

**POLITICAL RHETORIC IN PUBLIC SPEAKING: A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF  
SELECTED POLITICAL SPEECHES**

by

**MAKORO SJ**

A mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

**MASTER OF ARTS**

in

**ENGLISH STUDIES**

in the

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

(School of Languages and Communication Studies)

at the

**UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO**

**SUPERVISOR: DR NE NKEALAH**

**CO-SUPERVISOR: DR LD MKUTI**

**2018**

## **CONTENTS**

Dedication	iv
Declaration	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abstract	1
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Background to the study	2
1.2 Research problem	3
1.3 Purpose of the study	4
1.3.1 Objectives of the study	5
1.3.2 Research questions	5
1.4 Research methodology	5
1.4.1 Research Design	6
1.4.2 Sampling	6
1.4.3 Data collection	8
1.4.4 Data analysis	8
1.5 Credibility	9
1.6 Ethical considerations	9
1.7 Significance of the study	9
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Language and power	11
2.2 Brooks and Warren (1970)	11
2.3 Cohen (1998)	12
2.4 Brummette (2006)	13

2.5	Horne and Heinemann (2006)	14
2.6	Lucas (2012)	15
2.7	De Wet (2013)	16
2.8	Summary	16
2.9	Conclusion	17

**CHAPTER THREE: ANALYSES OF POLITICAL SPEECHES BY BARACK OBAMA AND NELSON MANDELA** **18**

3.1	Introduction	18
3.2	Speech by Barack Obama (2009)	18
3.2.1	Introduction to Barack Obama	18
3.2.2	Analysis of speech by Barack Obama	20
3.3	Speech by Nelson Mandela (1994)	24
3.3.1	Introduction to Nelson Mandela	24
3.3.2	Analysis of speech by Nelson Mandela	25
3.4	Summary	31
3.5	Conclusion	32

**CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSES OF SPEECHES BY THABO MBEKI, MUHAMMADU BUHARI AND MMUSI MAIMANE** **33**

4.1	Introduction	33
4.2	Speech by Thabo Mbeki (1996)	34
4.2.1	Thabo Mbeki's biography	34
4.2.2	Analysis of speech by Thabo Mbeki	36
4.3	Speech by Muhammadu Buhari (2015)	43
4.3.1	Muhammadu Buhari's biography	43
4.3.2	Analysis of speech by Muhammadu Buhari	45
4.4	Speech by Mmusi Maimane (2015)	55
4.4.1	Mmusi Maimane's biography	55

4.4.2	Analysis of speech by Mmusi Maimane	55
4.5	Summary	65
4.6	Conclusion	66
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>67</b>
5.1	Summary of findings	67
5.2	Conclusion	68
5.3	Recommendations	69
REFERENCES		70
APPENDICES		73
APPENDIX A: BARACK OBAMA’S INAUGURATION SPEECH (2009)		73
APPENDIX B: NELSON MANDELA’S INAUGURATION SPEECH (1994)		81
APPENDIX C: THABO MBEKI’S SPEECH – “I AM AN AFRICAN” (1996)		85
APPENDIX D: MUHAMMADU BUHARI’S INAUGURATION SPEECH (2015)		92
APPENDIX E: MMUSI MAIMANE’S SPEECH IN RESPONSE TO SONA 2015 (2015)		98

## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to my late father, Mashaba William Makoro (09/05/1918-08/08/2013). May his soul rest in peace.

## DECLARATION

I declare that this mini-dissertation titled **RHETORIC IN PUBLIC SPEAKING: A STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF SELECTED POLITICAL SPEECHES** is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references and that this work has not been submitted before for any other degree at any other institution.

Name: Seshego John Makoro

████████████████████

Signature: -----

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I wholeheartedly believe that my success as an individual is the result of my dependence on others, and their co-operation has led to this achievement.

I am deeply grateful for the motivation and wisdom of the men and women who, through their efforts, commitment, dedication, corrections and instruction, unearthed the talent in me which I did not know I had.

I am also thankful to all the friends and relatives who had been thrilled with an ungovernable excitement by my success. I feel a deep sense of gratitude for the development and production of this study to the following people:

My late father, William Mashaba, and my son, Mashaba Makoro, for their patience and support during my studies. Being a single parent, doing domestic chores and also attending to the daily needs of my aged and blind father was not child's play. Despite all these difficulties, the two of you always remained my mainstay. I love you. You know the rest.

Dr Naomi Nkealah, the diligent and gifted supervisor and advisor who shepherded me through this study from the beginning to its current form. You are an asset to any prospective student and may your talent and creative powers blossom and pave a way for you in the world.

Dr Lukas Mkuti, my co-supervisor whose input on my earlier choice of political speeches was instrumental in determining the direction this work has taken. Thank you for your contribution to my work.

Dr Boledi Melita Moloto, for believing in me and constantly reminding me of the commitment and dedication that my studies required, while patiently urging me to keep to the schedule and meet the deadlines set for the completion of my work. I must admit that you turned my pains into gains. Thank you.

Mr Tlou Masehela, you have been such a prolific provider of articles and journals for my studies. Your computer wizardry enabled me to get relevant study materials for my work. You are a star! Thank you.

Mr Marishane (Dikotla) Lengana Caspa of Unit C, Mankweng. You always provided me with a tranquil place for my examination preparation, big brother. You were so

hospitable that you made your home my other home away from home. Thank you.  
God bless you.

Mr Malatjie Edgar, for your motivation and inspiration during my studies. Your academic support did not go unnoticed.

Above all, God of Mount Zion, for the spiritual guidance given to me when all human effort failed me.



## **ABSTRACT**

This study contributes to the rekindled interest in rhetoric in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with the rise of important politicians on the world stage. It investigates the different rhetorical devices used by politicians to get their audiences to consent to their ideas. Selected political speeches analysed in this study highlight the different rhetorical techniques used by notable politicians in public speaking platforms. These techniques include the use of plural pronouns, repetition, allusion, rhetorical questions, negation, comparatives, present and future tense, hyperbole, and personification. The political speeches analysed here are Barack Obama's inauguration speech (2009), Nelson Mandela's inauguration speech (1994), Thabo Mbeki's "I am an African" speech (1996), Muhammadu Buhari's inauguration speech (2015), and Mmusi Maimane's SONA Debate speech (2015). The study found that all the five speeches make use of the identified rhetorical devices to 'sell' their ideas to their listeners and canvass their support.

