INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH

RESEARCH ARTICLE

THE BODY LANGUAGE OF POLITICS: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE READING IN THE GOP AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE, AUGUST 7, 2015.

Dr. Ali Mohamed AlShehri.
Associate Professor of Linguistics, College of Arts & Humanities, AlBaha University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Manuscript Info	Abstract
	This paper focuses on the use of body language as an effective tool on audiences especially in the field of political discourse. In more specific terms, it investigates the nonverbal communication strategy followed by the American candidates running for 2016 presidency of the United States of America. As a first-class democratic state, the USA is witnessing a period of competitive debates, full of wins and fails, among presidential candidates. What makes a difference to the American people is the body language through which a candidate can win the trust, confidence and emotion of his/her audience. This paper is going to analyze how each of the candidates included in this analysis functioned body language to achieve and win in this Grand Old Party (GOP) debate as judged here by body language experts, political consultants, nonverbal communication experts, senior advisers and CNN contributors. The paper ends with the recommendation that nonverbal body language communication counts more than we may realize in achieving trust, confidence and success in public speaking.

Introduction:-

General Background Politics and The English Language:-
Politics is the process by which decisions are made within a group. Harold Lasswell, (1936) a theorist, has defined politics as "who gets what, when and how". http://enwikipedia.org.wiki/political

Orwell (1946) in his essay 'Politics and the English Language' says: In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible. Things like the continuance of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of political parties. (Orwell, 1949).

Politicians resort to language in general and political language in particular to rationalize what they do. Gross actions in various parts of the world such as "deportations", use of "atom bombs", "cluster bombs", chemical and biological weapons, etc. can be simply allowed to let pass through political language and argumentative statements. To do this, politicians use euphemistic expressions, "question begging", and "sheer cloudy vagueness". In politics, when thickly-populated areas are swept out by nuclear weapons, politicians call it "pacification". Replacement of natives by occupiers is called "transfer of population". Destruction of remnants and monuments is rationalized by excavation. Lots and lots of people are imprisoned for long periods of time without even a sentence or a trial. This language is against plain truth and against the slogans and oaths which politicians vowed to keep.

This is what goes on in most parts of the Middle East at the present time. It is the interference of the Russians, the British, the Americans, the French in most of the countries in their so-called "New Middle East". Natural language rationalizes these actions through the slogan "elimination and eradication of ISIS".

Truth and Political Language:-
In his Nobel lecture (2005), Harold Pinter explains: Political language, as used by politicians, does not venture into any of this territory [truth] since the majority of politicians, on the evidence available to us, are interested not in truth but in power and in the maintenance of that power(Pinter, 2005)

Pinter's mouthpiece says "history repeats itself". Pinter confirms what Orwell (1946) stated above. Pinter believes that truth is far from being used by politicians in their political discourse. He includes sheer evidence that politicians are mostly interested in power and the language of power. To keep holding on that power, politicians prefer that people "live in ignorance of the truth". Pinter believes by evidence that "what surrounds us therefore is a vast tapestry of lies, upon which we feed"(Pinter, Nobel Lecture, 2005)

Listen to all American presidents on television say the words, 'the American people', as in the sentence, 'I say to the American people it is time to pray and to defend the rights of the American people and I ask the American people to trust their president in the action he is about to take on behalf of the American people.' (http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/pinter-lecture-e.html)

Pinter (2005) here is showing that natural is full of logic that can be injected to the minds of people and can change their minds into the "make belief" state in which they are far from the truth. The user of a natural language can put people in a frame separate from reality. Moreover, people might seem having opium when they are doomed by some extremely competent speech writers like those of George Bush's. Pinter explains how politicians throw dust in the eyes of peoples to make them blind. Politicians put themselves away from reality. They purposefully ignore truth so they won't see it. They are interested only in power and in how to keep holding the iron fist. What helps them do this is language and the actual words they use. Through language, they claim mercy while acting brutal, passion while being indifferent, respect while behaving scornful and treating people with contempt.

The Language of Assault vs. the Language of Dialogue:-
Here is a clear comparison by Littell (1995):-
Language always forms a primary step before any political act. Even acts of physical violence are justified by the so called "the language of assault". John. F. Kennedy and Yitzhak Rabin were subjected to serious verbal assaults before their assassination, a thing which has shortened their life expectancy.

