

Political Speeches of Some African Leaders from Linguistic Perspective (1981-2013)

Dr. Ibrahim Mohamed Al-Faki

Associate Professor
English Language Institute
King Abdul Aziz University, KSA
Wadi El-Neel University, Sudan

Abstract

This paper explores linguistic elements in political discourses in general and in political speeches, in particular. It presents some political speeches of some contemporary African leaders. The paper aims to contribute to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA), and the sub-field Political Discourse Analysis (henceforth PDA), by examining and analyzing political speeches from a linguistic perspective. The paper also aims to show how linguistic tools can be manipulated to reveal speakers' ideology and speakers' political stance. We use different linguistic tools for the analysis of the speeches. These include M.A.K Hallida's Transitivity", Herbert Paul Grice's Speech Act Theory", as well as semantic representations appearing in the political analyzed speeches. This study adopts quantitative methods to determine the presence of the examined linguistic tools found in the political speeches of some African leaders.

Keywords: Discourse analysis, political speeches, critical analysis, African leaders

I. Background

The idea of political discourse analysis had been approached by different disciplines from different perspectives. Our concern in this paper is the linguistic perspective of political discourse analysis. Politics has both wide and narrow senses. The simplest definition will be the one limited to the activities of institutions, such as political parties, governments and parliaments, in the fulfillment of political obligations. Politics is also conceived of as a struggle to gain and retain power among members of these institutions (Beard, 2000: 36). According to Bayley (2008), political discourse is a wide and diverse set of discourses, or genres, or registers, such as: policy papers, ministerial speeches, government press releases or press conferences, parliamentary discourse, party manifestos (or platforms), electoral speeches, and so forth. They are all characterised by the fact that they are spoken or written by (or for) primary political actors—members of the government or the opposition, members of parliament, leaders of political parties, candidates for office. A political discourse, therefore, is discourse in any political forum, such as campaigns, parliamentary debates, interviews, speeches, writing and so forth.

Chilton and Schaffner (1999: 212) identify political discourse as any discourse who's linguistic or other actions involve power or its inverse, resistance. Wilson (2001: 398) describes political discourse as language used in formal and informal political context with political actors, such as politicians, political institutions, government, political media and political supporters operating in political environments with political goals (Moreno, 2008: 34).

Overall, political discourse can be defined as the written or spoken language, verbal or non-verbal, used in politics to steer the emotions of audience to affect their opinions and attitudes. It is distinguished from other types of discourse, because it is intentional, functional, directive to a certain group of people, well-organized, and it is rich in figurative language, i.e., metaphors and similes.

Discourse is not a neutral representation of the world (Van Dijk 1988, 1992, 1995; Fairclough 1995a, 1995b; Fowler 1987; Mcleod and Hertog 1992; Downing 1990). Politicians make choices at different levels of discourse in order to represent events in a way that fits with their ideology. Butt et al. (2004) claims that "the very use of language is ideological"(p.288). Accordingly, the choice one makes among different choices matters.

The choices, which are made at any level (e.g., semantic, syntactic, lexical, etc.), could be used by politicians in order to produce positive/negative effects (Wilson, 2001) adds, “We not only use language to shape reality, but we use it also to defend that reality, against anyone whose alternative values might threaten ours” (p.34).

At the semantic level, Van Dijk (1997) states that one of the most important semantic choices “is to make propositions with positive predicates about the “self” rather explicit than implicit, rather direct than indirect, and stated rather than presupposed” (p.31). Also, Wodak et al. (1999) believe that in political discourse, the repetition of the pronoun 'we' is a “persuasive linguistic device which helps invite identification and solidarity with the ‘we-group,’ which, however, simultaneously implies distancing from and marginalization of ‘others.” (p.160). At the lexis level, on the other hand, choices seem to be “less overt operations, in the sense that they rarely go fully unnoticed by the listener or reader since they lie above the threshold of consciousness” (p.4). Volosino claims, “the word is the fundamental object of the study of ideology” (qtd. in de Beaugrande, 1999, p.259). He stresses the importance of lexical choices to reveal ideology; lexical choices carry the speaker’s negative or positive evaluation of the people, events, or actions (Sykes 1988; Van Dijk 1988, 1995; Fairclough 1995b). Politics can be viewed as "a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it" (Chilton, 2004, p. 3).

a. Aims of the Study:

The study aims to reflect on how ideology is embedded in political discourse of some African leaders. Politicians also use linguistic elements to have their message delivered to the mob.

In summary, the specific aims are to study:

- The use of politicians of linguistic elements to achieve their goals.
- The manipulation of politicians of texts to gain the audience to their side.
- The use of politicians of linguistic elements to have their message passed through.

b. Significance of the Study:

Research on political Discourse Analysis is quite extensive. This area of research has the potential to contribute to our understanding of political discourse in general, and to the African political discourse, in particular. This research will assess the attitudes and ideologies of political agents involved in the delivery of political speeches. The results of this research may be of some significance to politicians, sociolinguists and political analysts, as well as they may benefit the common persons, who have some interests to follow and underrated political speeches, with direct or hidden agendas of political speakers.

c. Questions of the study:

In this study, we raise the following questions:

1. How do politicians use language to persuade audiences?
2. To what extent have African leaders, chosen for this study, tended to be indirect and/or persuasive in their speeches?
3. How can politicians manipulate language to serve their ends?

II. Methodology & Data Collection

This study utilized qualitative methods as a basic technique to explore and analyse some African leaders' political speeches. The strength of the qualitative technique allows a broader view to be taken and made the research approach more flexible. However, the information necessary to conduct the study was derived and collected from secondary sources, concentrating heavily on printed materials, books, articles, magazines, the internet and periodicals

III. Literature Review

a. Introduction

Making speeches is a vital part of the politician’s role in announcing policy and persuading people to agree with it. In this section, we look at some of the most common features of political speeches and give some indication of how their linguistic methods can be analysed.

b. Common Features of Political Speeches:

Rhetoric is defined by Cockcroft and Cockcroft in their book *Persuading People* (1992) as 'the art of persuasive discourse'. The word 'discourse', here refers to both spoken and written communication. The Greek philosopher Aristotle (384-322 BC) wrote extensively on the art of rhetoric, seeing it as an important part of human activity, and so worth categorising and defining in great detail. Plato, on the other hand, believed rhetoric to be about 'the manipulation of an audience by people who were essentially insincere in their motives'. Neither saw rhetoric as concerned only with government, but as a factor in all humane communication. Although rhetoric, in the sense that the Cockcrofts uses the word, relates to all forms of human communication, the word has tended to be used much more frequently to refer to speech and even more specifically to a certain type of formal public speaking.

One of the most common features of political speeches is that it is the *skills* of speaking persuasively that are far more important than a personally held belief in the topic under debate. In competitions, for instance, debating teams are given a proposition and are told which side they must argue. They are judged on their rhetorical skills, and their ability to speak persuasively, rather than the honesty of their views.

Politicians are often accused of speaking claptrap. Max Atkinson (1984) traces the origin of the word 'claptrap'. He quotes a definition of the word as meaning 'a trick, device of language designed to catch applause' and for the sound-bites to work, the audience in the hall have to endorse what is being said by giving enthusiastic support. In other words they must happily fall for the claptrap. Atkinson notes from his survey of speeches that one of the most common means of eliciting approval is the use of what he calls a 'list of three'. Whatever the nature of the speech act, political speech or casual conversation, the three-part list is attractive to the speaker and listener because it is embedded in certain cultures as giving a sense of unity and completeness: 'on your marks, get set, go!' is the traditional way to start a race; omit either of the first two components and the runners are unlikely to respond.

Another common feature of political speeches is what Atkinson calls the **contrastive pair**, and what classical Greek and Roman writers on rhetoric called antithesis. Whereas the three-part list contains three parts which essentially complement each other, the contrastive pair contains two parts which are in some ways in opposition, but in other ways use repetition to make the overall effect. A good example of this is Neil Armstrong's words when he became the first person to set foot on the moon in 1969.

The context of these famous words is worth exploring. For days, millions living in the part of the world that was politically aligned to the USA had been watching television, waiting for the moment when the first astronaut would set foot on the moon. As Neil Armstrong was seen bouncing along the moon's surface, they heard his first words: One small step for man: one giant leap for mankind.