The study clarifies the concept of rhetoric in public speaking and also explains why people (listeners) may be persuaded by politicians to 'buy' their ideas, conveyed through manipulative political language. It is imperative that people be made aware of the influence that political rhetoric could have on their decision-making, particularly when public opinion is formed regarding events announced on public media. Members of the public or prospective voters will be able to distinguish the truth from falsehood, if they are familiar with the elements of rhetoric in political speeches. Politicians are likely to be stopped in their tracks from betraying public trust for personal gains. It is also important to realise that there is nothing wrong if politicians apply rhetoric in public speaking, as long as they have no intention of deceiving the listeners. However, modern-day politicians seem to use it differently. This study has identified various rhetorical devices used in the selected speeches that provide some understanding of how other terms such as persuasion and manipulation are related to rhetoric.

**Key words:** language and power, manipulation, persuasion, politicians, political rhetoric, public speaking.

## **CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

Stylistics does not have a universally acceptable definition as many scholars have their own definitions (Olateju 2012). Hendricks (1974:7) used the term stylolinguistics for stylistics, and defines it as the “act of bringing linguistics theory and methodology to bear on specific literary problems”. Widdowson (1996) describes it as the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation. Leech and Short (1981:13) describe stylistics as “the linguistic style”. Finally, Fowler (1981:24) refers to it as a type of criticism that makes use of the “concept and methodology of linguistics”. What these definitions have in common is that stylistics deals with the functional aspects of a language, and how language can be interpreted to reconstruct the writer’s or speaker’s intended message as literary or non-literary discourse.

Literary stylistics looks at the language of literary texts. According to Nkealah (2012:353), when studying a literary text “an analysis of form – language, structure, symbols – should not be pursued independently of an evaluation of content since both are equally instrumental in conveying meaning and highlighting the aesthetic value of a work of art”. This means that in literary stylistics, language is analysed in the context of the ideologies of the writer (Nkealah 2012). According to Bradford (1997:13), stylistics offers itself as “an easily definable activity with specific functions and objectives; stylistics enables us to identify and name the distinguishing features of literary texts”.

Bradford (1997) explains further that when language is used in the real world, the general understanding of what a word means is supplemented by a number of contextual and situational issues. Language, thus, becomes an enabling device that allows individuals to “articulate the sequence of choices, decisions, responses, acts and consequences that make up our daily lives” (Bradford 1997:13).

Stylistics is also pursued in non-literary studies. Rhetoric is a genre of stylistics that centres on non-literary communication. It is clear that the ability to communicate persuasively is vitally important not only to the politicians but to all persons involved in public speaking, for the purpose of promoting a particular cause. There is a notable connection between stylistics and rhetoric. Bradford (1997:13) states the following:

The connection between rhetoric and stylistics is that rhetoric was taught as part of grammar in post-renaissance education, and stylistics as a choice of words in exploring strategies and devices used in analysing different functions of convincing, arguing and persuading.

Bradford's statement suggests that rhetoric as a genre of stylistics was taught in Roman post-renaissance period specifically as a form of super grammar to provide speakers with the persuasive and argumentative skills that are part of the stylistic devices used in everyday linguistic exchange.

Bradford (1997) further notes that the term rhetoric is derived from the Greek expression *techne rhetorike*, which means the art of speech – an art concerned with the use of public speaking as a means of persuasion. As a practice, rhetoric has been used by political leaders from time immemorial to canvass support for their political agendas. It is clear that there is a connection between political rhetoric in public speaking and Bradford's view (on Plato's thesis) that rhetoric is regarded as a real world weapon used to get listeners involved in arguments that only satisfy the speaker's personal interest but has no link with the truth. It appears that politicians employ this rhetoric and linguistic strategy in their speeches to support their ideas and to win the support of their audiences. Thus, rhetoric presents itself as an important subject for study in present-day South Africa where multiple political parties exist, each canvassing support for its agenda.

## **1.2. RESEARCH PROBLEM**

The study investigates elements of rhetoric in political speeches as a way of understanding the alluring power of language in maintaining a system of domination. In ancient Greece, rhetoric was not meant to deceive people. However, modern-day politicians seem to apply it differently. Brook and

Warren (1970:238) warn that “the art of rhetoric and persuasion can be put to destructive uses if practiced by unscrupulous men”. In addition to the ideas expressed by these authors, Lucas (2012) cites the example of Adolf Hitler who was a renowned persuasive speaker but whose political ideologies were inhumane. He states: “Adolf Hitler was unquestionably a persuasive speaker. His oratory galvanized the German people into following one ideal and one leader. But his aims were horrifying and his tactics despicable” (Lucas 2012:35). Lucas therefore concludes that “[Hitler] remains to this day the ultimate example of why the power of the spoken word needs to be guided by a strong sense of ethical integrity” (Lucas 2012:35). Hitler’s case illustrates the power of rhetoric in winning public support even for causes that are detrimental to humanity’s well-being. This could be the reason why so many politicians have betrayed the public trust for personal gain, why business leaders defraud investors of millions of dollars, and why preachers focus on increasing church membership at the expense of their religious duties. This dynamic indicates the power of language as part of political rhetoric.

In a number of African countries, deplorable conditions exist particularly in rural areas. Yet, people continue to vote politicians into power even when they know that what the politicians are saying is far from the truth. Regardless of the empty promises, people continue to believe that there is a better tomorrow. What is it that politicians do to convince them? Surely, there must be something in the politicians’ language that exerts power over the people. This study identifies the rhetorical elements in the speeches of selected politicians, and assesses the effectiveness of these devices in persuading and manipulating audiences during public speaking.

### **1.3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of the study is to investigate the different rhetorical devices used by politicians to convince the listeners or audience to accede to their ideas. This is done through a stylistic analysis of selected political speeches. The following political speeches have been identified for analysis:

- i) Barack Obama’s Inaugural Address, 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009.

