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Abstract

This paper is trying to examine whether or not manipulation exists in political speeches by investigating the last speech given by the Egyptian ex-president, Mubarak, during the revolution of January 25th, 2011. The study is conducted, mainly, by applying Critical Discourse Analysis theory to the text under examination with the aim of pointing out manipulative features. By adopting Critical Discourse Analysis as an overall theory, the study revealed that many classical manipulative strategies have been used all over the speech like: positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, reflections of in-group-out-group ideology, emotionalizing the argument, asserting one’s power and discrediting the opponents, and finally tendency towards nationalism in order to manipulate the cognition of the audience.
Contents

1- Introduction ........................................................................................................................................4
2- Aim ..................................................................................................................................................4
3- Terminology .....................................................................................................................................5
  3.2- Framing .......................................................................................................................................5
  3.3- Episodic and thematic frames .......................................................................................................5
  3.6 - Metaphor ....................................................................................................................................6
4- Material ............................................................................................................................................6
5- Persuasion and manipulation: what is the difference? .....................................................................6
6- Theoretical Background ....................................................................................................................7
7- Method ...............................................................................................................................................12
8- The Social Context ..........................................................................................................................13
9- Data Analysis ...................................................................................................................................13
  9.1- The text –level analysis ..............................................................................................................13
  9.1.2- Framing ....................................................................................................................................19
  9.2- Sentence- level analysis ...............................................................................................................22
  9.3- The word-level analysis ..............................................................................................................24
    9.3.1- Metaphor ................................................................................................................................24
10- Conclusion ......................................................................................................................................27
11- References ......................................................................................................................................28
  11.1- Primary Sources .......................................................................................................................28
  11.2- Secondary Sources ...................................................................................................................28
12- Appendix .......................................................................................................................................30
1- Introduction

Under the broad umbrella of the term Political discourse, many kinds of political-related topics are found such as parliament debates, governmental conferences, political pamphlets, political speeches and even political car stickers. ¹ This paper deals with only one kind of political discourse, namely political speeches, and in particular one political speech given by the former Egyptian president, Hosni Mubarak after the revolution against him and his regime on January 25, 2011.

Political speeches are means by which politicians manifest, impose or argue their ideologies in order to convince the audience of the legitimacy of their purposes. The audiences are usually motivated to agree to the legitimacy of the purposes of the speaker if the speaker, in our case, the politician, succeeds to persuade them mentally, emotionally and morally. The power of ‘persuasion’ entails many devices and strategies that the hearer or the reader can perceive either consciously or unconsciously. According to Van Dijk, ‘persuasion’ has positive associations and gives the audience a full picture of the argumentation so that they are free to accept or not accept the argument. On the other hand there is another kind of persuasion called ‘manipulation’ which has negative associations and a more negative role is assigned to the audience as argumentation is not clear enough to give them the chance to make a free choice. ² In this paper I am focusing on the signs of the manipulative strategies. To this end, I am using a variety of theories that share together to point out the features of manipulation in the text. The critical discourse analysis theory (CDA) is the main theory in this paper.

2- Aim

In crucial times, it is common that the speaker manipulates the audience and tries to affect their understanding of the events in a way that benefits his/her own interest. ³ In his address to the

---

¹ Ådel, Annelie, 2010, p. 592
² Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p. 360-361
³ Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p. 368
nation, Mubarak, did not submit to the will of the demonstrators who asked him to ‘leave’.¹ Instead, he strived to keep his authority and rule as a president to the end of his electoral period. I am assuming that in order to reach his goal in staying in power and appease the crowds, he has to use a very powerful language that should be at a high level of influence to affect millions of rebels and millions of citizens. I am hypothesizing that since he did not listen to the crowd and tried to get around their demands to impose his own terms using language as a medium, this language might be not only persuasive but also manipulative. I would like in this paper to examine the possibility that he is manipulating his people to stay in power. My study is trying to answer two questions: Has the ex-president used any manipulative strategies in the text? If he did, what are they?

3- Terminology
For the aim of making this paper as simple as possible and make it easy for the reader to follow subsequent sections of the paper, I am providing in this section definitions of the unfamiliar terms and concepts that will be used in the theoretical background and data analysis sections.

3.2- Framing
Framing is “a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events, weaving a connection among them. The frame suggests what the controversy is about…”²

3.3- Episodic and thematic frames
“Episodic frames present an issue by offering a specific example, case study, or event oriented report (---). Thematic frames, on the other hand, place issues into a broader context”³.

² Gamson, W.A...& Modigliani, 1987, p 143
³ Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 170
Episodic frame introduces an issue by providing “specific example, case study or event oriented report”.¹ For example, when the aim is to discuss unemployment, a tragic story about an unemployed person is provided. On the other hand, if the same issue is tackled by the thematic frame, it provides a broader contextual scope, e.g. introducing reports by economy experts, provide statistics followed by comments by “economists and public official” to show the influence of economy on unemployment.²

3.6 - Metaphor

A metaphor is “a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action to which it is not literally applicable”.³

4 - Material

The transcript of the speech given by Mubarak was downloaded from Al Jazeera.net on April 13, 2013. The speech was aired on February 10, 2011. The process of scripting the presidential speeches involves many unseen hands that construct the text. Despite that, “presidents are responsible for their own communications” because they shape them to their purposes.⁴ Based on that assumption, the speech is assigned to the ex-president Mubarak who is fully responsible for it.

5 - Persuasion and manipulation: what is the difference?

Before starting to analyze the text, it is important to pinpoint the difference between the two interrelated terms ‘persuasion’ and ‘manipulation’. Wodak (1987), as referred to by Van Dijk, noted that the main difference between persuasion and manipulation is that in the case of persuasion, the audience are free to accept the argumentation or not. A positive role is assigned to the audience in the case of persuasion as they are free to react as they want depending on their acceptance to or rejection of the argumentation. Unlike that is the case of manipulation. A more passive role is assigned to the manipulated audiences which are not free to react as they lack the

¹ Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 171
² Cf. Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 171
³ See http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/metaphor?q=metaphor
⁴ cf. Whissell, Cythia, 2010, p 82
sufficient knowledge to resist the manipulation. Van Dijk has introduced four “contextual criterion” that may result in making the audience unable to “resist, detect or avoid manipulation”. These four criterion are:

1. The lack of the “relevant knowledge” and because of that the recipients cannot formulate “a counter-argument against false, incomplete or biased assertions”.  
2. “Fundamental norms, values and ideologies that cannot be denied or ignored”. 
3. “Strong emotion, traumas, etc. that makes people vulnerable”. 
4. “Social position, profession, statue, etc. that induce people into tending to accept the discourse”. 