These words show a range of repetition and contrast across the two parts of the utterance. The repeated 'one' is attached to words with contrasting meaning within the same semantic fields - 'small'/'giant' and 'step'/'leap'. The first words in each pair - 'small' and 'step' - are literal in that they describe what he was doing at the time, but the second words are metaphorical, 'giant leap' referring to technological progress. So 'for man' in one half becomes 'for mankind' in the second. Each part also has an identical syntactical structure, which although conveying a sense of an action has no main verb. There is also a phonological sense of repetition too, not just because some words are actually repeated but because the rhythm and stress are identical in each part.

The use of **contrast and repetition**, then, can involve a number of linguistic features: it can include lexical repetition; semantic repetition and/or contrast including the literal contrasted with the metaphorical; syntactical repetition; and phonological repetition.

So it is now clear that political language, political speech, political rhetoric, and political discourse are apparently interchangeable terms that political officials, such as scientists, politicians, and journalists, use to denominate the relation between language (linguists distinguish between language as a vehicle of communication and speech as the use of that vehicle by a given individual on a given occasion [Ullmann, 1962: 19-23]) and politics. The distinction between these terms, as we believe, does not seem to be of primary importance for the scholar in political language (political-semantic) studies, even though the terms represent different traditions of study.

Political language is a term introduced by pioneers of both propaganda research and the social sciences. When the aim is to influence power, and there is some impact upon power, we speak of the political function of language (Lasswell, Leites et al., 1949: 8), and when we speak of the science of politics, we mean the science of power.

Propaganda: Both public opinion and social science associate political language with propaganda, the organized action to influence and lead public opinion (Van der Meiden, 1988:58). Both concepts deal with mass communication (public communication), but the focus of political language is on communication and its, whereas propaganda focuses on action. Besides, political language encourages a scientific attitude that is both neutral and critical; propaganda seduces us to neglect the less manifest and less purposeful ways in which people's opinions and behavior are influenced in society. Further, propaganda is an outdated term to denominate political language, because it insufficiently takes social-scientific developments into account. The negative connotations to this term are well deserved. Finally, I would suggest limiting its use to crisis, war, and totalitarian communication, which is, in fact, what pioneers of propaganda research (Lasswell, Lerner, & De Sola Pool, 1952) did. It can be concluded from the above that a general approach to political language benefits from a non-dogmatic position, in which most terms that denominate the subject areas (political language) are equally accepted.

The subject area itself, however, should be described and even defined. The concepts of politics and the political are items in political theory and political philosophy under much discussion, from which stems one of the most traditional viewpoints: politics refers to activities and institutions related to state organization (Gruenert, 1974: 2). Moderate viewpoints emphasize political functioning (Lasswell, Leites et al., 1949: 8) or the negotiating of power or social conflict (Nimmo, 1978: 6). The broad concepts often identify politics as an aspect of language. These are mostly inspired by sociology (Mannheim, 1960: 278–79) and cultural anthropology (Malinowski, 1944: 74–75). Politics is driven by instinctive mechanisms (Mannheim, 1960: 279), motives (Mills, 1940), and needs (Malinowski, 1944: 74, 75), and can thus be summarized as a satisfaction of needs. Situations are affected by particular motives, which also determine the vocabulary (Mills, 1940). Classic Marxist conceptions of linguistic philosophy reflect Mannheim's (1960: 239) concept of global ideology (utterances reflect social structure). Modern structuralists' concepts are influenced by Mannheim's (1960: 238) concept of specific ideologies. Moreover, the definition of politics considers it to be a political action, according to Shapiro, because when one makes choices, one starts by choosing words (1982: 3). Those who control discourse control society. Politics is discourse, and discourse is politics (Shapiro, 1982: 1–2).

Popular concepts of language tend to limit language to verbal or written utterances, contrary to scientific concepts, which generally include nonverbal utterances.

Politics, like communication, is a process, writes Nimmo (1978: 7), and, also like communication, politics involves speech. This is not speech in the narrow sense of the spoken word but speech in the more inclusive sense, meaning all methods by which people exchange symbols—written and spoken words, pictures, movements, gestures, mannerisms, and dress. Scientific concepts of language often identify language with communication or regard language as a purposeful means of communication (Schaff, 1960: 292). Both linguists and communication scientists consider language a system of signs (Schaff, 1960: 292) or a medium to exchange symbols (Nimmo, 1978: 70; Meadow, 1980: 22). When broad concepts of language and politics coincide, language is mainly considered a power strategy. This attitude again results from cultural, anthropological, and sociological insights. Social phenomena are always uttered (Malinowski, 1944: 23); these utterances do not necessarily include speech, whether spoken or written. The principles on which society is based are not always uttered in public speech (Mannheim, 1960).

Politics is largely a matter of words. Negotiations are held, speeches are made, debates take place, and bargains are struck. Beyond these oral discussions are other forms of political speech, where in written communications, such as laws, proclamations, treaties, and other political documents, are created. This commonly used concept suggests that political language is public communication on the subject of politics. One can find it in the language of newspapers, television, and radio (including parliamentary debates, mass meetings, party meetings), propaganda (including publications for elections and other political pamphlets), and administrative, judicial, and diplomatic language (including law texts, treaties and international political negotiations) (Edelman, 1974a, 1974b; Fagen, 1966; Nimmo and Swanson, 1990).

Some scholars developed even more restricted concepts, as they equated political discourse to polemic or argumentative language (Klaus, 1971) or to political vocabulary (Prost, 1969: 117), either separately or as levels of analysis within the concept of language use in politics (Dieckmann, 1975: 47). Others refer to semantic criteria (content) or sometimes to pragmatic ones (functions and effects) in order to identify political language.

Popular political language concepts used by the public, politicians themselves, and literary writers tend to be restricted to the speech patterns used by politicians.

Negative connotations such as demagoguery and lies are always involved. Orwell's definition (1950: 336) adequately illustrates these popular concepts: The political dialects to be found in pamphlets, leading articles, manifestos, White papers and the speeches of undersecretaries do, of course, vary from party to party, but they are all alike in that one almost never finds in them a fresh, vivid, homemade turn of speech.

Language use in the public sphere as a definition of political language acknowledges current scientific developments in international communication theory, focusing on the growing power of the mass media, new communication technologies, the trends of globalization and commercialization. This moderate view obviously has been inspired by the critical approach of communication theory, which acknowledges the political function of almost all public utterances; however, the editors do not share its emphasis (from cultural studies) on popular culture (Hariman, 1995:190), which includes television and news (Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992).

IV. Examining Political Language

Rhetoric, the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion (Roberts, translation of Aristotle, 1954:24), is the oldest approach to political language. Its influence on contemporary political language studies is a more direct one than Orwell's, whose thesis (1949, 1950) that political language can covertly influence political thought, indirectly influenced many literary and scientific writings, such as research in political communication, political psychology, and postmodernism.

Lasswell and his disciples (the brilliant pioneers, who, in their research on propaganda, invented scientific content analysis) were aware, since the thirties, that language is a powerful source of information for all social scientists (Lasswell et al., 1949, 1952). Their work, the result of a survey that began during World War II in the Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communication, was aimed both toward developing new research tools and toward offering effective aid on war problems (Lasswell et al., 1952: 26). While dealing with political propaganda and political newspaper articles (and other forms of political communication), their work summarizes the so-called quantitative-semantic and political-semantic approaches. Quantitative semantics was used to denominate quantitative empirical research; political semantics was used in connection with the study of style (Lasswell, et al., 1949: 8–9). In a modern version, political semantics is defined as the political study of meaning or the study of meaning in politics, thereby referring to both quantitative and qualitative research.

The pioneers were not the first ones who scientifically dealt with political symbols. Since roughly the beginning of the twentieth century, several works have been published in which the vocabulary of politics has been described (glossary) and even analyzed (Dieckmann, 1975). The first political dictionaries were inspired by the language of the French revolution (Frey, 1925; Ranft, 1908). They were followed by research on the history of the use of certain terms, their changing meanings, and the contexts in which they have been used. The scope of subjects seems unlimited. So are the viewpoints and disciplines about which later studies were undertaken.

As noted in the following paragraphs, France (Frey, 1925) and Germany (Radike, 1849; Ranft, 1908) developed particular traditions of political language study.