Using the language of dialogue, on the contrary, makes it possible for citizens to articulate sharp differences of opinion. The words of assault, vilification, mendacity, and incitement are out of place in the politics of democracy. Many confused citizens cannot distinguish the language of assaults from the language of dialogue. Seduced by babblings about "individual rights"" and "freedom", many citizens can accept any idea with rich advertisements. That is why language is very important in the field of politics:

Littell (1995) emphasizes that through language or through actual words in an advertisement, or a statement, any idea can be accepted even if it destroys a moral principle like peace or even if it kills heroes.

Political Discourse:-
According to van Dijk (2001), political discourse is a class of genres defined by a certain social domain, namely that of politics (Van Dijk, 1998b). Thus, government deliberations, parliamentary debates, party programs, and speeches by politicians, are among the many genres that belong to the domain of politics. In doing so, Van Dijk has limited the area of political discourse to the professional activities of politicians. He also considers such discourse to be a form of institutional discourse, that is, only such discourses of politicians are considered that are produced in institutional settings as governments, political parties, or parliaments. This means that an informal conversation between a politician and friend does not count as a political discourse:

Furthermore, discourse is political when it accomplishes a certain political act such as governing, legislation, electoral campaigning and so on.

D.W. Johnson and R.T. Johnson (2000) explain the purposes of political discourse as:
(a) clarifying citizens' understanding of the issue and helping them reach the best judgment as to which course of action will solve a problem (b) helping them reach the best judgment concerning the solution of the problem, (c) increasing their participation, and (d) socializing the next generation into the attitudes they need to be active citizens.

Van Dijk (2001) describes political discourse at the level of context. A parliamentary debate, for instance, is defined by the fact that the participants are Parliament Members (MPs), and that it takes place in parliament. It is also a political act of policy–making and its consequences are defined in the institutional terms of political decision-making. Laws are enacted and policies are decided.

However, the study of topics, coherence, lexical style, metaphors or euphemisms is a unique indication of such a discourse.

Thomas Jefferson, according to D.W. Johnson and R.T. Johnson (2000), believes that political discourse is the heart of democracy. They also consider political discourse to be the formal exchange of reasoned views in order to determine the most appropriate course of action to solve a societal problem. It involves all citizens in the making of a decision, persuades others and illustrates the most effective course of action in order to solve problems. Within political discourse, each alternative course of action is expected to get its due attention and be analyzed in order to reveal its strengths and weaknesses.

Political Discourse Analysis:-
Politics, Morality, and Metaphorical Language:-
On the one hand, written discourse is limited to the linguistic context.
According to Lakoff (1995), a large proportion of our most common thoughts and beliefs make use of an unconscious syste of metaphorical concepts:

Such concepts are often reflected in everyday language, but their most dramatic effect comes in ordinary reasoning. Because so much of our social political reasoning makes use of this system of metaphorical concepts, an adequate appreciation of even the most mundane social and political thought requires an understanding of this system.
He also adds that liberals do not understand the form of metaphorical thought that unifies conservative values.

The Conservative Morality: Moral Strength:-
Lakoff (1995) adds that the metaphor with the highest priority in the conservative mind is Moral strength. This complex metaphor has a number of parts:
Being good is being upright:-
Doing evil is, therefore, moving from the position of morality (upright) to the position of immorality (being low).

Doing evil is falling:-
The moral strength metaphor considers evil or immorality to be a force, either internal or external, that can make one fall, that is, commit immoral acts.

Evil is a force (either Internal or External):-
Thus, in order to remain upright, one must be strong enough so as to stand up to evil. Hence, morality is conceptualized as strength or power.

Morality is Strength:-
http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/467716.html

The metaphor of Moral Strength sees the world in terms of a war of good against the forces of evil.

In the conservative mind, the metaphor of Moral strength has the highest priority as it determines thought, language and policy (Lakoff, 1996).