It is important as well to bear in mind that “boundary between (illegitimate) manipulation and (legitimate) persuasion is fuzzy, and context dependent”. Still, an analysis can judge a text to be manipulative if discourse is in the advantage of the manipulator and against the interest of the recipients. Given this distinction between persuasion and manipulation, manipulation can be defined as: a social and discursive act that aims to reproduce power of the elite which is against the interest of the people and results social inequality. With this definition in mind, I am conducting my discourse analysis.

6- Theoretical Background

Despite the fact that many approaches have been introduced to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), still, there is no definite methodology for CDA. There are no definite analytical tools related to the field of CDA, since the choice of these tools depends on the question/s of the study. For the purpose of this paper, I am using CDA as the broad theory of

---

1 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 361  
2 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 375  
3 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 375  
4 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 375  
5 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 375  
6 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 375  
7 Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 375  
8 Martínez, Dolores Fernández, 2007, p 126  
9 Martínez, Dolores Fernández, 2007, p 126, 27
my study. I am using CDA because its aim is to point out any textual feature that appears to be an attempt of the speaker to manipulate the audience.¹

Under the broad theory of CDA, I am combining two theories: on the one hand, I am searching for the ‘classical’ manipulative strategies suggested by Van Dijk (2006). On the other hand, I am searching for two manipulative strategies suggested by Huckin (1997). These two strategies were mentioned in other literature as well. They were mentioned by Gross (2008) and Charteris-Black (2011) and that is why I am searching for them.

According to Van Dijk, manipulation is a form of ‘social power abuse, cognitive mind control and discourse interaction’.² In order to uncover manipulation - given Van Dijk’s definition - one has to look for signs of manipulation by means of examining the social context, the ideology presented in the text and lastly, the textual structure. This paper will try to study these three aspects and will try to pointing out any classical strategy of manipulation.

We have to keep in mind that not every manipulative strategy should be found in every manipulative text,³ and that only an examination of the text can uncover which kind of manipulative strategies are used. Still, there are some ‘classical strategies’ in the manipulative discourse like: ‘emphasizing one’s power and moral superiority’, discrediting one’s opponents, providing details of the ‘facts’, polarization between Us and Them⁵, negative other-presentation, ideological alignment (democracy, nationalism), emotional appeals.⁶ Van Dijk also indicates clearly that implicit-fallacious-arguments are commonly used in manipulative discourse and that, because he says they are common, I am going to look for these too.

¹ Huckin, T.N, 1997, p 80
² Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 359
³ Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 379
⁴ ‘Moral superiority’ is a step towards positive self-presentation (Van Dijk 2006: 378). In this paper I will use the term positive self-presentation more as it is more general.
⁵ This term is almost based on the (US- THEM categorization) which is basically dividing people to’ US’ or the ‘in-group’ and ‘THEM’ which is an ‘out-group’ (Van Dijk 2000: 80). After creating the two groups, the difference between them is emphasized and that is ‘polarization’. In this paper, I am using the term ‘in-group-out-group ideology’ and ‘polarization’ depending on the.
⁶ Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 379
Emphasizing the power, position and authority can be emphasized through the use of “formal setting, attire, tone of the voice, lexical choices and so on”\(^1\). On the other hand, the speaker manifests his moral superiority by showing that he is democratic, caring, courageous, firm, etc.

Discrediting the opponent by assigning bad acts to him is common in manipulative discourse. This could be done through the Us and Them categorization.\(^2\)

Giving partial, biased or misleading ‘facts’ and then mentioning a lot of details about this ‘fact’ in order to make it look like ‘real’ is a strategy of manipulation.

The polarization between Us and Them is closely related to the in-group-out-group division.\(^3\) In this strategy the speaker is designing the text by making two groups: the ‘US’ group and the ‘THEM’ group. This may be developed to assigning good things to the former group and bad things to the latter one.\(^4\)

The overall strategy of positive self-presentation and bad other-presentation entails the assignment of good acts to Us and bad ones to Them. Using this strategy the speaker is stressing his morality, superiority and power and at the same time discrediting his opponent and maybe blaming him for the bad events or situations.\(^5\)

The ideological alignment towards abstract issues like ‘democracy’ or ‘nationalism’ aim to shed light on more abstract issues and not focus on the real event.

Emotional appeal entails the use of emotion arousing phrases, “dramatic rhetoric”\(^6\) and so on that help to make the audience less resistant to manipulation.

Implicit-fallacious-argument is a strategy in which the speaker associates the opponent to the enemy.\(^1\) Clearly, associating someone with the enemy will help to bad present and discredit that person.

\(^{1}\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 376
\(^{2}\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 376
\(^{3}\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2000, p 81
\(^{4}\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2000, p 80
\(^{5}\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 373

\(^{6}\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 376
Huckin mentions several strategies for manipulation; manipulating the genre (doing things that one should not do within a specific genre), framing, foregrounding/backgrounding, presupposition (on text and sentence level), exploiting styles, connotations, labels, metaphor etc.\(^2\) I am searching only for two of these strategies; framing and metaphors. I am searching for these two strategies because they are mentioned in other literature as well. According to Van Dijk manipulation “takes place by text and talk”.\(^3\) As our aim here is to investigate a text, a systematic text analysis schema that helps in uncovering manipulative strategies is needed. For that purpose, I am relying on a method suggested by Huckin (1997)\(^4\). This method helps to divide the text to different levels; the text-level, the sentence-level and the word and phrases – level. By dividing the text, it will be easier to search for the classical strategies, mentioned by Van Dijk and Huckin, in different textual layers and gives a better insight about whether manipulation is used or not and if used, in what way.

The text is not something that is arbitrary designed. It is rather a unified unit. The way the content of the text is presented and manifesting the perspective of the author is called ‘framing’.\(^5\) Examining the frame will help to uncover the author’s perspective and in which way he structured the frame to communicate his ideological views. This investigation will show whether it could affect the audience or not, the manipulative strategies could be pointed out.

According to Charteries-Black (2011), metaphors have a “cognitive and effective appeal” and “contribute to persuasion”.\(^6\) By investigating the kind of metaphors used and if they imply any cognitive or emotional appeal that affects the free choice of the audience, I will be able to see if these metaphors help in manipulating the audience or not. Metaphors will be investigated by the critical metaphor theory that will be introduced latter in this section.

In addition to Huckin’s theory, I am making use of another theory suggested by Gross (2008). The theory suggests that framing affects the audiences’ emotional reaction towards the text by

\(^1\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 378
\(^2\) Huckin, T.N, 1997, p 81-84
\(^3\) Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 360
\(^4\) Huckin, T.N, 1997, p 86
\(^5\) Huckin, T.N, 1997, p 82
\(^6\) Charteries-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 2
affecting their cognitive evaluation of the event or phenomenon. Gross tried to study the emotional effect of two kinds of frames: the episodic frame and the thematic one. In her experiment, she found that the “rhetorical devices such as episodic framing influence emotional response”. It also shows that episodic framing is “operating via both affective and cognitive routes”. This means that using episodic frames affects the audience’s cognition. The main premise that the literature of framing is based on is that: frames guide people’s thoughts and they do this because they highlight certain aspects of the event/policy.