At the base of discourse analysis lies linguistics, which is currently practiced in the Netherlands and Great Britain. Part of it focuses, mostly qualitatively, on political discourse (i.e., media texts and news reports). Bull's review (Chapter 12) of current research on political television interviews in Great Britain reveals much about the demagoguery of leading British politicians during the last two decades. Also, Bull shows what a discourse analysis looks like. The leading journal on the subject, *Discourse and Society* (1997), and its Dutch editor, Teun A. van Dijk, consider such an approach a detailed, systematic, and theoretically based analysis of text and talk.

The focus on narratives, or the use of the construction of reality perspective, by many discourse analysts has been inspired by the sociology-based communications approach of British cultural studies (conceived by Stuart Hall [1980]). In Chapter 10, Sorley presents the fact that such an approach deconstructs the narratives of the leading Canadian financial newspapers. He illustrates the approach of the Glasgow Media Group and the Birmingham School in investigating journalistic bias (ideological and political functions of the media) through linguistic analyses of how the media—newspapers, television, broadcasting, and photography—treated various linguistic-processing subjects (e.g., reality construction in relation to women or minorities) (Hariman, 1995). The language of news reports by various newspapers, radio stations, and television channels was compared, sometimes in combination with other sources of information, such as interviews, surveys, and public reports.

Modern structuralism, starting with Roman Jakobson and the Prague School, tried to counter this criticism, but this intellectual movement is still being attacked for the vagueness of its concepts and for the ideological confusion that it causes (Schaff, 1978: 22–23). The success of the newly formulated structuralism started during the late fifties in France (influential philosophers are Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Roland Barthes, Jean-François Lyotard, and Jean Baudrillard) (Rosenau, 1992). Since the late seventies, modern structuralist ideas gained importance all over the world (Shapiro, 1982, 1984, 1989). Beer and Hariman (Chapter 15) represent the American postmodern approach in this volume. In addition, Beer and Hariman deal with international relations, a promising field for political discourse studies, about which the authors question the whole of scientific theory. The study of political discourse, like that of other areas of discourse analysis, covers a broad range of subject matter, and draws on a wide range of analytic methods.

a. Political discourse.

The term is suggestive of at least two possibilities: first, a discourse which is itself political; and second, an analysis of political discourse as simply an example discourse type, without explicit reference to political content or political context. But things may be even more confusing. Given that on some definitions almost all discourse may be considered political, then all *analyses* of discourse are potentially political, and, therefore, on one level, *all* discourse analysis is political discourse.

This potentially confusing situation arises, in the main, from definitions of the political in terms of general issues such as *power, conflict, control, or domination* (see Fairclough 1992a, 1995; Giddens 1991; Bourdieu 1991; van Dijk 1993; Chilton and Chaffer 1947), since any of these concepts may be employed in almost any form of discourse. Recently, for example, in a study of a psychotherapeutic training institution, Diamond (1995) refers to her study of the discourse of staff meetings as "political," simply because issues of power and control are being worked out. They are being worked out at different levels, however: at interpersonal, personal, institutional, and educational levels for example, and in different strategic ways (Chilton 1997). By treating all discourse as *political*, in its most general sense, we may be in danger of significantly over-generalizing the concept of *political discourse*. Perhaps we might avoid these difficulties if we simply delimited our subject matter as being concerned with formal/informal political contexts and political actors (Graber 1981); with that is politicians, political institutions, governments, political media, and political supporters operating in political environments to achieve political goals. This first approximation makes clearer the kinds of limits we might place on thinking about political discourse, but it may also allow for development. For example, analysts who themselves wish to present a political case become, in one sense, political actors, and their own discourse becomes, therefore, political. In this sense much of what is referred to as *critical linguistics* (Fairclough, 1995b) or *critical discourse analysis* (van Dijk 1993; Wodak 1995) relates directly to work on political discourse, not only because the material for analysis is often formally political but also, perhaps, because the analysts have explicitly made themselves political actors (see van Dijk, this volume).

But such delimitation, like all delimitations, is not without its problems. For example, how do we deal with the work of Lakoff and Eberhard (1991) on family discussions of political events? Is this political discourse, or family discourse of the political?

In one sense it is both - but the issue of which may simply be a matter of emphasis (see, for example, Ochs and Taylor 1992). While delimitations of the political are difficult to maintain in exact terms, they are nevertheless useful starting points. Equally, while one can accept that it is difficult to imagine a fully objective and nonpolitical account of political discourse, analysts can, at best, and indeed should make clear their own motivations and perspectives. This may range from setting some form of "democratic" ideal for discourse against which other forms of political discourse are then assessed (Gastil 1993) to explicitly stating one's political goals in targeting political discourse for analysis (as in the case of a number of critical linguists: Fairclough 1995; Wodak 1995; van Dijk 1993). It also allows for more descriptive perspectives (Wilson 1990, 1996; Geis 1987), where the main goal is to consider political language first as discourse, and only secondly as politics. The general approach advocated above would respond to the criticism of Geis (1987), who argues that many studies of political language reveal their own political bias.

The study of political discourse has been around for as long as politics itself. The emphasis the Greeks placed on rhetoric is a case in point. From Cicero (1971) to Aristotle (1991) the concern was basically with particular methods of social and political competence in achieving specific objectives.

While Aristotle gave a more formal twist to these overall aims, the general principle of articulating information on policies and actions for the public good remained constant. This general approach is continued today.

Modern rhetorical studies are more self-conscious, however, and interface with aspects of communication science, historical construction, social theory, and political science (for an overview see Gill and Whedbee 1997). There is some merit in this argument, but without opening up issues about what is and what is not linguistics, many of the earlier studies in *social semiotics* and *critical linguistics* should also be included in a general linguistic view of political discourse (Fowler et al. 1979; Chilton 1990, 1985; Steiner 1985). While language is always clearly central to political discourse, what shifts is the balance between linguistic analysis and political comment. Distinguishing the direction of this balance, however, is not always straightforward.

In more modern times it was perhaps Orwell as (Willson: 2003) puts it, who first drew our attention to the political potential of language. This is seen in his classic article "Politics and the English Language," where he considers the way in which language may be used to manipulate thought and suggests, for example, that "political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible" (1969: 225). His examples are types of inverted logic (reflected in literary detail in his book *Nineteen Eighty Four*) and they echo through much of the present work on political discourse. Instances include the use of "pacification" to refer to the bombing of defenseless villages, or the use of "rectification of frontiers" to refer to the relocation or simply removal of thousands of peasants from their homes. Orwell was concerned with a general decline in the use of English, and politicians had a central responsibility for this decline. They have a general reputation for the construction of what Americans call "fog" or the British "political gobbledegook" (see Neaman and Silver 1990: 320). For example, the American navy have described high waves as "climatic disturbances at the air-sea interface," while in the 1970s, President Nixon's press secretary coined the phrase "biosphere overload" for overpopulation (also called "demographic strain" by some government officials) (see Neaman and Silver 1990: 317-21). The British are not exempt from such excesses of lexical production, however; an anti-vandalism committee of the Wolverhampton.

District Council was given the title, "The Urban Conservation and Environmental Awareness Work Party" (Neaman and Silver 1990: 321).

However, it is not simply manipulation that is at issue in the case of political language; it is the goal of such manipulation which is seen as problematic. Politicians seem to want to hide the negative within particular formulations such that the population may not see the truth or the horror before them. This is the general thrust of Orwell's comments, and it emerges again and again throughout work on political discourse, but with perhaps different levels of emphasis and analysis. The influential work of the political scientist Murray Edelman (1971, 1977, 1988) mirrors Orwell's concerns and looks at the symbolic manipulation of reality for the achievement of political goals. In a more directed political sense Pecheux (1982, 1978, 1981, following Althusser's claim that ideology is not just an abstract system of thought but becomes actualized in a variety of material forms, set about studying discourse as one type of material form, Pecheux argued that the meanings of words became transformed in terms of who used them, or, in Foucault's (1972) terms, in relation to particular "discourse formations." Here words (and their interaction) in one formation were differently interpreted within another. Conservative or right-wing views of terms like "social benefit" and "defense spending" may differ radically from interpretations available within a socialist or left-wing discourse (see below).

The general principle here is one of transformation. Similar words and phrases may come to be reinterpreted within different ideological frameworks. Linked directly to this process is the concept of "representation." Representation refers to the issue of how language is employed in different ways to represent what we can know, believe, and perhaps think.