- ii) Nelson Mandela's Inaugural Address as State President, 10<sup>th</sup> May 1994.
- iii) "I am an African" Speech by the former Vice-President Thabo Mbeki at the adoption of South Africa's Constitution Bill, 8<sup>th</sup> May 1996, on behalf of the African National Congress (ANC) in Cape Town.
- iv) President Muhammadu Buhari's speech following his swearing in as President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 29<sup>th</sup> May 2015.
- v) Democratic Alliance (DA) leader, Mmusi Maimane's speech during the State of the Nation's Address debate, "A broken man presiding over a broken society", 17<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

The above speeches have been selected because of their historical significance and relevance to the power of rhetoric, and for the simple reason that they provide fertile textual material for stylistic analysis.

#### **1.3.1. Objectives of the study**

The study has the following objectives:

- i) To identify and explain the various rhetorical devices used by politicians in public speaking.
- ii) To establish the kind of discourses created through this kind of rhetoric.

#### **1.3.2. Research questions**

This study is guided by the following research questions:

- i) What rhetorical devices do politicians use in public speaking?
- ii) What kind of discourses are created through this kind of rhetoric?

### **1.4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study employs a qualitative research design. In the second edition of their handbook of qualitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (2002:3) offer the following definition of qualitative research:

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretative material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes,

interviews, observations, photographs, memos and recordings to the self.

At this level, qualitative research studies the natural world or the world as it is, and this method of enquiry aligns well with the dynamics of the present study.

#### **1.4.1. Research design**

According to Leedy and Omrod (2013), there are several common research designs in qualitative research. They are as follows: case study, ethnography, phenomenology, grounded theory and content analysis. A case study, also called idiographic research, studies a particular or specific event in-depth for a prescribed period of time. For example, an educator may study and analyse instructional strategies for basic grammar rules. The purpose of ethnography is to understand how behaviour reflects the culture of a particular group. Ethnography focuses on a specific field site (in which a group of people share a common culture) and methods of data collection which include participation, observation and structured interviews. Phenomenological study aims to understand an experience from a participant's point of view. The design focuses on a particular phenomenon as it is perceived by human beings. Grounded theory is aimed at deriving a theory that focuses on a process including human actions, and how they result from the influence thereof. Lastly, content analysis identifies a specific body of material and focuses on the verbal and visual form of communication (Leedy and Omrod 2013). This study uses content analysis as its research design, since it has identified a body of political speeches which it subjects to in-depth analysis.

#### **1.4.2. Sampling**

Sampling is a process whereby a researcher chooses particular entities for analysis from many resources drawn from data collected. Sampling can be random, where the selection is done simply on the basis of representativeness, or purposive, where the selection is carefully targeted at particular entities (Leedy and Ormrod 2013). The researcher uses purposive sampling for this study, as this was necessitated by the goal to select the speeches of politicians who have been recorded as making a history in world

politics. The sampling thus enables the researcher to present a unique selection of political speeches. A total of five speeches have been sampled.

**1.4.2.1. Barack Obama’s Inaugural Address, 20 January 2009**

The reason for the selection of this speech is that in the entire American political history, there was never any black person elected as the president of the United States of America before. Barack Obama is the first African-American to rule as president of the USA. In addition, Obama is one of the world’s most renowned politicians with impressive oratory skills.

**1.4.2.2. Nelson Mandela’s Inaugural Speech, 10 May 1994**

Nelson Mandela’s speech is relevant to this study because he was a good orator and people enjoyed listening to him, particularly his famous trademark concluding phrase “I thank you” in most of his speeches. Some of his words are still being quoted today in books and on TV, for example, “It always seems impossible until it is done”. Like Obama, Mandela made world history as the first black man to rule the Republic of South Africa as it is known today.

**1.4.2.3. “I am an African” speech by former Vice President Thabo Mbeki on the adoption of South Africa’s Constitution Bill, 8 May 1996, on behalf of the African National Congress (ANC) in Cape Town**

The speech was delivered by the then Deputy President, Thabo Mbeki, in 1996 when the new constitution was adopted with Nelson Mandela as state president. The speech is unique because it outlines a new concept of national identity for South Africa and creates a sense of belonging by making references to South African history. Mbeki’s speech has been quoted in numerous speeches both locally and abroad. The speech makes Mbeki a renowned and skilful public speaker associated with the likes of Martin Luther King Jnr. The phrase “I am an African” was also echoed by the then opposition leader Tony Leon as a sign of appreciation after Mbeki’s speech was made.

**1.4.2.4. President Muhammadu Buhari’s speech following his inauguration as President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 29 May 2015**

This is a significant speech delivered by an African head of state at an appropriate time, especially when one considers the fact that Nigeria was experiencing serious political turmoil, lawlessness, instability, insecurity, unemployment and inadequate electrical power supply. Clearly, the country was on the verge of a total collapse when this promising speech was delivered by this prominent leader. It would be interesting to examine the speech to see what it reveals as Buhari gets to the pinnacle of his political career. Significantly, Buhari is one of only two Nigerian presidents who has ruled the country twice as head of state, first as a military ruler and now as a civilian ruler. The other president is Olusegun Obasanjo who ruled as military head from 1976 to 1979 and as civilian president from 1999 to 2007.

**1.4.2.5. DA Leader Mmusi Maimane’s speech during the State-of-the Nation’s Address debate: “A broken man presiding over a broken society”, 17 February 2015**

The reason for the inclusion of this speech is that as a young, dynamic and newly elected leader, Mmusi Maimane rises above the rest of the other political opposition party leaders by taking President Zuma head-on in response to his State-of- the Nation’s Address in 2015. The speech made by the Democratic Alliance (DA) leader caught the attention of both the local and international media because it was broadcasted live on South African national television. Being the first black South African to lead the DA, Maimane made a name for himself. What makes the speech unique is that it is aggressively confrontational. It is, therefore, a relevant point of reference to use when looking at rhetoric from the point of view of political aggression.