If the analysis of ‘framing’ shows that the episodic frame is used in a way that affect the emotions, the cognition and hence, the reaction of the audience in a way that serves the interest of the speaker, it will be a sign of manipulation. Framing is important to my study as it shows another side of manipulation manifested in making use of the special features of frames in order to affect the opinion of the audience by affecting their emotions and perception and thus pushing them to take particular reaction that serves the speaker’s interests.

I am also making use of the ‘critical metaphor analysis theory’ when examining metaphors in the word-level analysis. ‘The critical metaphor analysis theory’ is suggested by Charteris-Black and aims at uncovering the intention and ideology of the politician which are hidden in the language usage. The theory involves three stages: identifying the metaphor, interpreting and then explaining it. A metaphor can be identified by seeing if the word “is used with a sense that differs from another more common or more basic sense”. Charteris-Black has argued that the use of metaphors in political speeches plays an important role in affecting the cognition and emotions of the audience. According to him, metaphors affect the mental perception of the audience and hence, their emotions and indirectly their reaction. It is noteworthy that Charteris-Black is adopting Van Dijk’s criteria that differentiate between persuasion and manipulation just as this paper does.

1 Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 172
2 Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 183
3 Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 183
4 Gross, Kimberly, 2008, p 170
5 Charteris-Black, Jonathan 2004, p43 was quoted in Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 45
6 Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 45
7 Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 45
8 Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 2
9 Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 50,51
As the aim of my study is investigating the existence of manipulative strategies in the speech, I find that the critical metaphor analysis theory is a good complement to the overall CDA theory as it helps to uncover the ideology and intentions of the speaker and thus helps to uncover manipulation.

7- Method

There are many aspects that can be studied in a political address. For instance, studying its phonology, semiotic aspects, in which the tone, facial expressions and the speaker’s way of dressing, hair style, etc, are taken in account, and many other perspectives of study. This paper deals with only the written text as a source of discursive data. The original text is written in Arabic but I am providing a translation for the quotations I am using in my study. I translated the quotations in a way that makes the Arabic text comprehensive and readable. I made my best to provide, as far as I could, the closest natural equivalent to the original text and was faithful to the intended meanings of the text. Still, I did not provide a word-for-word translation.

As manipulation is found mainly in talk and text, and as my aim is to point out any manipulative strategies in the text, I am making use of Huckin’s suggested text-analysis method. The analysis deals with three levels: the whole text-level, the sentence-level, and the words and phrases-level. In each of these levels, I will search for the previously mentioned strategies. I find this method useful because it deals with three different levels of the text and hence, give a better insight into the data which helps to unmasking how manipulation is designed and used. As Huckin suggested, I dealt with the text as a whole in the beginning, then, I examined every sentence and, finally, went through each single word.

In each part of the ‘data analysis’ section, I am beginning with providing examples. All the examples are presented in Arabic and then translated into English. After examples, a discussion and interpretation is given in order to connect the findings to the concept of manipulation.

1 Huckin, T. N. , 1997, p 86
8- The Social Context
During 30 years, Mubarak ruled Egypt. He founded the National Democratic Party (NDP) which became over time the most legally powerful party in the country. On the 25th of January, 2011, people of Egypt demonstrated in many parts of Egypt especially in Tahrir (liberation) square in Cairo and in many other important towns all over the country. “The main drivers of the unrest have been poverty, rising prices, social exclusion, anger over corruption and personal enrichment among the political elite, and a demographic bulge of young people unable to find work”.

For 16 days, from 25 January to 10 February, people demonstrated in the streets calling for Mubarak to ‘leave’ and resign without any reaction from the president. The importance of this speech lies in the fact that it was the first formal reaction from the president addressing the demonstrations. Instead of submitting to the people’s will, Mubarak chose to delegate power to his newly appointed vice-president, Omar Suleiman, make some constitutional reforms and lift the state of emergency law sometime in the future. In so doing Mubarak chose to stay in his position and hold his title which is to his advantage and against the peoples' who wanted full reformation leading to a better life.

9- Data Analysis
9.1- The text –level analysis
A survey of the text shows that, the ex-president has named the addressees three times during his speech. I will discuss every one of these:

Example 1

الإخوان المواطنين، الأبناء شباب مصر وشبابها، أتوجه بهديك اليوم لشباب مصر بميدان التحرير وعلى اتساع أرضها، أتوجه إليكم جميعا بحديث من القلب، حديث الأب لأبنائه وبناته

1 Asser, Martin , 2011
Fellow citizens, my sons, the youth of Egypt. Today I am addressing the youth in Tahrir square and all over Egypt. I am addressing you all from the heart. A speech from a father to his sons and daughters.

Analysis

In these very first lines, Mubarak is differentiating between three groups: the citizens in general, the younger generation of Egypt, and lastly those who are in Tahrir square. One cannot help wondering if all these three groups will not be included if the president chose to address his ‘fellow citizens’ instead of naming every group? By addressing three different groups, he is trying first to distinguish between those who are not demonstrating and those who rebel. He creates a clear division between the two groups. He has developed this even further in the following sections of the text, as will be seen. If Mubarak chose to address all the ‘fellow citizens’, the youth and the common citizen will be addressed as one unit. This kind of division, I would argue, is ideologically meant as a first step towards polarization between Us and Them, which is based mainly on the in-group ‘US’ and out-group ‘THEM’ structure in which he is trying to ideologically differentiate between the ‘GOOD WE’ and the ‘BAD THEM’. This step is even developed and is clearer in the following paragraph when saying:

Example 2

أقول لكم إنني كرئيس للجمهورية لا أجد حرجاً أو غضبًأبدا في الاستماع لشباب بلادي والتفاوض معه، لكن الحرج كل الحرج، والعبيب كل العيب، وما لم ولن أقبله أبداً. أن أسمع لإملاءات أجنبية تأتي من الخارج، أياً كان مصدرها وأيما كانت ذرواتها أو مبهراتها

Translation

I am telling you as a president, that I feel no shame to listen to the youth of my country or interact with them, but it is shameful and a mistake, the thing that I did not nor will accept, is to listen to a foreign dictations, whatever the source or the reasons might be.
Analysis

In the above passage, Mubarak has pictured himself as a democratic leader who is not ashamed to listens and respects his people’s demands and interact with them. "أني كرئيس للجمهورية لا أجد حرجا أو غضابية أبدا في الاستماع لشباب بلادي والتجارب معهم". On the other hand, his opponents, the rebels, are listening to foreign dictation "إِلَمَّاءات أجنبية". Mubarak is hinting that the rebels are traitors. As this accusation is implied and involves no evidence it can be said that it is fallacious. This implicit-fallacious-argument is common in the manipulative discourse.