There are basically two views of representation: the universalist and the relativist (Montgomery 1992). The universalist view assumes that we understand our world in relation to a set of universal conceptual primes. Language, in this view, simply reflects these universal possibilities. Language is the vehicle for expressing our system of thought, with this system being independent of the language itself. The relativist position sees language and thought as inextricably intertwined. Our understanding of the world within a relativist perspective is affected by available linguistic resources. The consequences here, within a political context, seem obvious enough. To have others believe you, do what you want them to do, and generally view the world in the way most favorable for your goals, you need to manipulate, or, at the very least, pay attention to the linguistic limits of forms of representation.

In Fairclough's (1989) in "(Torode 1991:122) in view of critical linguistics/discourse, for example, political discourse is criticized as a form of social practice with a malign social purpose. The alternative goal is a discourse which has no underlying instrumental goals for any participant, but is genuinely undertaken in a co-operative spirit in order to arrive at understanding and common ground."

Examples of this malign social purpose are highlighted in work on the political discourse of what has been referred to as "nuke speak." As is clear, the very title "nuke speak" is formed on analogy with Orwell's famous "newspeak," where the assumption was that if one could manipulate or limit what was possible in language then one could manipulate or limit what was possible in thought. Chilton (1985) and others argue, using a range of analytic techniques, that in the political discourse of nuclear weapons efforts are made to linguistically subvert negative associations. An example from Montgomery (1992: 179) highlights this general issue (see also Moss 1985):

Strategic nuclear weapon - large nuclear bomb of immense destructive power *Tactical nuclear weapon* - small nuclear weapon of immense destructive power *Dower Enhanced radiation weapon* - neutron bomb (destroys people not property) *Demographic targeting* - killing the civilian population

In this example Montgomery is performing a type of translation in which he explicitly attempts to show how the language on the left of the dash is manipulating reality as represented by the translation on the right. For Montgomery, the language of nuclear weapons is clearly "obscurantist and euphemistic."

c. Syntactic Representations in Political Discourse

A similar and related point to that noted in Montgomery's work has been made specifically in the case of syntax (Montgomery 1992; Simpson 1988, 1993; Chilton 1997). The system of "transitivity," for example (Halliday 1985, provides a set of choices for describing "what is going on in the world." One such choice is referred to as a "material process," where what is going on may be described as an *action*, *transaction*, or *event*. An example from Goodman (1996: 56) clearly illustrates these options:

Actions (Actor)	(material process: action)	event
The soldier	fired	someone

Writers with a technical interest in weaponry (in a specialist magazine) might have an interest in obscuring the pain and destruction that weapons cause. Writers who are on the same side as the soldiers might also have an interest in obscuring their army's responsibility for the death of innocent civilians. Although Goodman was writing in 1996, we can note the similarity with Orwell's comments some 50 years previously (see also Chilton 1997; Stubbs 1996). While many of Goodman's claims may be true, Fairclough (1995) notes that such claims are often built around single, isolated utterances, taking no account of the textual or historical context of production. One might, for example, decide to present the sentences highlighted by Goodman by sequencing the events for the listener in very specific ways:

Announcement

Innocent villagers died last night. It was the soldiers who fired on them. It was the soldiers who killed them!

In the first sentence here it is the villagers who are highlighted, not the soldiers. One might argue, as does Goodman, that such a form obscures those responsible. However, not only are those responsible highlighted in the next two sentences, but the very contrast that is indicated by their exclusion from the first and not the following sentences might lead readers back to the first sentence to confirm their originally hidden responsibility. By inviting readers/listeners to revisit the first sentence, this small text may emphasize not only the responsibility of the soldiers, but that they have tried to avoid that responsibility.

Issues of representation, however, need not only revolve around specific syntactic transformations: without any seemingly manipulative intent one can achieve personal and political goals by relatively uncontroversial structural selections. Consider the general area of evidentiality. Evidentiality refers to the way in which forms of evidence become grammaticalized in different languages and to the attitude one takes or adopts toward this evidence (see papers in Chafe and Nichols 1986, since not all evidence is of a similar type. There is a complex interaction here between such things as beliefs, assumptions, inferences, and physical experiences (sight, hearing, smell, touch, etc.): *I saw John yesterday; I believe I saw John yesterday; I was told John was seen yesterday; it is possible that John was seen yesterday.* Equally, it may be that in some cases it is not simply the syntactic form which is chosen, but rather the relative distribution of particular syntactic selections which carries the political implications.

Work by Stubbs (1996) on the distribution of *ergative* forms within two school geography textbooks may be used to illustrate this point. As Shbbs (1996: 133) explains, ergatives are verbs which: can be transitive or intransitive, and which allow the same nominal group and the same object group in transitive clauses and as subject in intransitive clauses:

Several firms *have closed their factories*:

Factories *have been closed*.

Factories *have closed*.

The important point is that ergatives have agentive and nonagentive uses. This allows ergatives, like transitivity in active and passive sentences, to be used differentially depending on the ideological goals of the text.

Wilson (1993) explicitly treats such forms as discourse markers and suggests that they may function differentially in the marking of ideological contrasts. In an analysis of students' debates on specific political subjects, it is noted that "and" maybe used for either planned coordination (as in X, Y, and Z) or unplanned coordination (as in X and Y and 2). The choice one adopts relates to the way one wishes to present the elements coordinated by "and." In political terms, unplanned coordination is used where one wishes the elements to be treated independently (Scotland and England and Wales and Northern Ireland), whereas planned coordination treats the elements as naturally linked (Scotland, England, Wales, and Northern Ireland). (ibid)

This is not to deny the significance of single words or phrases in the discussion of political discourse; the aim is merely to highlight other relevant aspects in delimiting political discourse. But even at the level of words and phrases themselves, as Stubbs has shown, it may not merely be the single occurrence of a term that is important but sets of collocation relationships, which in their turn produce and draw upon ideological schemas in confirming or reconfirming particular views of the world. For example, Stubbs (1990: cited in Stubbs 1996: 95) analyzed a newspaper text of riots in South Africa and showed how blacks and whites here frequently described by different sets of words (see Wodak and Reisigl, this volume):

Blacks act in *mobs, crowds, factions, groups*. They constitute *millions*, who live in *townships* and *tribal homelands*. They *mass* in *thousands* and are followers of *nationalist leaders*. But Whites (who are also reported as committing violence) are *individuals* or *extremists*; by implication different from other (normal) Whites.

On a related level, there is a further potential problem with some of the examples of political representation noted above, and this is that relativism affects everyone, including the analyst. The descriptive and, indeed, manipulative element in analyses concerned with the way in which representation may become systemically structured for specific effect is not in doubt. The derived implications may sometimes, however, be more political than analytical. At one level there is a suggestion that heroic terms for weapons, such as *tomahawk, peacekeeper, Hawkeye*, etc. (Moss 1985: 561, or the reordering of events (active vs. passive), reconstitute the world for hearers such that the truth or reality of an event is subverted. I have no doubt of the general truth in this, but along with Horkheimer (1972) and Garfinkel (1967), I do not view participants to communication as potential "interactional" dopes but rather, as Giddens (1991) suggests, social actors capable of making choices, no matter how constrained the conditions. As Giddens notes, an agent who has no choice is no longer an agent. Equally, since the transitive system of English syntax is available to all English speakers, alternative ways of representing the world may not be interpreted by hearers in exactly the ways that producers intend. As suggested above, the transformation of a passive sentence in production into an active sentence in interpretation imperfectly feasible. Indeed, research into political information processing clearly indicates that interpretation is affected by cognitive bias (St Evans 1989).

c. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Background):

In this section, we first provide a brief 'story' – how it all began; then we present an overview of some important research agendas in CDA and discuss new challenges for CDA research. Secondly, we discuss the various theoretical and methodological approaches assembled in this volume from a sociological and epistemological perspective. There, we focus mostly on three central and constitutive concepts: power, ideology and critique. We also, of course, summarize some of the salient principles which are constitutive of all approaches in CDA.

In addition, we mention some important criticism which CDA has been confronted with in the past years (see Billig, 2003, 2008; Chilton, 2007; Chilton and Wodak, 2007; Wodak and Cillia, 2006 for an extensive discussion of this issue).

The terms Critical Linguistics (CL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are often used interchangeably.

