

For my coursework piece, I decided to a newspaper editorial which had been published online. The piece was written as if it had been published in The Daily Telegraph, a right -wing middle class newspaper. I chose to do the piece because I am interested in c urrent affairs and newspapers, and I am a very opinionated person. I thought that a newspaper column would be a good place to share my opinion on the topical story of waterboarding.

For my style model, I went onto the Telegraph's website and found a newsp aper column by Boris Johnson, the Conservative Mayor of London. As a Conservative, his column had a slight anti-Labour bias, although it was very subtle and often humorous. I attempted to replicate this when I mentioned that waterboarding is classed as an 'enhanced interrogation technique' and quickly quipped that that was "more spin in one phrase than Alastair Campbell managed in an entire dossier" – a reference to the controversial September Dossier which 'sexed up' claims that Iraq had Weapons of Mass D estruction.

From that quote, we can see some of the writer's persona, seeing immediately that they are critical of the Iraq War, despite later making it clear he is a Conservative ("thankfully, I'm a son of Thatcher"). We can see more of the writer's pers ona throughout, by writing with a high register, we see that they are quite sophisticated and maybe slightly arrogant.

The piece starts with a graphic description of what would happen to a victim of waterboarding, but as it features direct address, it mak es the reader feel like that it is happening to them – "*you* have a bag over your head", "*you* are shackled", "*you* feel like *you* are drowning". After each description of the torture, the actual theme is introduced. Originally, my piece was going to follow a structure by which each waterboarding scenario would be followed by the writer's opinion, but before my final draft I decided that this actually distracted from the main point of the article, so I decided not to continue with this idea. My main argument starts in the paragraph beginning "Let's be clear on this matter". That sentence of "let us be clear" makes it seem like I know what I am talking about and that I am being completely honest. My arguments are further bolstered by listing officials who have disagreed with George Bush's claims, such as the Director of Public Prosecutions and the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights.

The summing up of my arguments begins with George Bush's original comment which sparked this news story. The language used in the ensuing four paragraphs is emotive, and reads almost as if it were a speech. It really attempts to put the reader on the side of writer, and make them believe that Bush was completely out of order. The story was published on the week on which Remembrance Day fell, so I as the writer incorporated this to try and shock the reader and make them nod sagely in agreement with me when I state that the reason we entered the Word Wars in the first place was to "fight for our lives and our rights", and then contrasting that by saying that Bush "a former leader of the free world" can say that "freedom and democracy... can go to pot if it might save some lives". The following one clause sentences have a short and long lasting impact by simply refuting Bush 's claims.

I enjoyed writing this piece, as it gave me a chance to put my opinions forward. Having my peers read my work and give feedback was a good experience that I enjoyed, as I like people correcting me and reading my work.