When the speaker is assigning good qualities to himself and bad qualities to his opponents, it is regarded as a step towards positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation which is in the speaker’s own interest and thus regarded as a manipulative strategy.¹

In his second addressing, Mubarak has chosen to address the younger generation that demonstrate first and the citizens in general second:

Example 3

الأبناء شباب مصر، الإخوة المواطنين. لقد أعلنت بعبارات لا تحتمل الجدل أو التأويل عدم ترشحني للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة، مكتفيا بما قدمته من عطاء للوطن لأكثر من 60 عاما في سنوات الحرب والسلام. أعلنت أمسك بذل، وأعلنت تمسكا مماثلا ودخان الفضل في النهوض بمسؤولتي في حماية الدستور ومصالح الشعب حتى يتم تسليم السلطة والمسؤولية لنم يختار الناخبون في شهر سبتمبر المقبل، في انتخابات حرة ونزيهة توفر لها ضمانات الحرية والنزاهة. ذلك هو القسم الذي أقسمته أمام الله والوطن، وسوف أحافظ عليه حتى نبلغ بمصر وشعبها بر الأمان

Translation

My sons, the youth of Egypt, my fellow citizens. I had confirmed with clear sentences, that could not be misunderstood, that I will not run for the next presidential election. It is enough to serve my country for more than 60 years in both war and peace times. I confirmed that and I had also confirmed that I will continue to take my responsibility in protecting the constitution and the profits of the people until it is time to transfer power to the person who is chosen by the people through fair elections next September. This is the oath I gave in front of God and the country and I will keep this oath until Egypt and its people are save and sound.

¹ Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 373
Analysis

In the first lines of the address, Mubarak is stating very clearly that he determined to continue his electoral period and won’t step down. His motivation behind that is fulfilling his oath that he would protect the constitution and the national security. If we keep in mind the tragic scenario that Mubarak faced when losing his power as a president and stepped down only one day after this speech, we might assume that there is another reason behind his decision. Stepping down from power made him face the anger of the people, get prisoned and sentenced for life after found guilty of the killing of the protestors.¹ I would assume, on the light of the events after the speech, that Mubarak knew in advance what might happen and tried to avoid it. The manipulative strategy of the positive self-presentation is stressed in this passage as the one above. Mubarak emphasized his moral superiority by pictured himself as a man who is keeping his oath and is concerned with the national security and that is why he determined to keep his position. On the other hand, he implicated that those who won’t help him in the amendments he is going to do are not concerned about the security of Egypt and hence not patriotic or even, like implicated before, are ‘traitors’ “خونه””. This kind of implication is fallacious and denotes one of the common manipulative strategies, namely the implicit-fallacious-argument. An example is when saying:

Example 4

Translation

I proposed this vision as it is my responsibility to help my country to pass through crucial times. I am making sure that my vision becomes reality hour by hour, I am looking forward for the support of every one that loves Egypt and its people in order to make my vision comes true.

¹ Pizzey, Allan, 2012
In the next quotation I would like to discuss the third addressing paragraph. In this section, Mubarak is addressing the citizens alone and excluding the younger generation:

Example 5

الإخوة المواطنين.. إن الأولوية الآن هي استعادة الثقة بين المصريين بعضهم البعض، والثقة في اقتصادنا وسمعتنا الدولية والثقة في أن التغيير والتحول الذي بدأنا لا ارتداد عنه أو رجعة

Translation

My fellow citizens, our priority now is to regain the confidence between the Egyptians, the trust in our economy and international reputation, and to be sure that we will not give up the changes that we have started.

Analysis

In the previous passage, Mubarak addressed citizens in general and did not mention the rebels “الثوار” at all and this is the development of his distinction of the different groups from the very beginning. He is now excluding or omitting the rebels and addressing the citizens alone calling for nationalism and solidarity. My argument is that, Mubarak aimed to make a division between the citizens “المواطنين” and the rebels “الثوار” to make it easy to him to discard the rebels and assign bad deeds to them so that the other citizens will stop supporting them or even take them as national enemies “أعداء الوطن”, hate them and take violent reaction against them. This kind of scenario is totally in the interest of the president who aims at regaining his power by suppressing the revolution. This assumption is supported by his claim that the economy will be affected by the act of demonstrating and stating clearly that demonstrations “ظاهرة” must be stopped. The following quotations are examples:

Example 6

إن مصر تتغثاز أوقاتا صعبة لا يصح أن نسمح باستمرارها فزيدنا ما ألحقته بناإقتصادنا من أضرار وحسنات يوما بعد يوم، وينتهي بمصر الأمر إلى أوضاع يصبح معها الشباب الذين دعا إلى التغيير والإصلاح أول المتضررين منه.
Translation

Egypt is passing crucial times. We cannot allow this to continue. The result will be increasing the harm that affected us and our economy day after day. If this situation continues, those who called for reforms will be the first ones affected by it.

The same strategies were used again in the following passage:

Example 7

Translation

I faced death many times, as a pilot, in Addis Ababa and a lot more. I did not yield to foreign dictations.

Analysis

In the previous example, Mubarak combined many strategies that sustain one another. He uses the fallacious implication that the rebels are traitors that listen to foreign dictations. By so doing, he is accusing them of disloyalty and hence, discrediting them. He polarizes between himself as a powerful courageous loyal leader and ‘them’ who listen to foreign dictations. This also manifests his power and superior morality as he did not yield to foreign dictations and at the same time discredits his opponents. In other words, he is juxtaposing his heroism and nationalism to their, implicated, disloyalty and betrayal.

To sum up the results of the discussion above, I found many strategies that are used for the aim of manipulation. I found an intensive use for the positive self-presentation and bad other-presentation in all the different sections of the text. Other strategies were found as well; the overall strategy of in-group-out-group was established from the very beginning by naming every addressee and distinguishing them. This was enhanced by the polarization between the ‘good president’ and the ‘bad rebels’, the implicit-fallacious-arguments were found in many instances. I found clear evidence of stressing one’s power and morality superiority, discrediting the opponent
Towards the end of the address, the in-group-out-group ideology reached its ultimate goal by excluding the ‘rebels’ from the address and include only the ‘citizens’.