In fact, recently, the term CDA seems to have been preferred and is being used to denote the theory formerly identified as CL. Therefore, we will continue to use CDA exclusively here (see Anthonissen, 2001; Chilton and Wodak, 2007 for an extensive discussion of these terms and their history). The manifold roots of CDA lie in Rhetoric, Text linguistics, Anthropology, Philosophy, Socio-Psychology, Cognitive Science, Literary Studies and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics.

Nowadays, some scholars prefer the term Critical Discourse Studies (CDS). For example, Teun van Dijk provides us with a broad overview of the field of (C)DS, where one can identify the following developments: between the mid-1960s and the early 1970s, new, closely related disciplines emerged in the humanities and the social sciences. Despite their different disciplinary backgrounds and a great diversity of methods and objects of investigation, some parts of the new fields/paradigms/linguistic sub-disciplines of semiotics, pragmatics, psycho- and sociolinguistics, ethnography of speaking, conversation analysis and discourse studies all deal with discourse and have at least seven dimensions in common (see van Dijk, 2007a; Wodak, 2008a):

We find notions such as racist discourse, gendered discourse, discourse on un/employment, media discourse, populist discourse, discourses of the past, and many more – thus stretching the meaning of *discourse* from a genre to register or style, from a building to a political programme. This causes and must cause confusion – which leads to much criticism and more misunderstandings (Blommaert, 2005; Reisigl, 2007; Wodak, 2008a; Wodak and deCillia, 2006).

V. Analysis of the Linguistic Elements Used In Political Speeches

We will give an account of the rhetorical devices used by the politicians in this study. This will further enhance our proposition about the use of politicians to these rhetorical devices when it comes to political speeches.

a. Rhetoric

The study of rhetoric is very important in political speech making. Rhetoric teaches politicians how to speak well; it teaches politicians how to present ideas in vigorous and persuasive discourse, and to communicate their thoughts and impressions effectively. According to Jones & Peccei (2004), “language can be used to influence people’s political views by exploring in detail the ways in which politicians can use language to their own advantage”.

Moreover, “Aristotle’s Rhetoric points out that we all employ rhetoric, the persuasive use of language, generally in trying to demonstrate the rightness of what we want the other person to accept.” (Joseph, 2006:110).

The power of rhetoric is using persuasive discourse to convince an audience. Persuasion is considered as the ways of using language to exploit feelings, to foreground or to obscure responsibility and agency, to repeat equal ideas, or to draw attention to a particular part of the message, as shown in Jones & Peccei (2004:51-52) and Inogo-Mora (2004:47).

Relying on the use of rhetorical devices, politicians make the impact of their ideas on the addressee increase to their own advantage. One of the rhetorical devices that politicians usually use in their speeches is that using suitable personal pronouns.

Cameron states that “one is the frequent use of names, especially first names, and another use of pronouns *I and you*. There is a preference for informal styles and registers, which connote a higher degree of intimacy or solidarity than more formal ones” (2001:132).

Jones & Peccei (2004:51), state that parallelism is “a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. This can serve to emphasise that the ideas are equal in importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which make the speech more memorable. In one speech, politicians always want the audience to focus on key features - salient points. And the parallel patterns of discourse are seen as a best choice “to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech.” (Jones & Peccei, 2004:51). With a similar distinction, It could be argued that (1) using personal pronouns in a group of two ‘*I and you*’ connotes a higher degree of intimacy and solidarity – it makes the gap between the speaker and the listener narrower, (2) the choice of ‘*we*’ is considered as a ‘bridge’ connecting ‘*I and you*’- making a sensation that the speaker and the listeners are the same side, and (3) using parallelism, politicians emphasise their key views, persuade audience to sympathize with their views, and make their speech more memorable. (ibid)

b. Metaphors

Metaphor theory was first introduced in 1980 in the book *Metaphors We Live By*, written by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. It belongs to the field of cognitive linguistics, which aims at explaining conceptual systems and language within the general study of the brain and the mind. This field draws on cognitive psychology, cognitive neuroscience, and developmental psychology. It attempts to unify those disciplines to explain as many aspects of language as possible, including syntax, semantics, and discourse (Lakoff and Johnson 270).

Metaphors have traditionally been thought of as features of literary language, especially poetry, with little relevance to other sorts of language. Previous work on metaphor has strongly suggested that this is not true. Metaphors are pervasive in all kinds of discourse. Moreover, metaphors are not just superficial stylistic adornments. They help us construct our reality.

Metaphors can also be looked into from the perspective of Functional Grammar. In the grammatical metaphor, a semantic configuration that would be represented congruently (i.e., non-metaphorically) by one type of clause is represented metaphorically by another. For example, what she gave him was that box would be the metaphorical form for the congruent correspondent she gave him that box. The reason for the choice of the metaphorical form is to select process type, transitivity functions, choices in mood and modality and to structure them the way the speaker wants it. It is important to say that grammatically metaphorical forms are never totally synonymous with their non-metaphorical counterparts; there will always be some semantic feature or features distinguishing the two (Halliday, 1985).

c. Grammatical Metaphors

Functional Grammar defines metaphors as variations in the expression of meaning rather than just variations in the use of words. In other words, Functional Grammar looks at metaphors from a different perspective, not asking “how is this word used?” but “how is this meaning expressed? Or “How is grammar structured to make the text effective in the achievement of purpose?” Once we look at metaphors in this way, we recognize that lexical selection is just one aspect of lexico-grammatical selection, or “wording”; and that metaphorical variation is lexico-grammatical rather than simply lexical. In short, many metaphors can be located in lexical expressions as well as in the grammatical variation that accompanies them.

Halliday (1985) explains that while written language typically attains a high lexical density often accompanied by a relatively simple grammatical structure, spoken language is usually grammatically complex and often accompanied by a relatively simple choice of words. Consequently, metaphorical complexity is typical of written language. In the case of presidential speeches, they are originally written texts delivered orally. Thus, since they are written texts, one might expect to find some kind of metaphorical complexity in them; however, as they are intended to be read out loud, they share more the characteristics of spoken than of written language. In spite of this difficulty, a few examples have been spotted that will show the way meaning is expressed metaphorically.

d. Ideational metaphors

In ideational metaphors, lexico-grammatical features are re-arranged to put forth a certain view of reality. They constitute an alternative way of constructing a picture of reality. As from the very day of the attacks on the Twin Towers, the American president’s speech stated the feelings of the nation as well as the government’s intention to confront and defeat those that had caused such great damage to the country.

e. Pronouns

The pronouns that political speakers use to refer to themselves or their audience can be a significant part of the message. They can be used either to foreground or to obscure responsibility and agency. Politicians who give speeches usually do it as representatives of political groups such as political parties, governments or nations, rather than as individuals. What they are allowed to say and how is often very limited, because one of the main goals of giving a political speech is to enhance the credibility of the politician in question (Irimiea 2010:4).

The essence of analyzing pronouns in political discourse is that they help in constructing identities, associations, actors and ideological groupings. Pennycook (1993) argues that Applied Linguistics has often opted for a rather bland descriptivism which tends to assume the existence of an unproblematic world that is neatly referenced by words in language-like pronouns- which are in fact very complex political words that raise difficulty about who is being represented. Bramley (2001) argues that pronouns are not merely a way of expressing a person, number and gender as is suggested by traditional grammarians nor do they only do deictic or referential work, they must be thought of in terms of the context of interaction and identity work that they accomplish.

Political speeches are supposed to increase the population's political participation, help them to understand important issues and how a problem is best solved as well as a way for the politicians to persuade others to have the same opinions as them. The speeches usually rest on the discussion and exposure of an issue and, most importantly, the use of persuasion techniques (Irimiea 2010:3).

Making speeches is the way leading politicians convey information and opinions to the people, and computers and TV have undoubtedly made it easier for the citizens (and other people across the world) to access those speeches. These days, although the audience is a key part of political speeches, the real audience is the millions of people reading the speeches in the newspapers, listening to them on the radio or watching them on TV (Beard 2000:37). When giving speeches, politicians have a tendency to present the positive aspects of themselves and the negative aspects of their opponents. One way of achieving this is by intentionally using specific personal pronouns, which refer to themselves or others (Allen 2007:2).

f. Analysis of personal pronouns

The analysis of political speeches begins with the particular pronouns chosen by each leader. Crystal (1995) gives the simplest definition of a personal pronoun as " a grammatical form referring directly to the speaker (first person), addressee (second person) or others involved in an interaction (third person)".

g. The use of first person pronouns

Personal pronouns are very much related to the relationship of power and solidarity, therefore the choice of the pronoun that each African leaders, quoted in this study, uses reflects this relationship of power and solidarity. Fairclough (1989), describes pronouns as "certain values that are encoded in different formal aspects of language". Throughout each of the speeches chosen for analysis in this study, choices are made by the leaders in terms of personal pronouns and this pronoun represents someone. Here we choose to write "someone" because the "target" is always different as will come later in the concluding section.

