as one. It provides a means of expressing political thoughts, agenda and programmes, without suspicion by the parties involves nevertheless it is also utilized by Nigerian politicians as instrument for manipulation and mind control. Politicians utilize linguistic resources consciously to exercise control over unsuspected members of the public, usually against their will or against their best interests. Manipulative language use is the stock in trade of politicians and public office holders. It is one of the discursive social practices of dominant groups geared towards the reproduction of their power. Such dominant groups may do so in through the following means; persuasion, providing information, education, instruction and divers social practices that are aimed at influencing the knowledge, beliefs and ultimately the actions of the

recipients. Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker's covered intentions behind what is being said. Language plays a significant ideological role because it is an instrument by means of which the manipulative intents of politicians become apparent.

REFERENCES

- Adedimeji A.M.(.). The Unifying role of English in a multilingual nation: the case of Nigeria
<https://www.unilorin.edu.ng/publications/ADEDIMEJI/THE%20UNIFYING%20ROLE%20OF%20ENGLISH%20IN%20A%20MULTILINGUAL%20NATION.htm> Accessed on 28/09/2015.
- Bamgbose, A. (1971). The English language in Nigeria. In J. Spencer (Ed). The English Language in West Africa. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Emeka-Nwobia, N.U. (2014). A Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Former Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo, A PhD Thesis submitted to the Department of Linguistics and Literary Studies, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki
- Emeka-Nwobia, N.U. (2015). "The Place of Indigenous Nigerian Languages in National Development". *Journal of Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol.5(12) Pp 112-116
- Emeka-Nwobia, N.U. (2014). "Religion in Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo's Political Discourses". *International Journal of Language, Literature and Gender Studies (AFFREVA LALIGENS)*, Ethiopia, Vol. 4(1)23-33
- Emeka-Nwobia, N.U.(2013) "Speech Act Analysis of Presidential Inaugural Speech: Olusegun Obasanjo's 29th May 2003 Speech". In *Journal of Nigerian Languages and Culture*.(A Publication from APNILAC) Vol.14 No.1 (35 – 56)
- Eyisi, J. (2000) Language and Education: The Raison D'être for Political Socialization". *African Journal of Research in Education*. Vol. 1, No. 2.pp 149-154
- Fairclough, Norman (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Fairclough, Norman (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman
- Fairclough, Norman (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold
- Fairclough, Norman (1996). A Reply to Henry Widdowson's "Discourse analysis: a Critical view". *Language and Literature*, 1996, 5 (1): 49-56
- Fowler, R. and B. Hodge (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler et al (Eds.). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul. pp. 185-213
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Isayev, M.I. 1977. *National Language in the USSR: Problems and Solutions*. Moscow: Progress Publications.
- Jija, T. (2012) Language as a Tool for Conflict Management and Resolution in Nigeria. *Journal of Igbo Language & Linguistics* No. 5, 2012 (112-120).
<http://www.linguisticsafrikana.com>
- Kress, Gunther (1990). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. Vol.11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp.3-9, 11-13
- O'keefe DJ. (2015). *Persuasion: Theory and research*. Sage Publications
- Onuigbo, S. (2013). Language as Action in Political Culture. In *Journal of Nigerian Languages and Culture*.(A Publication from APNILAC) Vol.14 No.1 (1-18)

- Onuigbo, S. (1990). English In A Technological Age: A Special Mechanism For Information Storage Andconveyance. *Journal Of Technological Education Review*, 1&2, 127-154
- Taiwo, R. (2007) Satirizing Politicians and Public Officers in Nigerian newspapers. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture* 22 (3), 19-28
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998a). Critical Discourse Analysis. Available: <http://www.hum.uva.nl/teun/cda.htm>. (Acessed 28/09/2015)
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998b). Opinions and Ideologies in the Press. In Bell, Allan and Peter Garrett (Eds.). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp 21-63
- van Dijk, T.A. (1996). Discourse, Opinions and Ideologies. In Christina Schaffner & Helen Kelly-Holmes (eds.) *Discourse and Ideologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters Ltd, 1996. 7-37
- van Dijk, T.A. (1995). Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis. In Christina Schaffner and Anita L. Wenden (eds.). *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth: Aldershot. Pp.17-33
- Jaffer Sheyholislami - 15 - <http://www.carleton.ca/~jsheyhol/cda.htm>
- van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage Publications. Pp.242-282
- van Dijk, T.A. (1988a). *News Analysis: Case Studies of International and National News in the Press*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Van Dijk (1988b). *News as Discourse*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum
- Wodak, R. (1995). Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In Jef Verschuren Jan-Ola Ostman, and Jan Blommaert (eds.). *Handbook of Pragmatics-Manual*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Pp.204-210.
- Wodak, Ruth (2000a). Discourses of Exclusion: a European Comparative Study: Speech at the Opening of the EU Observatorium, 7/8 April, 2000, Hofburg Vienna. Available: <http://www.tuwien.ac.at/diskurs/stellungnahmen/Wodak5.html> (February 10, 2001)
- Wodak, R. & Ludwig, Ch. (Ed.) (1999). *Challenges in a changing world: Issues In Critical Discourse Analysis*, Vienna: Passagenverlag.