9.1.2- Framing

The ex-president has used two kinds of frames: the thematic frame when addressing the rebels and the episodic frame when addressing the citizens. I will argue that Mubarak has used these two frames when addressing the two different groups he created on purpose. The thematic frame is used when providing information about the president’s reaction to the killing of the demonstrators, constitutional reforms and the emergency law. The most part that contains factual instances is the one concerning the constitutional reforms:

Example 8

ولقد تلقيت أمين التقرير الأول بالتعديلات الدستورية ذات الأولوية المقترحة من اللجنة التي شكلتها من رجال القضاء وفقهاء

والقانون لدراسة التعديلات الدستورية والتشريعية المطلوبة.

وإنني تجاوبا مع ما تضمنه تقرير اللجنة من مقترحات، ومقتضى الصلاحيات المخولة لرئيس الجمهورية وفقا للمادة 189 من الدستور، فقد تقدمت اليوم بطلب تعديل ست مواد دستورية هي المواد 76 و77 و88 و93 و89 و189، فضلا عن إلغاء المادة 179 من الدستور، مع تأكيد الاستعداد للتقدم في وقت لاحق بطلب تعديل المواد التي تنتهي إليها هذه اللجنة الدستورية وفق ما تراه

من الدواعي والمبررات.

وتشتشف هذه التعديلات ذات الأولوية تسير شروط الترشيح لرئاسة الجمهورية، واعتماد عدد محدد لمددة الرئاسة تحقيقا لتناول السلطة، وتعزيز ضوابط الإشراف على الانتخابات ضمانا لحريةها ونزاهتها، كما تؤكد اختصاص القضاء وحده بالفصل

في صحة وعوضية أعضاء البرلمان، وعدل شروط وإجراءات طلب تعديل الدستور.

أما الاقتراح بتعديل المادة 179 من الدستور فإنه يستهدف تحقيق التوازن المطلوب بين حماية الوطن من مخاطر الإرهاب وضمان احترام الحقوق والحريات المدنية للمواطنين، بما يفتح الباب أمام إيقاف العمل بقانون الطوارئ فور استعادة الهواء والاستقرار وتوافر الظروف المواتية لرفع حالة الطوارئ.
Translation

Yesterday, I received the first report from the committee that I formed of law and constitutional experts, this report includes the suggested constitutional adjustments of priority.

As a response to the suggestion of the committee, and according to the authority I am entitled as a president according to the article nr. 180 of the constitution, I applied today for a request to adjust six constitutional articles. These articles are: 76, 77, 88, 93, 189. I also asked for the deletion of the article 179. I also confirm that I am ready to request, later on, for the adjustment that the constitutional committee suggest according to what it see right.

The suggested constitutional adjustments of priority aim at facilitate the conditions of applying for the president position. It also aim at deciding a specific number of presidential periods. This will lead to the devolution of power. It also strengthens the control over the supervision of the elections to ensure free and fair elections. It also confirms that only the judicature has the right to verify the membership of members of parliament, and adjusted the conditions and procedures for requesting amendment of the constitution.

The suggestion of the cancellation of the article 179 aims at achieve the required balance between protecting the nation from the dangers of terrorism and to ensure the respect of the rights and civil liberty of the citizens. This will open the door to stop the emergency law immediately as soon as stability is restored and the availability of favorable conditions for the lifting of the state of emergency.

Analysis

This kind of frame – a frame that provides factual information - is suitable in the case of the rebels as they need to know the kind of measurements that are taken and hear the details of these measurements to feel secure and to sooth their anger. Still, I would argue here that Mubarak has tried to provide detailed, partial information to the rebels to manipulate them instead of to persuade them. When the people demonstrated and asked Mubarak to ‘leave’, their causes, as mentioned in the ‘social context’ section, cannot be solved by changing five articles and deleting one in which all of them concern the elections. We cannot imagine that the common
citizen has read the constitution and knows every article in it and what they imply. He could possibly, talk about new job opportunity, economic reforms, take measurements against the corruption, etc. As he chose to tackle the issue that concerns him and his position, I would argue that he is manipulating the people. By providing so much details to one side of the problem and give the impression of its major importance, he tried to make the ‘facts’ (the reforms) seem more real than they really are.

When addressing the citizens, Mubarak used the episodic frame. He made himself an example of dedication and heroism. It helps by highlighting some aspects (e.g. Mubarak’s heroism during the October war and the attempts to assassinate him). By doing so, he tried to arouse the sympathetic reaction of the audience and giving a good picture of himself. An example is:

*Example 9*

I was a young man, a youth just like all these youth, when I have learned the honor of the military system and to sacrifice for the country. I have spent my entire life defending its land and its sovereignty. I have witnessed and attended its wars with all its defeats and victories. I have lived during defeat and victory. During the victory in 1973, my happiest days were when I lifted the Egyptian flag over Sinai. I have faced death several times when I was a pilot. I also faced it in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and elsewhere. I did not submit nor yield to foreign dictations or others. I have kept the peace. I worked towards the Egyptian stability and security. I have worked to the revival in Egypt and the prosperity. I did not seek authority. I trust that the majority -- the vast majority of the Egyptian people know who is Hosni Mubarak, and it pains me to what I have -- what I see today from some of my fellow citizens.
Analysis

In this passage, Mubarak mentions his youthhood and how he participated in the October war "حرب أكتوبر" and raised the flag over Sinai "سيناء" and how he survived many assassination attempts during his presidential period. All these instances are aiming at emotionalizing the argument and motivating the audience to sympathize him. By so doing, he is motivating the citizens to support him out of pity and thus, he could regain his authority and power which the rebels are challenging in the Tahrir square. According to Van Dijk, mentioning emotion arousing instances is emotionalizing the argument and is one of the classical manipulative strategies.

Following the suggestion of Huckin and examining the framing of the text, I found three strategies of manipulation: providing details of the ‘facts’, emotional appeal and the classical good self-presentations and bad other-presentation.

9.2- Sentence-level analysis

A survey of many sentences revealed that the importance is clearly given to the president and his actions. Examples are:

Example 10

أقول لكم قبل كل شيء، إن دماء شهدائكم وجرحاكم لن تضيع هدراً، وأؤكد أنني لن أتهاون في معاقبة المتسببين بها بكل الشدة والجسم، وسأحاسب الذين أجرموا في حق شعبنا باقصى ما تقرره أحكام القانون من عقوبات رادعة.

Translation

I am telling you before anything, that the blood of the martyrs and the injured will not go in vain. I assure you that I am going to punish those who caused this blood fiercely. I will see that those who are found to be guilty are punished as extreme as the law allows.

Example 11

وأقول لعائلات هؤلاء الضحايا الأبرياء: إنني تعلمته كل الألم من أجلهم مثلما تألمتم، وأوجع قلبي كما أوجع قلوبكم
Translation
I am telling the families of those innocent victims that I was hurt as they did and my heart ached just as theirs.