We would be inclined to suggest that the reason for this is because a leader is solely persuading the grass-root or the public audience; therefore the beliefs the leader is expressing are his personal ones. The other first person pronouns used are 'Me' and 'My.' 'My' is used when each leader is expressing his personal views and opinions. In his famous speech "I'm an African" president Thabo Mbeki cited an example for the use of personal pronouns that refer, as mentioned here and there in this study, to "personal" matters. The title of the speech itself "I'm an African" is suggestive of this sense of "belonging".

I owe by being to the hills and the valleys, the mountains and the glades, the rivers, the deserts, the trees, the flowers, the seas and the ever-changing seasons that define the face of our native land. My body has frozen in our frosts and in our latter day snows. It has thawed in the warmth of our sunshine and melted in the heat of the midday sun. The crack and the rumble of the summer thunders, lashed by startling lightening, have been a cause both of trembling and of hope... The dramatic shapes of the [landscape] have... been panels of the set on the natural stage on which we act out the foolish deeds of the theatre of our day.

Another example from the same text:

That I am born of a people who are heroes and heroines. I am born of a people who would not tolerate oppression. I am of a nation that would not allow that fear of death, torture, imprisonment, exile or persecution should result in the perpetuation of injustice. I am born of the peoples of the continent of Africa.

The Use of "we":

The use of the pronoun 'we' can become fairly complicated in that it can refer to a number of different people. Pennycook (1993) sees 'we' as always simultaneously inclusive and exclusive as a pronoun of solidarity and rejection, of inclusion and exclusion. Any construction of a 'we' clearly presupposes the existence of a 'they' or 'you'. Thus, by analogy, 'we' excludes and assumes a parallel 'other' exists somewhere in the text. According to Fairclough (2001), when 'we' is used by a leader inclusively as part of the led, it assimilates the leader to 'the people' possibly as a humbling tactic. See an example of the above:

'if we stand together, we will resolve most of our economic and financial Shortcomings'. (President Kabila's Speech, March 27, 2001).

The use of 'you':

'You' has a referential ambiguity. It can refer to a single or plural. 'You' has the potential to give the notion of discursual proximity and the notion of the addressee being in bond with the addresser.

'You' has the potential to be exploited for what Fairclough (2001:52) refers to as 'synthetic personalization' which is a "compensatory tendency to give the impression of treating each of the people as an individual".

j. Parallelism

When politicians want to draw attention to a particular part of their message and make it stand out from the rest of the speech, they often use parallelism, a device which expresses several ideas in a series of similar structures. This can serve to emphasize that the ideas are equal in importance and can add a sense of symmetry and rhythm, which makes the speech more memorable.

An example is:

We don't live in hope..

We don't have that culture..

We don't expect manna to come from the skies

VI. Analytical Framework

a. Introduction

In this part, some political texts of some African leaders are introduced and linguistically analyzed. Collection of the corpus was made from books, linguistic journals and the internet. The linguistic analysis we adopted is in accordance with what appears in next section "The Linguistic Elements". In our analysis for the political texts, we focused on the rhetoric, metaphoric representations. We also use M.A.K Halliday's Transitivity Model as an analytical tool, especially when the text strives to "hide" the "agent" by means of passivity. We put the texts in a numerical order starting from Text 1. The linguistic analysis follows. Sometimes two or three texts are presented first, all at once then comes the analysis. This only happens when texts share some common linguistic features.

b. Political Speeches Texts

The Texts to be analyzed are *italic*. Linguistic elements concerned are in **bold**.

Text 1

What we need, Mr. President, is not an imposition of solutions based on self-interests, but a consensus on the reduction of harmful emissions and a climate change regime that balances adaptation and mitigation backed by the transfer of technology and resources. We need to pay special attention to the three pillars of sustainable development, namely, economic growth, social development and environmental protection (President Mugabe's Speech, September 24, 2010).

Text 2

All together, we must safeguard our territorial sovereignty and integrity, as well as peace, to break with the Congo of old, synonymous with wars and extreme poverty (President Kabila's Speech, November 16, 2006).

Text 3

As the effects of the crisis are easing off, the first signs of recovery are showing and there seems to be a resumption of investments, I think we should envision the future differently. In fact, I believe that an era is coming to an end. To be explicit, I feel that the goal we should set ourselves is to make Cameroon an EMERGING COUNTRY within a period of about twenty years (President Biya's Speech, May 17, 2010)

(a) Use of the pronoun "we", "us" and "our":

We need to pay special attention...

I think we should envision the future differently.

I believe that an era is coming to an end.

I feel that the goal we should

Let us all put our shoulders to the wheel and begin to build.

The pronouns "we", "us" and "our" in the above is a strategy of collectivization. The choice of the verbs of senses ("think", "feel" and "believe") suggest passion and emotional involvement.

(b) Modal auxiliary: "must" and "should"

We must safeguard our territorial sovereignty and integrity....

We should envision the future differently.

The use of modal auxiliaries above shows obligation and necessity.

(b) National Unity and Nationalism

In text 4 below, the thematic preoccupation is national unity. Here, President Mill in his acceptance speech as the president-elect of Ghana *persuades* all Ghanaians to welcome and support his emergence as the president as an opportunity for transformation and change in Ghana.

Text 4

Change has also come to Ghana; let us all embrace it and forge ahead together with a common sense of purpose. Let us all put our shoulders to the wheel and begin to build a Better Ghana (President Mill's Speech, January 7, 2009)

Text 5

Together, rich and poor, developed and developing, North and South can and must truly hold hands and address the challenges of climate change and sustainable development; work together to defeat poverty and underdevelopment and ensure that every human being is saved from the indecencies and humiliations that are attached to the poor....and so let our actions speak louder than our words (President Mbeki's Speech, September 25, 2007).

Text 6

We are convinced that what has been achieved during the First demonstrates that as Africans we can and will solve our problems. We are equally certain that Africa will record new advances as she pursues the goal of a better life for all. She will do what she can to encourage a more equitable and humane new world order (President Mbeki's Speech, April 27, 2004).

In text 5, President Mbeki employs the modals of 'can' and 'must' to admonish Africans to collectively join hands to fight poverty. President Mbeki is optimistic that if all work together, there would be socio-economic improvement in Africa. The modal "must" expresses a compelling obligation on the two regions to ensure a collective effort towards socio-economic advancement. In the same vein in text 6, modal auxiliaries 'can' and 'will' are repeatedly employed to emphasize the willingness and commitment of African people to deal with their problems. In addition, he expresses confidence that Africans have the will to improve the socio-economic situation.

Text 7

To alleviate them, I invite and encourage a mutually beneficial economic cooperation between our two countries. I have no doubt whatsoever that if we stand together, we will resolve most of our economic and financial shortcomings (President Kabila's Speech, March 27, 2001).

President Kabila of Congo in text 7 advocates cooperation between his country (Congo) and Zimbabwe in order to achieve economic development in the two countries. While the first person's pronouns "we" and "our" personify and collectivize the African economic crisis, the modal "will" emphasizes the need for African unity in resolving the economic crisis to be resolved. This need for African unity and cooperation is also reiterated by Kabila in the text below.

We all know that some economic problems have been created by hidden forces that do not appreciate the African solidarity that Allied countries have demonstrated. It is however, my strong belief that these are temporary problems that will be overcome. To alleviate them, I invite and encourage a mutually beneficial economic cooperation between our two countries. (President Kabila March 2001)

Text 8

Ghana, therefore, reiterates her support for a global integration that ensures inclusive and equitable development and effectively contributes to substantial poverty alleviation, including full and productive employment as well as broad access to social services (President Mill's Speech, September 24, 2009).