**1.4.3 Data collection**

All the selected speeches were available in the public domain. The researcher therefore accessed them using the internet. All secondary material was accessed using both online and physical libraries.

**1.4.4 Data analysis**



The data has been subjected to critical content analysis. Content analysis is a detailed and systematic examination of the contents of a particular body of material for the purpose of identifying patterns, themes or biases (Leedy and Ormrod 2013). Content analyses are typically performed on forms of human communication, including books, newspapers, personal journals, legal documents, films, television, art, music, video tapes, transcripts, internet blogs, and bulletin board entries. For example, a researcher might use content analysis to determine what attitudes are reflected in a speech or a newspaper article of a particular era in history. The researcher typically defines a specific research problem or question at the very beginning (Leedy and Ormrod 2013). The data has been analysed to determine patterns in terms of recurring rhetorical devices used in the speeches of political leaders.

### **1.5 CREDIBILITY**

In order to ensure credibility, only the original speeches are used for content analysis. Although the researcher has tried to be unbiased in the analysis, it is inevitable that the findings are based on the researcher's own interpretation of the data. For the sake of maintaining the credibility however, the original speeches have been appended to this dissertation as Appendices A to E.

### **1.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Since the research is a stylistic analysis of transcripts of speeches already in the public domain, it does not require any ethical clearance. It is purely academic and no human subjects are involved.

### **1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Students studying language and power are likely to benefit from this study because it highlights the many functions of language, pinpointing the persuasive or manipulative language used by skilful speakers to win the support of their listeners. Other beneficiaries of this study could be voters, members of parliament, political opponents and demonstrators who need

to understand the language of political rhetoric in order to make informed decisions about who or what cause to support.

Clearly, the power of language as part of political rhetoric is one aspect that makes people vote politicians into power, even when they know that what those politicians are saying is far from the truth and that their promises are hardly ever fulfilled. Given the significance of the power of language and its influence on listeners, scholars of rhetoric are likely to gain a lot of knowledge from this study, as many functions of language and manipulative skills used by public speakers and politicians have been highlighted and their effectiveness discussed. Since rhetoric is regarded as the most powerful persuasive means of arguing, the ultimate goal of which is to make a person act in a certain way, it is therefore imperative that rhetoric as a political instrument be given a wider focus.

## **CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. LANGUAGE AND POWER**

An extensive literature review is conducted in this study on the link between language and power to get a better understanding of political rhetoric. A preliminary study indicates an intrinsic connection between rhetoric and political discourse analysis. It is necessary at this point to explain what political discourse is before elaborating on the connection between language and power.

According to Van Dijk (1993), political discourse is primarily about policies but with expected overall meanings related to political systems, ideologies, institutions, political processes and political events. Political discourse is a reflective process in the sense that as much as campaigning politicians speak about themselves as candidates and their intentions to implement their policies to fulfil their promises when elected into power, they also speak about their opponents and political enemies, including bad policies and politics of previous governments. Briefly, political discourse is about politics itself. It is about any topic given in a political context.

The review of selected literature below highlights key theories on the interconnection between language and power as well as rhetoric and public speaking.

### **2.2 BROOKS AND WARREN (1970)**

According to these authors, language has tremendous power. They base their ideas on persuasion and define it as an art, primarily a verbal art, by which one gets somebody to do what one wants and makes them think at the same time that this is what they wanted to do all along. In line with this definition, it could be said that the power of language is at play whenever persuasion is used in speech. Brooks and Warren (1970:238) further highlight that persuasion represents oratory power in the world because orientation cannot take place without the spoken language constituting a powerful force in the communication process. The persuasive

language that taps into the listener's emotions and feelings helps the speaker to achieve this. For example, the effectiveness of language and the persuasive power of the speaker stir up a particularly powerful emotion in his/her audience and manipulates it, which is similar to what is done in the sermon of a revival preacher or in the harangue of the leader of a lynch mob (Brooks and Warren 1970).

Brooks and Warren (1970:252-253) cite an example of Winston Churchill's address to the House of Commons that focused on the British determination to defeat Nazi Germany. The speech was probably delivered during an exposition of a desperate military situation: "We shall go on to the end. We shall fight in France. We shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island whatever the cost may be". There is no denying that the speech is loaded with a great deal of rhetoric as a form of discourse to stir the emotions of the listeners on a military platform and to get them moving in the direction of the speaker. This is clearly a form of political rhetoric used in public speaking. It shows the persuasive power of language as well as the kind of language that transmits power.

### **2.3 COHEN (1998)**

Cohen (1998) writes about the critical power of language. He states that language reveals who we are by its very expressive nature. Ideas that are formed in a person are used in naming objects in the world, such as the naming of physical objects. There are various representations that are open to the person who uses language to demonstrate power, as in the case of where powerful images associated with advertising are accompanied by powerful slogans to influence agreement on the part of the consumer. For example, according to Susana Murcia Bielsa and Mick O'Donnell (2017), language as power in public discourse focuses on the "power" that companies exert through the media. Advertising companies direct their messages to potential consumers with carefully chosen language to persuade viewers to buy their products. There is a great influence that companies have on the news media, and at the same time newspapers and television do not like to offend their advertisers. For these reason, news media are very careful about what is to be published and how to

present it. For example, the paper which advertises for MacDonald's may decide to turn a blind eye on food poisoning and, instead, blame providers of raw materials (Bielsa and O'Donnell 2017).

Since newspapers depend on the amounts of money that they make in newspaper sales, it is imperative that as many newspapers as possible be sold in order to make profits. So the newspaper companies are selective in what they print – and print only what the reader wants to read (Fairlough 1995). In addition, the power of language influences social actions, particularly when rhetoric is developed with the intention of persuading others to agree with one's opinions. After all, it is through rhetoric or persuasive communication that social action is influenced. Cohen (1998:196) cites Isocrates on the significance of public speech in democratic life and human existence in general:

Because there has been implanted in us the power to persuade each other and to make clear whatever we desire, not only have we escaped the life of wild beasts but we have come together and founded cities and made laws, invented arts, and generally speaking, there is no institution devised by man which the power of speech has not helped us to establish.