Example 12
أقول لكم إن استجابتي لصوتكم ورسالتكم ومطالبكم هو التزام لا رجعة فيه، وإنني عازم كل العزم على الوفاء بما تعهدت به بكل الجدية والصدق، وحريص كل الحرص على تنفيذه دون ارتداد أو عودة للوراء

Translation
I am telling you that my response to your demands is a commitment without retreat. I am determined to fulfill this commitment with all the seriousness and faithfulness. I am so careful to put my commitment in to action with no retreat.

Analysis
In each of the previous passages, the speaker used the ‘preposed agent pronoun’ (أ) which equals (I) in English. The occurrence of the preposed pronoun is not meant to emphasize the actions of the agent but more to assert his identity.¹

With this intensive usage of the pronoun ‘I’ in the introduction section when addressing the rebels mainly, I would argue that the priority in the text is given to the president, his acts, what he says, what he will do or decided to do, what he believes or feels, in short the importance is given to his identity and thus stressing his superiority and power as a president. Mubarak is the doer in every single sentence above mentioned examples whereas the opponent, the protesters, are in the ‘patient’ position which is a passive position. In so doing, Mubarak tries to dominate the audience by opposing power over them. This power and domination contrast with the free will associated to persuasion and, hence, is a sign of manipulation.

To summarize, the analysis discovered one classical strategy, which are emphasizing one’s power

¹ Badawi, Elsaid, Michael G.Carter and Adrian Gully, 2004, p 359
9.3- The word-level analysis

9.3.1- Metaphor

With the help of critical metaphor analysis theory, I am going to discuss three kinds of metaphors used in the address: metaphors from the family-domain, metaphors from the war-domain and lastly personification. Metaphors serve an ideological purpose that helps in the overall strategy of positive in-group-presentation and negative out-group-presentation which emotionally affect the audience.¹

The first striking metaphor is a metaphor drawn from the domain of the’ family’ and used at the very beginning of the address:

Example 13

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم.. الإخٛح اٌّٛاؽْٕٛ، الأثٕبء شجبة ِظش ٚشبثبرٙب، أرٛجٗ ثذذ٠ضٟ اٌ١َٛ ٌشجبة ِظش ثّ١ذاْ اٌزذش٠ش
وعلى اتساع أرضها، أتوجه إليكم جميعا بحديث من القلب، حديث الأب لأبنائه وبناته

Translation

In the name of Allah, the merciful, the compassionate, Fellow citizens, my sons, the youth of Egypt. Today I am addressing the youth in Tahrir square and all over Egypt. I am addressing you all from the heart. A speech from a father to his sons and daughters.

Analysis

In the above quotation, when stating that the speaker is a ‘father’ it raises an intimate and emotional feeling between the ‘father’ ‘الأب’ and his ‘sons and daughters’ ‘أبنائه وبناته’. To put it another way, Charteries-Black explained that the use of metaphors from the family domain helps in imparting a feeling of security and the desire to protect this family, the nation.²

In our case here, Mubarak has chosen to picture the nation as a ‘family’ in which he is the

¹ Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 32
² Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 29
‘father’ who will protect this family. By so doing, he purposes to stimulate the audience to listen to him and submit to his argument and at the same time push them to feel the urgent desire to protect the family by ceasing to revolt and by stopping those who revolt.

War-like metaphors are employed as well. An example is the following:

*Example 14*

المصريين جميعا في خندق واحد الآن

*Translation*

All the Egyptian are in one trench now

*Analysis*

The war-related metaphor sends many cognitive and emotional messages. First and foremost, it suggests the existence of enemies. If we keep in mind the president’s implication when saying that the youth are listening to “foreign dictations” "إملاءات أجنبية تأتي من الخارج", one might relate that to the enemy metaphor. However, the ex-president did not specify the outside enemy explicitly but only implicitly, the one who listens and responds to the enemy is regarded as a traitor and, hence, an enemy, and thus those who demonstrate are the nations’ enemies. The use of metaphor in political speeches, as in our case here, helps to deepen the notion of the positive presentation of supporters and the bad presentation of the opponents.\(^1\) Framing the opponent as an enemy by using metaphors from the domain of war were used by politicians, such as Thatcher, to negatively present their opponent.\(^2\) Using metaphors this way evoke more and more the notion of the in-group-out-group frame that was used all over the text. In so doing the speaker is not trying to persuade the audience but to manipulate them. By implying that the rebels are enemies to the nation, Mubarak falsifies their good intention towards the nation and their credibility. By so doing, Mubarak tries to suppress the revolution by making the people regard the rebels as enemies and traitors, which is obviously in the best interest of the speaker.

---

\(^1\) Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 32

\(^2\) Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 33
and that is a clear mark of manipulation.¹ Still, the speaker provided no clear evidence of the purpose of using this metaphor or explicitly named the ‘enemy’ which gives an evidence that he aimed at evoking the feeling of fear not to support the rebels otherwise they will be supporting traitors and hence they will be traitors as well. This kind of “implicit –fallacious- argument” is a strategy of manipulation.²

Another feature of metaphors is the use of ‘personification’ which was used in many passages like:

*Example 15*

إن مصر تتجتاز أوقاتا صعبة

*Translation*

Egypt is passing crucial times

*Example 16*

إلني أعلم علم اليقين أن مصر ستتجارز أزمنة ولكن تنكسر إرادة شعبها، ستقف على أقدامها من جديد بصدق وإخلاص أبنائها كل أبنائها، وسترد كيد الكاندين وشماتة الشامتين

*Translation*

I know for sure that Egypt will survive this crises and that her people’s will not collapse. Egypt will stand on her feet again because of the faithfulness and truthfulness of her sons, all of them. She will make those who conspire against her pay back.

*Analysis*

The use of personification involves emotional and cognitive effect on the audience, or as Charteris-Black put it; “The use of personification carries a strong expressive force because it evokes our feelings and beliefs about people and applies them to feelings and beliefs about

---

² Van Dijk, Teun A, 2006, p 378
abstract political issues”.¹ This kind of metaphor is important as well in evoking patriotism and nationalism that are crucial in times of national crises.²

Using metaphors are vital in political speeches as it plays a great role to enable politicians to create their leadership identity and also to be morally accepted in the light of shared values between them and their addressees.³ Mubarak has chosen to be the ‘father’/الأب”, the youth who demonstrate are “traitors’/traitorous sons and “enemies’/معرضي يوما لضغوط أجنبية أو إملاةات Egypt, is a person that is suffering and is in danger. The expected reaction from these three messages is: saving the nation by unifying the nation (the family) under the ‘fatherly’ leadership of the president and standing against the ‘traitors’ (disobedient sons) for the good of all. When combining these metaphors with the mention of the president’s heroism in his youthhood, assassination attempts, and his refusal to listen to any ‘foreign dictation’ when saying:ٌُ أخؼغ ٠ِٛب ٌؼغٛؽ أجٕج١خ أٚ ئِلاءاد (I did not yield to foreign dictations), we conclude that it is a complete picture of good-self presentation vs. bad-other presentation that use many textual features that spread all over the text, like in the previously discussed framing, and in the agent-patient relations highlighted in the sentence-level analysis. The aim is to evoke the desired message: the president is ‘good’ and the protestors are ‘bad’ and this is a sign of manipulation.