Text 9

At the international level, I am glad to see that our Armed Forces are working closely with other countries on military activities in the region and beyond, especially in relation to peacekeeping missions under the auspices of the United Nations. (President Mwai Kibaki September 2006)

Text 10

*Fellow countrymen and women, these concessions are the outcome of **our** numerous campaigns, meetings, correspondences, and briefings on the new Africa and new Nigeria. It was on the basis of these efforts that the creditor nations saw with **us**. **They** had confidence in **our** country, its government, and its policies and programmes. **They** were satisfied that **we** had shown leadership on all fronts, developed the courage to take tough and at times unpopular decisions, but stayed the course on reforms (President Obasanjo's Speech, June 29, 2005).*

In text 10 above, President Obasanjo makes use of the pronominal "they" and "we" to polarize Western economic power and the new Africa (Nigeria). "They" refers to the West that possesses powerful economic might while "We" signifies the African leadership efforts.

Text 11

*As I said earlier, the sectors that suffered the most are commodity exports whose prices are fixed without **our** involvement. **We** therefore need to progressively free ourselves from such dependence by, where possible, setting up processing industries which **would** have the advantage of creating jobs (President Biya's Speech, December 31, 2009)*

President Biya of Cameroon identifies the necessity for Cameroon people to disentangle and become economically independent. Cameroon is a country that agricultural activities mainly contribute to her largest share of income. Most of the prices of Cameroon exports (such as timber, cocoa, banana, coffee, sugarcane) are fixed at international market, without active participation of Cameroonians. Thus, President Biya, in his end-of-the-year (2009) speech, recognizes the need for Cameroon to establish industries that would process these agricultural products and in the process create jobs. This according to the president will liberate Cameroon from reliance, enslavement and foreign domination. Thereby, it will make Cameroon advance economically.

Text 12

*We are calling for a new international political, economic, and commercial order; an order that is more just and balanced; one free of discrimination and double standards, and which achieves the interests of all; one which takes into the consideration the concerns and priorities of developing countries, and establishes democracy as the basis for engagement between **rich and poor** states, as well as achieving balanced representation for the developing world in the agencies of international organizations, in existing financial institutions, in global economic decision-making mechanisms, and in the principle international groups, such as the G-8, and the G-20. (President Mohamed Mubarak's July 11, 2009).*

In text 12 above, President Mubarak advocates for pure democracy which would guarantee Africans fair play in world politics.

Text 13

*Recently, **we** have sought to re-engage the European Union on the issue of the immediate removal of the evil sanctions that are hurting our people. But no sooner had **we** started the re-engagement than we realised that the European Union is far from being sincere, as the bloc keeps on shifting goal posts. The European Union and America are keen to have **our** people continue suffering under the evil sanctions. Let all Zimbabweans unite on this matter, and with one voice, continue to demand **their** removal. (President Mugabe August 10, 2010).*

Text 14

*Part of this agenda is employment creation for **our** youth. I therefore do not expect you to continue purchasing expensive imported furniture when **our** young people are making quality goods locally. **You should** therefore support **our** local furniture industry and help create jobs for **our** youth (President Kibaki's Speech, February 5, 2010).*

Text 15

*It is now time for all parties, particularly Israel, to realize that peace is the normal condition for human life and the only means for the development of peoples and advancement of nations; that oppression **can** never make security, nor **can** aggression generate peace. Permanent and stable peace **should** be just and even-handed, ensuring balanced rights and obligation of parties involved. (President Mohamed Mubarak's October 21 2000).*

Text 16

*In the process of strengthening and sustaining **our** democracy therefore, **we must** maintain constitutionality with responsibility and expedience when there are situations that challenge or undermine the tenets of what **we** have all strived so hard to attain. (President Obasanjo's Speech, May29, 2004).*

In texts 15 and 16, Presidents Mubarak and Obasanjo also advocate for a need to break the yoke of culture of culture of dependency.

At the presidential reception house in Asmara on July 21 2009, Isaias Afwerki, Eritrean President, spoke to Barney Jopson, the FT's East Africa correspondent, about international relations, domestic politics, military service, economic management, and western aid. These are edited excerpts from the interview. (Isaias Afwerki, Eritrean President 1991-2013).

Texts (17 to 20)**FT correspondent: Which people do you think are changing?**

Isaias Afwerki: Everybody else.

Text 17

*We maintain our policies and our positions have proven to be correct. And many who may not admit it officially are changing. Changing by denouncing previous policies and previous interventions here and there ... **I don't** exclusively mention one party or another as to whether they've become favourable to us or not. **I don't** think that's relevant because **we don't** live on the favours of others. **We don't** expect others to be very kind to **us** or very generous to **us** when **we** disagree with **them**. **We don't** like that to happen. **We** would like to agree and disagree, but **we** should respect the opinion of others and others will have to respect **our** opinion.*

This text is abundant with the use of pronouns "I, we, us and them", ranging between the meanings of "subjectivity" with the mention of pronoun "I" :*I don't exclusively mention one party or another. I don't think that's relevant.*

The pronoun "**we**" which is highly institutional in the text cited above, representing, as a whole, the Eritrean government:

We should respect the opinion of others and others..

We don't expect others to be very kind to us.

When we disagree with them

Text 18

We don't live in hope. We don't have that culture. We don't expect manna to come from the skies. We don't expect any administration in Washington is going to bring in solutions for everything ... We don't have that kind of culture. We're not even interested. We're not even interested in hoping. Hoping for something is disabling ... You cannot expect anyone to come with some miracle to solve your problem. And it's not interactive. It does not engage people on the issues because you will be sitting around, hands folded and expecting somebody to do it for you.

We don't have that culture. No hopes. No expectations. No dreams. Nothing like that. We would like to see real things happen on the ground and we would like to be party to those things.

This text, again, is rich in the use of pronouns, especially institutional "we" and this "we" is highlighted in the text. However, the first line of the text shows an interesting parallelism in "we don't", which adds a sense of symmetry and rhythm.

We don't live in hope..

We don't have that culture..

We don't expect manna to come from the skies (which is ideological and religious as well).

The use of parallelism in the cited text emphasizes the president's ideas draws the attention of the recipient or, in this case, the interviewer, and generally this usage by politicians makes the repeated words more memorable because of their significance to the politician concerned.

Text 19

You go and ask the Chinese on their democracy. *You go and ask* the Mauritians, the Iranians, the Madagascari. *You go and ask* Congo Brazzaville.

You go and ask the Hondurans. *You go and ask* everybody else. *You go and ask* people in Europe.

Text 20

FT: Well, let's look at it in another way then. Are people free to offer critical opinions of the government, if they want to?

IA: *They're free. They're free. This is a free country. This is a free country...* *I mean, I would have expected you to say something else had you been in Nairobi, in Lagos, other capitals, even in Europe, where you can't even move after five o'clock in the evening...*

In these two texts "19 and 20", there are good examples of rhetorical repetition: "You go and ask" and "they're free" and "this is a free country" to attach clarity or emotional effect.

Text 21

I am an African, Thabo Mbeki's speech.

Thursday, June 18, 2009 A speech delivered by former president Thabo Mbeki on the occasion of his birthday. (Thabo Mbeki: South African President, 1999-2008) "**Friends**, on an occasion such as this, we should, perhaps, start from the beginning. So, let me begin

The president started his speech greeting the mob by saying "friends" which shows a degree of *intimacy*. It is important here to note that greetings differ from one political speaker to another. Obama of the USA, for instance, greets the mob: "Dear brothers and sisters while Bush, the son, greets the mob: "Dear Americans". The two different styles of greeting reflect intimacy and *racism*, respectively.

Text 22

I owe by being to the hills and the valleys, the mountains and the glades, the rivers, the deserts, the trees, the flowers, the seas and the ever-changing seasons that define the face of our native land An example of a symmetrical rhythm that highlights a degree of belonging.

Text 23

I know that none dare challenge me when I say – I am an African! ...

Here president Mbeki uses Halliday's verbal process of "saying" - when *I say – I am an African*. The use of pronoun "I" makes the text subjective, stating personal viewpoints about his 'africinity' and 'Africanism'.

Text 24

I have seen our country torn asunder as ... my people, engaged one another in a titanic battle, the one redress a wrong that had been caused by one to another and the other, to defend the indefensible. *I have seen* what happens when one person has superiority of force over another, when the stronger appropriate to themselves the prerogative even to annul the injunction that God created all men and women in His image. *I have seen* the corruption of minds and souls [in] the pursuit of an ignoble effort to perpetrate a veritable crime against humanity. . *I have seen* concrete expression of the denial of the dignity of a human being emanating from the conscious, systemic and systematic oppressive and repressive activities of other human beings. An example of repetition "I have seen" to create an emotional effect.