This statement shows the significance of rhetoric in the establishment of the democratic system in particular, and in human progress in general. To put it in a modern context, it suggests that the speaker who makes a political speech has the power to use the speech to convey a particular ideology which the audience inevitably accepts.

#### **2.4 BRUMMETTE (2006)**

According to Brummette (2006), rhetoric in popular culture explains the concept of orature or the total body of oral discourse styles and traditions. This kind of communication practised in African culture (Afrocentricity) shows the power of language communicated through the spoken word. In other words, speaking and performing a text creates a whole new experience for both the speaker and the audience. There is also a possible creation of unity and harmony between the

speaker and the audience which in turn establishes a bond that grows stronger as a result of the power of oral communication (Brummette 2006).

It is worth noting that in return, language (words) also makes communication possible between the speaker and an audience. This information suggests that language will always have power, depending on the skill of the user, be it in written or spoken form. This idea started way back in Athens when a group of teachers called Sophists were more concerned about winning the argument than with establishing the truth (Brummette 2006). This could be the same powerful language (political rhetoric) applied by modern-day politicians in their public speeches to persuade an audience to embrace their viewpoints.

## **2.5 HORNE AND HEINEMANN (2006)**

In their book *English in Perspective*, these authors focus on the power that language has in changing people's perception or shocking, hurting and offending people. For example, "before a witness gives testimony in court, he or she has to take a verbal oath and swear on the bible that he or she will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the whole truth" (Horne and Heinemann 2006:134). It is clear from this practice that language is a powerful tool that binds people in a number of significant ways. The authors further highlight the fact that some prayers as well as songs of praise and anthems have specific forms and are always repeated in exactly the same way. They also give a practical example of a crowd that can be emotionally swayed, inflamed or urged to take action by a skilled orator.

These examples show that language can indeed influence behaviour through the creation or reinforcement of perceptions, especially the language used in advertisement to persuade consumers to buy products, as seen in the adverts appearing on radio and television. This explains why a huge financial injection is needed in advertising (Horne and Heinemann, 2006).

On the other hand, some governments, churches and authorities sometimes ban or censor the writings of certain authors because they believe that these writings will influence the people who read them “either politically or morally” (Horne and Heinemann 2006:135). A classic example is Steve Biko’s book on racism titled “*I write what I like.*” The book gives a detailed exposition of racial practices by the apartheid government in the 1970s. The result was that the apartheid government banned the book because it was believed that it would have a negative influence on the followers of the Black Consciousness Movement or the majority of black people in South Africa. Another South African writer whose books were banned was Nardine Gordimer for the same reasons.

Language, indeed, does have power which could be used for manipulative purposes as part of political rhetoric in public speaking. For example, in an attempt to alleviate the plight of the ‘previously disadvantaged’ people, the current ANC-led government has introduced Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) whereby black people have access to government tenders. This initiative by the government was criticised in certain quarters of the population as it seemed intended to cater only for certain population groups and not others, hence the name BEE. The government found itself unwittingly guilty of racial discrimination and immediately changed the name of the programme to Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment. The new name is now acceptable in the eyes of most South Africans. Again, the power of language appears to appeal to the feelings of those sectors of the South African population that felt marginalised. The new name, seemingly, has managed to soothe the hurt feelings of people and changed the negative attitudes that were provoked by the first name (Horne and Heinemann 2006).

## **2.6 LUCAS (2012)**

In his book *The art of public speaking* (2012), Lucas writes about the power of language and the principles of persuasion as they apply to public speaking. The author states that politicians and advertising agents, sales people and interest groups, fundraisers and community activists all vie for their audience’s attention, votes, time, support, and that the main aim is to get the audience to agree with them

and to act on that agreement. In order to achieve this, good persuasive speakers need to be clear and concise in communicating information. Skilful and persuasive speakers use the language that appeals to their listeners' emotions and build their speeches on a firm base of facts and logic. Persuasive speakers, thus, become effective with an appropriate use of strategic rhetoric (Lucas 2012). In line with these ideas, it is evident that the political rhetoric used in public speaking depends largely on how the speaker tailors his/her message and beliefs, in order for them to be accepted by the listeners.

## **2.7 DE WET (2013)**

In his book *The art of persuasive communication*, De Wet (2013) addresses very significant issues prevalent in the South African political arena which provide a better understanding of persuasive techniques applied by politicians in any political debate to win the public's support. The discussion in this book serves as an eye-opener about the importance of language power to the potential persuaders and the persuaded in society at large. Both the persuaders and the persuaded are able to identify persuasion and at the same time develop a way of defending themselves against the 'unscrupulous' whenever they become aware of manipulative language strategies or rhetoric used against them (De Wet 2013). For example, the use of apology or confession as verbal tactics gives candidates the chance to show their qualities by admitting their errors or poor judgement. In doing so, they contrast themselves with the not-so-versatile politicians who try to conceal or downplay their weaknesses. This kind of confession puts them in a better position, according to De Wet (2013), especially when one considers the notion that there arises a time within the human spirit when there is a need to forgive, even to admire the wrongdoer who confesses. This is, arguably, another form of power constituted by language (political rhetoric).

## **2.8 SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE REVIEWED**

All of the authors discussed in the above literature review agree that language demonstrates power. Brook and Warren (1970) and Lucas (2012) agree that the effectiveness of language and power as a form of persuasion is because it appeals



to the listeners' emotions and gets them to accept the speaker's views. Cohen (1998), on the other hand, agrees with Horne and Heinemann (2006) that language influences social actions, and that public speakers use rhetoric as a strategy to manipulate the listeners' emotions. Furthermore, Brummette (2006) agrees that Sophists in ancient Athens were more concerned with winning the argument than with establishing the truth. This idea is in line with modern-day politicians who apply political rhetoric to persuade their listeners to support their views, with little or no attention paid to the truth that should go with it, as long as the politicians get the support they need.