To McGregor (2003), Luke (1997), and Van Dijk (1988), the written and spoken word is powerful and capable of uncovering social pains. In doing this, CDA supports those who are oppressed and helps them to resist illegal power, dominance, inequality, and bias. Moreover, peoples would be able to transform to better lives (Foucault, 2000) and (Anders, 2013).
Body Language versus natural language:-
Body language, on the other hand, perhaps is more truthful in the sense that although normal language is deeply rooted in ideology and rich in figures of speech and euphemisms, body language is not. The latter clearly carries more extra linguistic contexts. It can also be taught, and famous politicians get body language training. Natural

language is almost covert but body language is completely overt. A perfect coincidence can be attained when the speaker possesses a sincere personality and a clear manipulation of body language.

Samples of Body Language in International Politics:-
In such a study of body language, it is expected to show samples of photos of some influential political figures mentioned here in order to add other types of non-linguistic contexts. Those samples of political figures have caught public opinions glimpses because of their protrusion and stature. So, one can say: someone looks like Cameron, or someone else looks like Mandela or Obama or Regan, or some female looks like Andera Gandhi or Angela Merkil because of the impression which those figures printed in the minds of people who saw them or watched their photos. To reach the masses with ideas, passions, beliefs and care, politicians do not only know what to say but how to say it. They have to articulate "correct body language along with their statements", (Edwards 2013).

Cameron: Master of Gesture Politics:-
The first impression about David Cameron, the British Prime Minister, can be gotten by looking at this photo.

	With his open clear face, raising of the head, and showing his wide open pushing hands, Cameron closes the door, dismissing and pushing away illegal immigrants and telling them to go home. In this second photo of his, Cameron is the master 'in his powerful, practiced use of gesture when speaking', (Pitch coach, October 18, 2013).
	As the photo illustrates, Cameron's gesture, tone of voice and facial expressions count more than words alone. It is clear from the photo that the hand gesture looks too strong, carries a warning, and comes from a strong firm fist. In this third photo, Cameron's intentions drive him to frame his gesture this way by putting his fingers apart to show that the gesture is more important than the word.
	It happens, sometimes, that stillness and the non-gesture appearances convey "certainty and reassurance". This can be seen in the body language of the German Chancellor, Angela Markel, the most powerful female politician nowadays. In the following photo,
	Her "intent" is clear. The power of the personality is shown quite clearly through her serenity and the pose of her hand (Pitch coach, October 18, 2013).
	When looking at the above photo, one may ask about what is going on in the Russian President's mind. In terms of body language, Putin's legs are extended apart, his face seems to be calm, and he looks in good temper. The photo above appeared together with the "news headlines like "Russia Takes Over Ukraine's Military Bases, Officers" (USA Today). Despite the crisis the war caused to the whole world, the man is keen on

showing himself in a relaxing and confident position.

Experts' Views about Body Language in the American GOP debate.

Following is a coverage made by ABC News, CNN, and other news sources, and critically investigated by the researcher, about the opinions of body language experts (among other nonverbal communication contributors, experts, political consultants, and advisers) in which each of them expresses his opinion regarding the way every candidate tried to portray himself during the GOP debate of August 7, 2015.

A note about the experts:-
Joe Navarro, who wrote the book "What Every Body is Saying," is a former FBI agent who used non-verbal analysis to identify spies and gain counterintelligence. **JanineDriver** is a New York Times bestselling author who now leads a body language training at the Body Language Institute in Washington. And **John Neffinger** is a communications strategist who teaches at Georgetown University and Columbia Business School, and also coaches politicians to communicate more effectively.**BillPascoe** is a political consultant in the American Spectator. **Dr.David Givens** is a body language and nonverbal communication expert and is the directorofthe Center for Nonverbal Studies. **Jennifer Rigdon**is a nonverbal communication expert at the Washington University in St. Louis Olin School of Business. **Dan Pfeiffer** is a former senior adviser to President Obama.**Tara Setmayer** is a CNN contributor.