The text above is also **metaphorical** in:

"I have seen **concrete** expressions of the denial of the dignity of a human being", meaning to say "stubborn , categorical and hard-lined denial".

Text 25

There the victims parade with no mask to hide the brutish reality – the beggars, the prostitutes, the street children, those who seek solace in substance abuse, those who have to steal to assuage hunger, those who have to lose their sanity because to be sane is to invite pain. Perhaps the worst among these, who are my people, are those who have learnt to kill for a wage. To these the extent of death is directly proportional to their personal welfare...

The text is metaphorical. Metaphorical devices are highlighted and underlined in the text. The president talks about people who are "abusive" and find "comfort and last resort" in being so "seek solace in substance abuse,". Normally, we invite people, be them close friends, relatives or even a bit distant. But inviting "pain" is a very subtle metaphorical usage "because to be sane is to invite pain".

Also, the president talks about the people who steal to “satisfy” their hunger, regardless of the means of the endeavour “*those who have to steal to assuage hunger*.”.

Text 26

*As an African, this is an achievement of which I am **proud, proud** without reservation and **proud** without any feeling of conceit...*

The repetition in this text is an indicator to the “pride” that the president feels of being African. The president is proud of his 'Africanity and Africanism'.

VI. Conclusion

a. Introduction:

This paper is conducted on the analysis of political speeches for some African leaders. Politicians under this study use many rhetorical and metaphorical devices. These devices have great effect in manipulating the mind of the mob, covering and softening truths and befogging the thoughts. Pronouns and lexical choices are also used by politicians as linguistic tools that are used to persuade and manipulate the audience.

b. Results and Findings:

The linguistics elements used by the African leaders are as follows:

Linguistic element	Number of times
Pronouns (inclusive we + subjective I"	28
Solidarity	14
Parallelism	5
Metaphor	3
Analogy	2

The use of pronouns, as can be seen above, shows the highest figure. The result concludes that the pronoun 'I' is used when the speaker wants to speak as an individual rather than as a representative of a group:

'I know that none dare challenge me when I say I am an African' . Text 23.

'You' ,however, is used by the politicians as a generic pronoun as well as a way for the politicians to speak to their congress.

'we' is used to invoke a sense of collectivity and to share responsibility:

" **We** don't expect others to be very kind to us or very generous to us when **we** disagree with them. **We** don't like that to happen". Text 17.

"They" is used to separate 'self' from 'other'. People are free to offer critical opinions of the government . **They** are free to do that". Text 20.

Solidarity is used 14 times by different politicians. This linguistic element is represented in the text by 'we'. This use of 'we' can be manipulative; it can claim a spurious solidarity, for instance, when a politician uses it to convince people that she is one of them". (Fairclough 2001: 12).

It is important to mention here that all the 'we' used by politicians in this study are inclusive 'we'. Inclusive 'we' includes the addressee to mean (you and I) while exclusive 'we' excludes the addressee to mean (he, she and I but not you"). Parallelism is used 5 times. Parallelism is used by politicians to reinforce an idea or an approach. They also use it as a persuasive device.

Modal auxiliaries and analogies are used only twice. Metaphors are used three times. To conclude, the use of solidarity is the highest among all the other linguistic elements used in this study. Politicians tend to use this linguistic element to create a sort of oneness between them and the audience. Politicians resort to solidarity as a persuasive way through which their message is manipulated.

c.Recommendation

The study recommends that politicians should use plain language so that a mutual understanding between politicians and audience would be established. Inferences politicians refer to and use in their speeches will become clearer and the 'message' which politicians run after will be easily grasped the moment it comes to the minds of the audience. But in all cases a politician should consider the audience he is talking, that whatsoever linguistic devices he uses in his speech, his intentions- direct or hidden agendas - would be easily understood.

References

- Aristotle. (1991) *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civil Discourse*, trans G. Kennedy . Oxford: Oxford University Press .
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power* Cambridge: Polity .
- Cameron, D. (1995) *Verbal Hygiene* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul .
- Chilton, P. (1985) *Words, discourse and metaphors: the meanings of deter, deterrent and deterrence* . In P. Chilton (ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate* . London: Pinter , 103 27.
- Chilton, P. and Schaffer, C. (1997) *Discourse and politics* . In T. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction. Vol. 2* . London: Sage , 206 31.
- Cicero. (1971) *Selected Works* , trans. M. Grant. Harmondsworth: Penguin .
- Diamond, P. (1995) *Status and Power in Verbal Interaction: A Study of Discourse in a Close-knit Social Network* Amsterdam: Benjamins .
- Edleman, M. (1971) *Politics as Symbolic Action* New York: Academic Press Edleman, M. (1977) *Political Language* New York: Academic Press
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power* London: Longman .
- Fairclough, N. (1992a) *Discourse and Social Change* Oxford: Blackwell . *Social Interaction. Vol. 2* . London: Sage , 258 85.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* London: Tavistock Publications .
- Fowler, R. and Marshall, J. (1985) *Power* . In T. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* . London: Academic Press , 47 63.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall .
- Gastil, J. (1993) *Undemocratic discourse: a review of theory and research on political discourse* . *Discourse and Society* (3) (4), 469 500.
- Geis, M. (1987) *The Language of Politics* New York: Springer Verlag Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self Identity* Cambridge: Polity .
- Gill, A. M. and Whedbee, K. (1997) *Rhetoric* . In T. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Structure and Social Process* . London: Sage , 157 85.
- Goodman, S. (1996) *Visual English* . In S. Goodman and D. Graddol (eds), *Redesigning English: New Texts, New Identities* . London: Routledge , 38 72.
- Graber, D. A. (1981) *Political languages* . In D. Nimmo and K. Sanders (eds), *Handbook of Political Communication* . Beverly Hills: Sage , 195 224.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* London: Arnold .
- Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T. W. (1972) *The Dialectic of Enlightenment* New York: Herder and Herder .
- Jones, Rodney. *Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By* Chicago: University of Chicago Press .
- Montgomery, M. (1992) *An Introduction to Language and Society* London: Routledge .
- Moss, P. (1985) *The rhetoric of defence in the United States: language myth and ideology* . In P. Chilton (ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate* . London: Pinter , 45 62.
- Neaman, J. S. and Sliver, C. G. (1990) *Kind Words* New York: Facts on File
- Ochs, E. and Taylor, C. (1992) *Family narratives as political activity* . *Discourse and Society* (3) (3), 301 40.
- Orwell, G. (1969) *Politics and the English language* . In W. F. Bolton and D. Crystal (eds), *The English Language Vol. 2: Essays by Linguists and Men of Letters, 1858–1964* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press , 217 19.
- Shapiro, M. J. (1981) *Language and Political Understanding* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Simpson, P. (1988) *Language and ideology* . *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* (7) , 166 88.
- St Evans, J. B. (1989) *Bias in Human Reasoning* Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum .
- Steiner, E. (1985) *The concept of context and the theory of action* . In P. Chilton (ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate* . London: Pinter , 213 27.
- Stubbs, M. (1990) *Knowledge about language: grammar, ignorance and society* . *Special professorial lecture* . Institute of Education, University of London .
- Stubbs, M. (1996) *Text and Corpus Analysis* Oxford: Blackwell .
- Torode, B. (1991) *Review of Fairclough, N., Language and Power*
- van Dijk, T. (1989) *Structures of discourse and structures of power* . In J. A. Anderson (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 12* . Newbury Park, CA: Sage , 163 83.
- van Dijk, T. (1991) *Racism and the Press* . London: Routledge and Kegan Paul ,
- van Dijk, T. (1993) *The principles of critical discourse analysis* . *Discourse and Society* (4) (2), 249 83.
- Wilson, J. (forthcoming) *Linguistic Forms of Political Life* .
- Wilson, J. (1990) *Politically Speaking* Oxford: Blackwell .
- Wilson, J. (1993) *Discourse marking and accounts of violence in Northern Ireland* . *Text* (13) (3), 455 75.
- Wodak, R. (1989) *1968: The power of political jargon – a “Club 2” discussion* . In R. Wodak (ed.), *Language Power and Ideology* . Amsterdam: John Benjamins , 137 63.
- Wodak, R. (1995) *Disorders of Discourse* London: Longman .