The suggestion raised by Horne and Heinemann (2006) that a balance should be struck between freedom of expression and protection against the power of language is valid since members of society need to be made aware that language can be used to their detriment by unscrupulous politicians and other persuaders who seek to change their opinions. De Wet (2013) shares the same view with Horne and Heinemann (2006) on censorship and propaganda where certain governments take action to ensure that the writings of authors do not have a negative moral or political influence on the people who read their works. Rhetorical statements of South African statesmen are a classic example of the power of language.

## **2.9 CONCLUSION**

In my view, the most valid point that stands out from the others is the one made by Horne and Heinemann (2006:135) that a balance should be struck between freedom of expression and protection against the power of language to avoid hurting people's feelings in our quest for freedom. Being seen as the important members and leaders of society, politicians have the moral obligation to be extra cautious in their language usage in public. Politicians need to be aware of the potential power that language has of either building or destroying the society that they purport to be constructing.

## **CHAPTER THREE: ANALYSES OF POLITICAL SPEECHES BY BARACK OBAMA AND NELSON MANDELA**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

Both Barack Obama and Nelson Mandela have been known as famous politicians with incredible attention-drawing oratory skills. According to Chartes-Black (2005), successful speakers, especially in a political context, need to appeal to attitudes and emotions that are already within listeners. This analysis and interpretation of the two speeches of Obama (2009) and Mandela (1994) show how political speeches are used to persuade and influence the audience through political rhetoric in order to win their support. In this analysis, special attention is paid to the linguistic aspects of language which make the speeches effective and convincing.

### **3.2 SPEECH BY BARACK OBAMA (2009)**

#### **3.2.1 Introduction to Barack Obama**

Barack Obama is the first African-American President of the United States of America. According to his biography in Wang (2010), he was born on 4 August 1964 in Hawaii and has lived in many places, including Indonesia. His mother was from the state of Kansas and his father was from Kenya. He has a law degree from Harvard University in Massachusetts and he also studied at Columbia University in New York. His wife, Michelle Obama, also worked as a lawyer and later worked for the University of Chicago. Together they have two daughters, Sasha and Malia.

Having served on the US Senate since 2004, “Obama introduced bipartisan legislature which allows Americans to learn online how their tax dollars are spent” (Wang 2010:256). This no doubt contributed to building his good relations with the American public. Wang (2010) reports that Obama also served on the Veterans’ Affairs Committee which is responsible for caring for the needs of soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. Again, this secured huge support for him in the public

media. Wang (2010) notes that his biggest supporters were young people, African-Americans, poor citizens and the people who wanted change.

When Obama started campaigning for the presidential seat, the US was facing severe economic crisis as a result of its investment in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Obama therefore made his campaign slogan “Change has come” and hoped to rebuild the confidence and beliefs of Americans (Wang 2010). Subsequently, he defeated Hilary Clinton, the former first lady, and became the Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party in 2008. During the following months in 2008, he defeated McCain, the Republican Party’s Presidential candidate, and won all three television debates held in Oxford (Mississippi), Nashville (Tennessee) and Hempstead (New York). Finally in 2009, he successfully rallied 333 electoral votes and became the 44<sup>th</sup> American president and the first African-American President in American history (Wang 2010). Obama has written and published two books, *Dreams from my Father: A Story of Race and Inheritance* (1995) and *The Audacity of Hope: Thoughts of Reclaiming the American Dream* (2006) which have become very popular since he became president (Wang 2010).

According to Victoria West (2014), President Obama’s rhetoric is more secular than that of the previous presidents. He focuses more on shared American ideals, portrays immigration in a much more positive light, and racial issues from a perspective that has never been possible for previous presidents. Obama’s speeches and writings are characterized by metaphors and nouns. His use of nouns creates a sense of belonging and unity among his countrymen. Obama’s speech under analysis here was delivered on the same platform in Washington D.C. where Martin Luther King Jnr had in 1963 delivered his famous “I have a dream” speech. Interestingly, on both occasions the audience was made up of both blacks and whites, the speech was broadcast on television, and, in the case of Obama’s speech, even on the internet.

### 3.2.2. Analysis of speech by Barack Obama

The introductory paragraph of Obama's inaugural speech already indicates a carefully thought-out strategy to appeal to his audience's sympathy and to win their support. He says:

I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors. I thank President Bush for the service to our nation, as well as the generosity and co-operation he has shown throughout this transition. (Obama 2009)

There is a persistent use of the pronoun "us" as an indication of inclusiveness. In other words, the speaker does not want the listener to feel that they are being excluded from this important achievement. Obama's speech cleverly creates a sense of belonging to the activities of the country, by all Americans. This point puts him in good standing since everyone is involved in the task of rebuilding the nation.

In addition, the opening statement can be interpreted as showing that Obama is not selfish, arrogant or boastful. The fact that he says he is "humbled" also creates the impression that he is no more important than other Americans. This is a very effective rhetorical technique used to appeal to the audiences' support and to make the speaker more acceptable to them. Obama does not lose sight of the fact that his predecessors have made positive contributions to the nation in their services. The use of the possessive pronoun "our nation" as a rhetorical device further acknowledges the role played by President Bush whose co-operation Obama appreciates. Undoubtedly, this kind of rhetoric is likely to sway even Bush's staunch supporters to Obama's side. There are, of course, many references to the pronouns "our" and "we" used in Obama's speech, not only at the beginning but in the middle of the speech as well. For example, the phrases and statements "we the people have remained faithful...", "we remain a young nation...", "we remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on earth...", "we will build bridges and roads..." and "we will not apologise for our way of life..." indicate a very strong sense of unity and

shared responsibility which Obama and his fellow Americans intend to display for the betterment of their country. Again consider the following:

“...our ancestors....”

“...our forebearers...”

“...our enduring spirit...”

“...our better history....”

“...our individual ambitions...”

“...our goods and services...”

“...our capacity remains undiminished...”

“...our schools and colleges...”

“...our ambitions...”

“...our economy...”

“...our common defence...”

“...our power...”

“...our cause...”

“...our patchworks...”