The Principle of Hands:-
Navarro said that the candidate Donald Trump used the "precision grip" which indicates "certainty about one topic or sentiment." Trump "is the only one that touches the microphone, which is a territorial display. It says that everything in front of me is mine". **Driver** said that Trump "keeps it real". He was acting like a little kid, to "like – what-I'm- saying-right-now", to "more aggressive palm-down gestures". He was "pointing and chopping', all his moves are all integrated which means Trump is being authentic". **Neffinger** noticed that Trump's gestures are smooth when he's confident and jerky when he is agitated … He's also overusing a particularly funny clown face where he pinches the sides of his mouth".

Givens wrote in The Guardian 2015 Aug. 7: "Nonverbally (through his body language) Donald Trump won Thursday's Republican presidential debate… His hand' gestures, facial expressions, and tone of voice dominate, and made the competitors seem ineffective, even wimpish". Jennifer Rigdon (Washington University, St. Louis) drew the audience's attention to Trump's "shrug".

About the candidate Dr. Ben Carson, **Navarro** sad that he "is the only speaker to steeple his fingers - touching fingertip to fingertip." This indicates confidence, according to Navarro, while Driver noticed that Dr. Carson's body movements tended to be "more free-flowing" in "a less-aggressive way". **Driver** also noticed that Dr. Carson "often kept hands in an almost-humble-like pose where he puts his right hand on top of his left hand like he's in a church". **Neffinger** said about Dr. Carson that he has "soft vocal tone, slow pacing and gentle motion"; which indicates that he is thoughtful and calm. The body language expert said that Carson "seems like a regular person, someone who might be a neighbor". When he claps his hands, he does this in an inward manner. **Rigdon**, of the Fox 2 Now, says that Dr. Carson' gestures tell of "some kind of internal struggle" and "lack of confidence in his own beliefs".

As for the candidate Jeb Bush, **Navarro** said that he "didn't do much nonverbally .. smiling toward Donald Trump". The two features that indicate care for people are nonverbal and passion. Neither of them is demonstrated by Bush. "He failed to convince through his nonverbal". **Driver** said that "Bush's facial expression appeared nervous". All in all he looked like "he just didn't want to be there". **Neffinger** concluded that Bush didn't "appear confident: stooping, wincing and shrugging". Now compare Bush's shrug with that of Trump's. Whereas the first indicates hesitance, he second indicates self-confidence and aggression.

Carly Fiorina's nonverbal success continued to progress, according to **Navarro**. She used her hand, arm and finger gestures together with her language. Her answers were fast and immediate. **Driver** noticed that Fiorina "smiled more and her body movements were more integrated" but that smiled disappeared when she was asked to reply to something she didn't like to hear. **Neffinger** counted Fiorina's smiles and said that she smiled once or twice. She had "confidence but not aggression, strength and control but little warmth or hope".

The candidate Marcko Rubio used more nonverbal and he used them with speed as "speed entices", according to **Navarro**. He used gestures and facial expressions which indicate passion and confidence. **Neffinger** commented that Rubio's facial expressions seemed "flat or uneasy". According to the CNN contributor **Tara Setmayer**, Marcko Rubio "looked relaxed, calm and presidential".

With the candidate Ted Cruz, **Navarro** believes that "Cruz was focused on one message and kept repeating himself. That is not good". **Driver** said Cruz's head "tilted to his left, which increases likability, but his hand gestures and pitch and tone of voice were aggressive. Generally, He was seen by many as "humbling instead of arrogant".

All in all, the above-mentioned body language experts believe that the candidates "were more passionate and gesturing", commented **Navarro**. **Driver** noticed that Trump and Casich "jot their shoulders out" as a sign of not liking. Driver said the rule of "angle our left shoulder to open up conversation and our right shoulder when we get defensive". **Neffinger** concluded by saying that "Overall, tonight's debate was a pretty good showing for the Republican Party. Jeb Bush looked awkward and Rand Paul looked unimpressed- - "low energy" as Trump might say- - but everyone else looked at least professional, if not quite presidential".

The Principle of Territory:-
In nonverbal communication, the principle of territory occupies the most important feature. Territorial display is a way of showing that the candidate feels comfortable in front of people (David Wallis, 2008). This principle applies generally to Trump's use of hands and arms. Jennifer Rigdon commented that Trump's shrug is heard and seen on TV screens across the world and continued to say that he "take a lot of space" with his hair gestures and facial expressions. In body language, this is an expression of complete confidence and overall dominance. Hillary Clinton's **"**use of the vertical plane by holding her head straight during the debates can suggest clarity and sense of priority of issues". Obama got more territory when "he held a baby within his face range to exemplify true connection with people" (Widdiecombe, 2008). The territory here covers the distance from his place to contain the whole audience.