To summarize, analyzing metaphors clarifies the use of six strategies: the in-group-out-group ideology, emotional appeal, positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, discrediting the enemy, implicit-fallacious-argument, and lastly, ideological alignment towards nationalism

10- Conclusion

The study aimed at investigating manipulation in the text by examining the existence of ten manipulative strategies suggested by Van Dijk and Huckin. All the manipulative strategies were found in the text. The manipulative strategies that were found in the text are as follows: In the text-level analysis, I found that Mubarak used the implicit-fallacious-argument, discrediting the opponent, positive self-presentation, the polarization between Us and Them which is based

¹ Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 257
² Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 256
³ Charteris-Black, Jonathan, 2011, p 312
on the in-group-out-group ideology. Discrediting the opponent and emphasizing one’s morality were found as well. The sentence-level analysis found one strategy; emphasizing one’s power. The word and phrases-level analysis showed that Mubarak has tried to emotionalize his argumentation by mentioning his heroism in the October war and the many attempts to kill him. Conducting a sentence-level analysis shows that Mubarak, tried to manifest his power and exercise domination over his opponents. A further investigation revealed positive self-presentation and bad other, the in-group-out-group ideology, emotional appeal, discarding the opponent and align towards nationalism as well as the use of implicit-fallacious-argument when aligning the rebels with the enemy without any evidence.

The study shows that all the strategies are found in the text which means that this text was aimed to manipulate the people not to persuade them.

It would be interesting if a study is conducted to investigate other semiotic aspects that might affect the audience, for example, the facial expressions of the president while giving this speech, his tone, his body language, etc, and then relating the findings to this study.
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12-Appendix

أقول لكم قبل كل شيء، إن دماء شهدائكم وجرحائكم لن تضيع هدراً، وأؤكد أنني لن أتهاون في معاكشتي المتستبين بها بكل الشدة والصمم، وسأحاسب الذين أجرموا في حق شبابنا بغض النظر ما تقره أحكام القانون من عقوبات رادعة.

وقول لعائلات هؤلاء الضحايا الأبرياء: إنني تألمت كل الألم من أجلهم مثلما تألمتم، وأوجو قلبكم كما أوجع قلبيكم.

أقول لكم إن استجابة لصوتنا ورسالتكم ومطالبكم هو التزام لا رجعة فيه، وإنني عازم كل العزم على الوفاء بما تعهدي به بكل الجدية والصدق، وحريص كل الحرص على تنفيذه دون ارتداد أو عودة للوراء.

إن هذا الالتزام ينطلق من اعتناع أطيب العقول وسماوتنا وترحمكم، وأن مطالبكم هي مطالب عادلة ومشروعة، فالأخلاق واردة في أي نظام سياسي وفي أي دولة، ولكن المهم هو الاعتراف بها وتصحيحها في أسرع وقت ومحاسبة مرتقبهما.

وقول لكم إنني كرنيس للجمهورية لا أحد حرجاً أو غضباً أبداً في الاستماع لشباب بلادنا والتعاون معه، لكن الحرج كل الحرج، واللقب كل العيب، وما لم ولن أقبله أبداً. إن استمع لإملاءات أجنبيَّة تأتي من الخارج، أياً كان مصدرها وأياً كانت ذراعها أو مبادراتها.
الأبناء شعب مصر، الاخوة المواطنون: لقد أعلنت عبارات لا تحتمل الجدل أو التأويل عدم ترشحى للانتخابات الرئاسية المقبلة، مكثفا بما قدمته من عطاء للوطن لأكثر من 60 عاماً في سنوات الحرب والسلام. أعلنت تمسكي بذلك، وأعلنت تمسكاً مماثلاً بذات القدر بالمضي في التهذيب مسؤوليتي في حماية الدستور ومصالح الشعب حتى يتم تسليم السلطة والمسؤولية لمن يختاره الناخبون في شهر سبتمبر المقبل، في انتخابات حرة ونزية توفر لها ضمانات الحرية والنزاهة. ذلك هو القدر الذي أقسمته أمام الله والوطن، وسوف أحافظ عليه حتى نبلغ بمصر وشعبها بر الأمان.

لقد طرحت رؤية محددة للخروج من الأزمة الراهنة، وتحقيق ما دعا إليه الشعب والمواطنون، بما يحترم الشرعية الدستورية ولا يفرضها، وعلى نحو يحقق استقرار مجتمعنا ومطالب أبنائنا، ويطرح في ذات الوقت إطاراً متفقاً عليه للانتقال السلمي للسلطة من خلال حوار مسؤول بين كافة قوى المجتمع وباصم قد من الصدق والشفافية.

طرحت هذه الرؤية ملتزماً بمسؤوليتي في الخروج بالوطن من هذه الأوقات العصيبة، وأتاحت المصحي في تحقيقها أولاً بأول، بل ساعة بساعة، متطلباً لدعم ومساندة كل حريص على مصر وشعبها كي ننجح في تحويلها لواقع ملموس، وفق توافق وطني عريض ومنشأة قاعدة، تسهُّل على ضمان تنفيذ قوانين السلطة البالغة.

لقد بدأنا بالفعل حواراً وطنياً يبدأ يضم شباب مصر الذين قادوا الدعوة إلى التغيير وكافة القوى السياسية، ولقد أسفر هذا الحوار عن توافق مبدئي في الآراء والمواقف يضع أقدامنا على بداية الطريق الصحيح للخروج من الأزمة، ويعين مواصلته للانتقال به من الخطوط العريضة لما تم الاتفاق عليه، إلى خريطة طريق واضحة وبدخل زمني محدد تستهي يوماً بعد يوم على طريق الانتقال السلمي للسلطة من الآن وحتى سبتمبر المقبل.

إن هذا الحوار الوطني قد تلاقى حول تشكيل لجنة دستورية تتولى دراسة التعديلات المطلوبة في الدستور وما تقتضيه من تعديلات تشريعية، كما تلاقى حول تشكيل لجنة للمتابعة تتولى مناقشة التفتيش الأمين لما تحدث به أمام الشعب. ولقد حرصت على أن يأتي تشكيل كلتى القائمة من الشخصيات المصرية المشهود لها بالاستقلال والتجربة، ومن قيام القانون الدستوري ورجال القضاء.