“...our liberty”

The recurrent use of the possessive pronoun “our” in connection with different nouns conveys the idea of collective ownership, whether it is of liberty, power, history, education or the economy. In line with this argument, Gunawan (2010:92) notes the following about the speech: “The cohesion in the speech is achieved by the employment of cohesive devices such as co-reference pronouns and ellipses”. Throughout the speech, Obama places himself as a humble citizen and addresses his audience as his inseparable compatriots in the use of the pronoun ‘we’ and the possessive pronoun ‘our’”. In other words, although Obama pays homage to his predecessors, he also cleverly uses his good oratory skills to distinguish himself from

them by the way he aligns himself to the people's collective dreams, beliefs and visions for the future of America.

The use of nouns in the speech that resonate with the people's experiences serves, in different ways, to make Obama's delivery more effective. An example of this is the line: "...we have chosen hope over fear, unity over conflict and discord". Here Obama deploys contrasting nouns to give the people a choice, but again the possessive "we" implies that he has chosen for them, because he knows what is good for them. Such a technique constructs him as a messiah with saving power. In relation to this, there is no doubt that he capitalises on what the audience expects to hear from him as the newly elected president. The people of America at this point expect to hear a message that is full of positive things, that will inspire hope in them, and that will make them look to the future with optimism. For this purpose, Obama deliberately contrasts abstract nouns that have positive connotations with nouns that have negative connotations, such as in the phrase "hope over fear". In addition, he uses juxtaposition, so that the audience can see for themselves the choices at hand. The underlying assumption is that the audience is rational and will applaud him for choosing the right options – hope over fear and unity over conflict and discord. This rhetorical technique makes the audience feel that the choice that has been made cannot be regretted, and it is therefore easier for them to embrace Obama's views. The rhetoric has a powerful persuasive function.

Gunawan (2010) indicates another purpose for using abstract nouns. He notes that abstract nouns are used also to refer to perceptions. For example, "when Obama talks about America's perceptions of 'their supremacy', he uses the words "greatness" in 'the greatness of our nation' and 'the course of American history' as a 'journey'" (Gunawan 2010:97). The use of abstract nouns in this context move the people to use their imaginative powers to see themselves in a different space, a space of greatness and transformation from the past. Thus, they are able to envision America under Obama as a country that will experience further greatness as a continuation of the tradition.

Both concrete and proper nouns are used in Obama's speech. Concrete nouns feature in statements such as "Homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered" and "Forty-four Americans have now taken the presidential oath" used to refer to the number of the U.S presidents so far in the history. Proper nouns are used to indicate historical war sites such as "Concord and Gettysburg" referring to the revolutionary wars, "Normandy" referring to World War II, and "Khe Sahn" referring to the Vietnam War. Collective nouns such as America or U.S. refer to the whole American people, while "generation" refers to the current generation of the American people as a whole. Significantly, proper nouns are used here as a rhetorical strategy to create colourful and incredible memories about the history of America, while deliberately suppressing the bleak side of the various wars.

The use of co-ordinating conjunctions in an unusual way in this speech holds the audience's attention. Consider the following extract from the speech:

For everywhere we look, there is work to be done. The state of our economy calls for action, bold and swift. And we will act, not only to create new jobs, but to lay a new foundation for growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We'll restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. All this we will do. (Obama 2009, emphasis underlined)

Undoubtedly, the use of the coordinating conjunction "and" here does not conform to formal grammatical rules. The coordinating conjunction "and" is used to connect two ideas in an acceptable English sentence. It is not usually used at the beginning of a sentence, but Obama uses this conjunction at the beginning of two statements above to convey a sense of determination in his objectives, especially when he says "And we will act" as a direct reaction to his previous statement about the state of the economy needing attention. The conjunction in this case, although grammatically misplaced, is strategically rightly placed for effect: the audience has to believe in a

president who desires to tackle the problems of America immediately. Similarly, Obama says “And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age”. Unlike the previous example, this statement has no direct correlation to the statement preceding it. Yet, the conjunction at the beginning of it intensifies the promises Obama is making to his people. Such use of conjunctions is acceptable in spoken rather than written language. In a speech, a speaker can deliberately deviate from formal sentence construction. This unusual word order is likely to draw the audience’s attention and force them to listen attentively as a result of its unique construction.

In the words of Wang (2010:254), “the study of presidential addresses has not only attracted the interests of political scientists and historians, but also attained the attention of linguists”. He adds: “This year, Barack Obama, the first African-American president in American history, captured the world’s attention” (Wang 2010:254). This view suggests that Obama’s speech is so different from those of past presidents in terms of language usage and structure, to the point that it has caught the attention of many people, including authorities on language matters.

Both Obama and Mandela are two of the most renowned leaders in the world, and both have been trained in law, which perhaps accounts for their good oratory skills. In the next section, the context shifts from the USA to South Africa, but the underlying problems of racism and white supremacy are issues that both leaders have had to deal with in their personal lives and political careers. Mandela, like Obama, exhibits outstanding rhetorical skills in public speaking, making him one of the most quoted leaders in world history.

### **3.3. SPEECH BY NELSON MANDELA (1994)**

#### **3.3.1 Introduction to Nelson Mandela**

Nelson Mandela trained as a lawyer and joined the African National Congress (ANC) in 1944. In 1963 he was convicted of high treason, and he spent 27 years in prison.



After his release in 1990, he assumed leadership of the ANC and worked tirelessly to negotiate an end to apartheid and minority rule in South Africa. He led the ANC to a resounding victory in the April 1994 elections, the first democratic elections since apartheid. He was inaugurated as the first black president of the Republic of South Africa on 10 May 1994, succeeding F.W de Klerk. According to De Wet (2013), the occasion at the Union Buildings in Pretoria was historic. The eyes and ears of all South Africans as well as millions around the world were on Mandela, who had become a world icon in the struggle for freedom. The inauguration was the largest gathering ever that included international leaders on South African soil (De Wet 2013).