The Eyes:-
Blinking of the eyes indicates loss of interest. Blinking excessively shows lying or increase in stress level. Avoiding eye contact is a sign of lying, guilt, or discomfort. Gazing continuously is a sign of threat. Maintaining eye contact with those a politician is addressing is a key to success in a presidential debates. Voters can easily discover whether a candidate is or is not passionate or interested by watching or following or spotting what s/he is looking at.

The Arms:-
When arms are held crossed by a politician in front of his audience, this could be read as a sign of self-comfort. Trump's "hand gestures, facial expressions and tone of voice dominated" while his competitor's "were weak ephemeral and often hidden from view along the body's sides or behind the podium" (Bill Pascoe, The American Spectator, 2015). Pascoe added that "On TV, Donald's big gestures, big hair, big hands, big jaw, big face and pugnacious lip pout clearly trumped the other candidates' smaller hand gestures, boring, close cropped hair, smaller hands, weaker faces and jaws, and unexpressive facial expressions".

Hands:-
Wringing of the hands is a sign of insecurity. Spreading a politician's fingers together with extending the hands is a sign of territory, confidence and authority. Folding hands with thumbs raised up is a sign of power and prospective achievements. This has been seen clearly with Tony Blair's hand gestures on contrary of Dr. Carson's hands and fingertip to fingertip position.

Feet and Legs:-

In political contexts, crossing legs is a sign of comfort with the surroundings and the current situation. In addition, when legs are spread out, this gives a sign of territorial display and comfort.

As shown in the photo above, the posture displayed by the presidential candidate, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, is actually meaningful. The politician stretches out his right palm while holding his fingers in a straight horizontal position. In this way, the man seems to show that he is decisive and firm. It becomes apparent that he knows what he is saying and what he is doing. Simultaneously, he seemingly attempts to convey the sense of responsibility to his audience through the body gesture that is seemingly used to point to the people watching him. A reading of Walker's body language by the nonverbal communication expert Jennifer Rigdon says that Walker "came across as incredibly nervous" (Fox 2 Now, August 7, 2015). But again she gives credit to him when she mentioned that he was looking straight at the camera which conveys the meaning of being passionate with the audience asking for their support, applauses and votes.

As a matter of fact, the politician in the above photo is conveying through his body gestures more than what he is doing while using his words. The eyes are wide open indicating the attempt of the candidate to show his intention to encompass all what is going on around him. Nevertheless, he is avoiding straight eye contact with his audience by raising his eyes up. This could denote that he is not a man who could face challenges easily. He escapes direct communication by blinding himself intentionally through his attempt to look at a vacant area in the ceiling. Furthermore, the position of both hands is significant. While the right hand is placed firmly on the papers kept on the podium in front of him, the left is raised vertically with its palm open. He is trying to keep what he has already got, while seeking more territory by his left hand.

Rigdon (Fox 2 Now, August 7, 2015) commented on Chris Christie's confident appearance as being a surprise to the audience and this put him as a winner. She called him "folksy" and "relaxed". He "brought the audience in", "inviting them to like him", through his way of leaning into the podium.

With the candidate Jeb Bush, the former Florida Governor, in the photo above, the principle of territory seems not completely achieved. With both hands raised up vertically, he is narrowing his space. He is not looking up straight. His head is leaning to the left hand side. Rigdon (Fox 2 Now, August 7, 2015) said that he "frequently shook his head "no" while giving affirmative answers-sending a confusing message to the voters about his opinions and authenticity". A candidate who does this is of course nervous and unsure. Tara Setmayer (CNN, August 7, 2015) says that Bush "came across as unsure, defensive and aloof".