وفضلاً عن ذلك فإننا إزاء ما فقدنا من شهداء من أبناء مصر في أحداث مأساوية حزينة أوجحت قلوبنا وهزت ضمير الوطن، أصدرت تعليماتي بسرعة الانتهاء من التحقيقات حول أحداث الأسبوع الماضي، وإحالة نتائجها على القور إلى النائب العام ليتخذ بشأنها ما يلزم من إجراءات قانونية رادعة.

وقد تلقينا أمتان التقرير الأول بالتعديلات الدستورية ذات الأولوية المقررة من اللجنة التي شكبتها من رجال القضاء وقىياء القانون لدراسة التعديلات الدستورية والتشريعية المطلوبة.
وإلا تجاوباً مع ما تضمنه تقرير اللجنة من مقتراحات، ومقتضى الصلاحيات المخولة لرئيس الجمهورية وفقاً للمادة 189 من الدستور، فقد قدمت اليوم بطلب تعديل ست موارد دستورية هي المواد 76 و77 و88 و93 و189 و191، فضلاً عن إلغاء المادة 17 من الدستور، مع تأكيد الاستعداد للتقدم في وقت لاحق بطلب تعديل المواد التي تنتهي إليها هذه اللجنة الدستورية وفق ما تراه من الدواعي والمبررات.

وتستهدف هذه التعديلات ذات الأولوية تيسير شروط الترشيح لرئاسة الجمهورية، واعتماد عدد محدد لمدد الرئاسة تحقيقاً لتدوين السلطة، وتعزيز ضوابط الإشراف على الانتخابات ضمانًا لحريةها ونزاهتها، كما تؤكد اختصاص القضاء وحده بالفصل في صحة وعوضية أعضاء البرلمان، وتعدل شروط وإجراءات تكليف القضاء.

أما الاقتراح بإلغاء المادة 179 من الدستور فإنه يستهدف تحقيق التوازن المطلوب بين حماية الوطن من خطر الإرهاب وضمان احترام الحقوق والحريات المدنية للمواطنين، بما يفتح الباب أمام إيقاف العمل بقانون الطوارئ فور استعادة الهدوء والاستقرار وتوافر الظروف المواتية لرفع حالة الطوارئ.

الإخوان المسلمون. إن الأولوية الآن هي استعادة الثقة بين المصريين بعضهم البعض، والثقة في اقتصادنا وسعتنا الدولية، والثقة في أن التغيير والتحول الذي بدأناه لا يزال عن أو رجعة فيه.

إن مصر تتغاظ أوقاتا صعبة لا يصح أن نسجح باستمرارها فزيادة ما أحدثته لنا واقتصادنا من أضرار وخسائر يوما بعد يوم، وبنتهي بمصر الأمر إلى أوضح يصبح معها الشباب الذين دعوا إلى التغيير والإصلاح أول المتضررين منها.

إن اللحظة الراهنة ليست متعلقة بشخصي، ليست متعلقة بحسن مبارك، وإنما باب الأمور متعلقاً بمصر في حاضرها ومستقبل أبنائها.

إن المصريين جميعاً في خندق واحد الآن، وعلينا أن نواصل الحوار الوطني الذي بدأناه بروح الفريق وليس الفراق، وليست رحيل أسامة بن علي من المسرح السياسي، وليست من المسرح السياسي. إن خلاص النزاع والتناحر، ينجازه مصر أزمتها الراهنة، ولنعيد للاقتصادية الثقة فيه، ولنعيد للاقتصادية الثقة فيه، ولناستعيد الآمن، وللشارع المصري حياته البسيطة الطبيعية.

لقد كانت شاباً مثل شباب مصر الآن، عندما تعلمت شرف العسكرية المصرية والولاء للوطن والتضحية من أجله. أفيت عمري دفاعاً عن أرضي وسعيتي، شهدت حربنا بهزائمنا وانتصاراتنا، شهدت أيام الانكسار والاحتلال وأيام العبور والنصر والتحرير. أسعد أيام حياتي يوم رفعت علم مصر فوق سيناء، واجهت الموت مرات عديدة طياراً وفي دس أباباً، وغير ذلك كثير، لم أخضع يوماً لضغوط أجنبية أو إملاءات، حافظت على السلام، عملت من أجل أم مصر واستقرارها، اجتهدت من
أجل نهضتها، لم أمع بوما لسلطة أو شعبية زائفة. من أصل الأغلبية الكاسحة من أبناء الشعب يعرفون من هو حسين مبارك، ويجز في نفس ما ألقاه اليوم من بعض بني وطني.

وعلى أية حال فإنني إذ أعي خطورة المفترق الصعب الحاصل، واقتناعا من جانبي بأن مصر تتجاز لحظة فارقة في تاريخها تفرض علينا جميعاً غليبية المصلحة العليا للوطن، وأن نضع مصر أولاً فوق أي اعتبار وكل اعتبار آخر، فقد رأيت تقويض نائب رئيس الجمهورية في اختصاصات رئيس الجمهورية على النحو الذي يحدثه الدستور.

إنني أعلم علم اليقين أن مصر ستنجذآز أزمتها ولن تنكسر إرادة شعبها، ستقف على أقدامها من جديد بصدق وإخلاص أبنائها كل أبنائها، وسترد كيد الكاندين وشمانة الشامتين.

سنثبت نحن المصريين قدرتنا على تحقيق مطالب الشعب بالحوار المحضر والواعي، سنثبت أنه لنا أتباعاً لأحد، ولا نأخذ تعليمات من أحد، وأن أحد لا يصنع لنا قراراتنا سوى نبض الشارع ومطالب أبناء الوطن.

سنثبت ذلك بروح وعزيم المصريين، ووحدة ومباكس هذا الشعب، وتشمكنا عز زرعة مصر وكلمتها وهويتها الفريدة والخالدة، فهي أساس وجدها لأكثر من سبعة آلاف عام.

ستعيش هذه الروح فيما دامت مصر وشعبها، ستعيش هذه الروح فيما دامت مصر ودأم شعبها، ستعيش في كل واحد من فلاحينا وعمالنا ومتتقيننا، ستبقى في قلوب شيوخنا وشابنا وأطفالنا، مسلمين وأقباطهم، وفي عقول وضمائر من لم يولد بعد من أبنائنا.

أقول من جديد. إنني عشت من أجل هذا الوطن حافظاً لمسؤوليته وأمانته، وستظل مصر هي الباقية فوق الأشخاص و فوق الجميع.