When the principle of territory is applied to the candidate Marco Rubio, it seems that it is almost comprehensive. The man looks straight up to his audience. He looks passionate and careful. He holds the podium and extends his left hand for more space and territory. Rigdon (Fox 2 Now, August 7, 2015) says of Marco Rubio that his gestures suggest that he "seemed incredibly calm, relaxed present – and, most importantly, presidential". According to Rigdon, Marco Rubio is the winner.

Conclusion:-

In nonverbal body language communication image is important. This can be seen in actors as skilled communicators. It has been shown above that more than 90 % of communication is nonverbal. Around 7% is verbal.

Politicians use big words, Trump does not. In response to a question raised by Emily Atkin (Think Progress Newspaper) about Trump's natural language compared to other politicians, M. Y. Liberman stated that other politicians like Jeb Bush used big and politics-laden vocabulary items such as "strategy", "government", "president", "America". "Six out of 13" words used by him are monosyllabic, like "growth", and "state". The most recurrent word in his speech is "the". On the other side, Trump's recurrent word is "I". Another favorite word for Trump is His name "Trump". In addition, 8 out of his 13 recurrent words are monosyllabic while the disyllabic ones are simple words like "very", "China" and "Money". Finally, his salient three-syllable word is "Mexico". (Atkin, 2015).Tara Setmayer (CNN, August 7, 2015) says that Bush "came across as unsure, defensive and aloof".

Chris Christie seemed "folksy" and "relaxed". He "brought the audience in", "inviting them to like him".

Scott Walker seemed "nervous" although he was looking straight at the camera which conveys the meaning of being passionate with the audience asking for their support, applauses and votes.

Dr. Ben Carson was confident but he always used fingertip to fingertip gesture. He was humble as if he were in a church. He was calm, a regular man, and a good neighbor, according to the experts' views.

Ted Cruz used to repeat himself most of the time. This gave the impression that he was of a humble not aggressive personality.

Carly Fiorina succeeded to some extent in her use of nonverbal language. She used her hand, arm and fingers but she smiled more than she used body movements. She was confident but not aggressive, strong but lacked hope.

But when it comes to body language, Trump is dominating. Still the latter's use of natural language is supportive to his position. His recurrent use of the first person pronoun "I" gives an impression of self-confidence and dominance. Also, the use of both words "Trump" and "money" indicates his tendency to rely basically on his sources of power as a gentleman as well as a businessman. His use of the words "China" and "Mexico" indicate that the foreign affairs do lie within the scope of his interest.

And in order to be in close touch with the public, a speaker must be comfortable in front of his audience. Choosing from among alternative and compatible proposed body language portrayals, the winners can be determined. We have seen ore use of body language in Donald Trump's performance, namely his use facial expressions, eye-contact, shoulders, and hands. Moreover, his occupation of territory adds to his passion and trust with his voters. It is in the mind of the candidate to use all possible ways of body language to portray his likeability with his people, and he should be trained to that. Perhaps Donald Trump is trained to do that and this pushed him to be the winner when it comes to body language, of course among other things.

Rigdon, of the Fox 2 Nowand CNN contributor Setmayer ranked Marco Rubio as a winner due to his being calm, relaxed and presidential. Moreover, he looked passionate, careful and holding more territory.

On the part of the audience, and especially with the American people, it makes a difference. They are good readers of body language and of what each candidate portrays more than what s/he says. They spot the candidate from hair to eye-contact, eye-rolling, jaw moving, shoulders, hands, finger tips, legs, and toes. Extra para-body language includes body leaning, sitting straight, putting on glasses, removing of them, sliding them down on the nose, clearing of the throat, types of smiles, and repetitions of interjections. In doing this, they set rules for other peoples to learn the art of reading body language. Together with natural language, body language is actually effective in the overall success in public speaking.

References:-

1. Anders, A. (2013). Foucault and the right to life: From technologies of normalization to   societies of control. Disability Studies Quarterly, Vol 33, N0 3. Retrieved from http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/3340/3268
2.   Atkin, E. (2015, September 15. What Language Experts Find So Strange About Donald   Trump. Thinkprogress.
3. Atkinson, M. (1994). Our Masters' Voices: The Language and Body Language of Politics. New York: Routledge. (9780415018753).
4. Borg, J. (2014, July 7).   "Secrets of body language". Documentary Channel. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pWudObtwUY8
5. Burgoon, J., Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2010). Nonverbal Communication. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
6. Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.
7. Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
8. Cook, W. A. (1983). Introduction to transformational Grammar. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
9. Edwards, V., V. (2013). The Power of Body Language. Retrieved from http://www.creativelive.com/courses/power-body-language-vanessa-van-edwards
10. Gerson, J. (2015, August 7). Who won the GOP presidential debate-When it comes to body   language? Uffalussy. Retrieved from http://www.psmag.com/politics-and-law/scoring-the-body-language-of-gop-debate
11. Givens, D. (2015, August 7). "Donald Trump's body language dominates Republican debate". The Guardian
12. Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (2000, April). Civil political discourse in a democracy: the contribution of psychology. Retrieved Fromhttp://www.Co-operation.org/pages/contro-pol.Html/
13. Johnson, David W.; Johnson, Roger T. (2000). Peace and Conflict . Journal of Peace Psychology, Vol 6(4), Dec 2000, 291-317. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327949PAC0604_01
14. Lakoff, G. (1996, 2002). Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think, Second   Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
15. Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M., (1980, [1995]). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press . Retrieved from http://www.press.uchicago .edu/Misc/Chicago/467716.html
16. Lasswell, H. (1936). Politics: Who Gets What, When, How. Retrieved from http://enwikipedia.org.wiki/political
17. Lakoff, G.(1995).Metaphor, morality and politics. Or, why conservatives   have   left   liberals   in   the   dust. Retrieved fromhttp://www.rockridgeinstitute.org /research/lakoff/newschool.pdf
18. Littell, F. H.(1995). "The Language of Assault vs the Language of Dialogue". The Christian Ethics Today Foundation, December 1995 (Issue 4 Page 23). Retrieved from http://christianethicstoday.com/cetart/index.cfm? fuseaction=Articles.main&ArtID=259
19. LOU DOBBS TONIGHT. (2015, August 9). "Analyzing the body language of the GOP Presidential candidates". FOX NEWS PROPAGANDA.
20. McGregor, S. (2003).Critical Science and Critical Discourse Analysis. Vol. 15, No. 1.
21. Orwell, G. (1949). Nineteen Eighty–Four. London: Secker & Warburg. Retrieved from
22. http://www.strike.the-root.com/4/long/long.7html
23. Parker, M.(2013, October 18). Pitchcoach. Retrieved from http://www.pitchcoach .co.uk/2013/10/cameron-master-gesture-politics/
24. Pascoe,   B.   (2015).   "Nonverbal   cues",   The   American   Spectator.   Retrieved   from http://spectator.org/articles/63707/how-win-political-debate
25. Pease, A., & Pease, B. (2006). The Definitive Book of Body Language. New York: Bantam. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org /index.cfm?fa=buy.option ToBuy&id=1997-38342-007
26. Pease, A., &Pease, B. (2012). The Body Language of Love. Buderim, Qld: Pease   International.
27. Pinter,   H.(2005,   December).Art,   truth,   &   politics.   Retrieved   From http://www.Nobelprize.org. http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2005/pinter-lecture-e.html
28. Retrieved from https://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html
29. Struyk, R. (2015, October 29). "Body language experts tell us about the third republican debate", ABC News. Retrieved from http://abcnews.go.com /politicsdebate/story?id=34813392
30. This entry was posted in Insight, Topical and tagged body language, Cameron, Michael Parker, pitchcoach on October 18, 2013 by Michael
31. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). What is political discourse analysis? In: Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (Eds.), Political linguistics. (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
32. Van   Dijk,   T.   A.   (2001,   April).   Political   discourse   and   ideology.   Retrieved   from http://www.discourse-in-society.org
33. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, Ideology, and Discourse. Spain: Elsevier Ltd.
34. Wallis,   D.   (2008,   March   31).   "The   Body   Politic",   Brandweek,   p.   Retrieved   from http://youtube.com/watch?v=aRbBJiOjfdu
35. Widdicombe, L. (2008, June 23). "The way they move", THE NEW YORKER. Retrieved from http://youtube.com/watch?v=QDGOWGSSVDO&FEATURE=RELATEDs