### **3.3.2 Analysis of speech by Nelson Mandela**

Nelson Mandela's inauguration speech, like Obama's, attempts to be inclusive and to avoid sidelining any South African citizens. There is an element of optimism, coupled with a sense of belonging, in his remarks as a result of the joy South Africans and the world are experiencing on this occasion. Consider the following statement: "Today, all of us, do by our presence here, by our celebration in other parts of the country and the world, confer glory and hope to newborn liberty" (Mandela 1994). Phrases such as "all of us do....." imply that no one is marginalised, while possessive nouns like "our country..." indicate that the achievement was not the result of an individual but of a joined effort. By using the inclusive phrase "all of us" and the adjectival noun "newborn liberty" concurrently, Mandela intimates that this is a new era and all South Africans are collectively responsible for nurturing this new liberty to maturity. Abstract nouns have been carefully used to show a positive attitude in the speech. This is a clearly skilful rhetorical approach on the part of Mandela to win the support of the audience. His entire speech anchors on this prospect of moving forward and rebuilding a South Africa for all.

Another example of political rhetoric in the speech is the successive use of abstract nouns with positive connotations, such as "belief", "justice", "confidence", "nobility" and "hopes". The following statement illustrates this point:

Our daily deeds as ordinary South Africans must produce an actual South African reality that will reinforce humanity's belief in justice, strengthen its confidence in the nobility of the human soul and sustain all our hopes for a glorious life for all.

These words have an appealing effect on the audience, because the audience would surely value the ideals they evoke. The nouns can also imply that political actions taken during the struggle have produced good results. The phrase "our daily deeds" fits in well with the efforts made by the people of South Africa in their quest for freedom, while "an actual South African reality" implies that all South Africans need to be equal, regardless of colour, in order to live a better life. The use of the adjectival phrase "glorious life for all" adds to the effectiveness of the rhetoric in the speech, as this might be what previously oppressed South Africans have been waiting for all this time.

Another effective rhetorical device in the above extract is the use of "ordinary South Africans" as an adjectival phrase. It suggests that there is no difference between Mandela and the audience in terms of status or importance. However, Mandela is not an "ordinary" South African; he is a world icon, a man who defeated apartheid by his sheer resilience. To refer to himself as part of "ordinary South Africans" is a powerful rhetorical tool. This rhetoric is likely to work for him, making the audience accept him because of his humility.

There is also a noticeable repetition of the idea of unity and togetherness in Mandela's speech, for various purposes. The following examples are worth citing:

To my compatriots, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld.

That spiritual and physical oneness we all share with this common homeland explains the depth of the pain we all carried in our hearts as we saw our country tear itself apart in a terrible conflict.

We must therefore act together as a united people, for national reconciliation, for nation building, for the birth of a new world.

We know it well that none of us acting alone can achieve success.

From the statements above, it is evident that the ideal of unity or togetherness is being emphasised and the speaker uses it to establish the idea that he is not acting alone but with all South Africans. In the first statement, for example, Mandela employs metaphor in comparing South Africans' attachment to the country to the Jacaranda and Mimosa trees' rootedness in the soil. This metaphor evokes a strong sense of belonging to South Africa, a sense of unity among all South African peoples. There is a subtle appeal here to white South Africans to join with blacks to build a new non-racial South Africa. The three other statements continue to build on this idea of unity that needs to be intensified for the sake of "national reconciliation" and for "nation building".

There is also the repetitive use of declarative statements in Mandela's speech as a way of appealing to the audience's emotions. Consider the following statements:

Let there be justice for all.

Let there be peace for all.

Let there be work, bread, water and salt for all.

Let each know that for each the body, the mind and the soul have been freed to fulfill themselves.

Notably, Mandela is appealing to the audiences' feelings about justice, peace, economic security and freedom. He is urging them to think about these positive aspects which have not been applied or implemented by the previous government. Directly or indirectly, he implies that the new government will put all these aspects to practice and that the people can help the government in achieving these ideals.

One also notes in Mandela's speech the use of repetition as a way of warning or cautioning the audience against resorting to practices associated with the apartheid regime. Consider the following statement:

Never, never and never again shall it be that this beautiful land will again experience the oppression of one by another and suffer the indignity of being the skunk of the world.

The above statement has become Nelson Mandela's famous quotation which sends a strong message to any prospective government not to repeat the pains and sufferings brought about by racial oppression. The repetition projects a forceful message that South Africa will never again be a mockery of the world because of racial segregation.

The use of the plural pronoun "we" is quite pervasive in Mandela's speech, and it serves a vital purpose. As shown in previous examples, it indicates that Mandela relies on all South Africans to build a new nation. In other instances, it serves to allay the fears of the white minority who had previously trampled upon the rights of the black majority. Consider this statement:

We have triumphed in the effort to implant hope in the breasts of the millions of our people. We enter into a covenant that we shall build the society in which all South Africans, both black and white, will be able to walk tall, without any fear in their hearts, assured of their inalienable right to human dignity – a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world.

The inclusive “we” serves a powerful persuasive function in the speech as it indicates that there is no element of revenge in Mandela’s plan for South Africa. Rather, Mandela plans to make South Africa a home for all, white and black. No doubt, the white sector of his audience would feel relieved at hearing this, and would be more inclined to support the new government. Effectively, Mandela’s use of the inclusive “we” throughout his speech eases the political tension in the country at the time.

There is also the use of “we” as a sign of divinely allocated authority, quite similar to the use of the plural pronoun in Shakespearean plays. The statement below illustrates this point:

We are both humbled and elevated by the honour and privilege that you, the people of South Africa, have bestowed on us, as the first President of a united, democratic, non-racial and non-sexist government.

Mandela here refers to himself as “the first President of a united...government”. Although he is a single individual, he uses the plural pronouns “we” and “us” to convey to his audience the idea that he is only the representative of a body of leaders elected by the people. At the same time, his position as head of that body is incontestable, because it was validated by a democratic election in which the will of the people was the decisive vote. Thus, he can use the royal “we” in reference to himself and his government as a body of authority divinely and constitutionally instituted. This effectively projects him to his audience as a kind of demi-god, quite akin to the biblical golden image created by the Jews for their own worship. The rhetoric in this case serves a double function, for while conveying Mandela’s humility, it simultaneously insinuates his love for power.

These ideas about Mandelian rhetoric corroborate the view by Dwivedi (2015:66) that the role of a rhetorical speech is “to persuade and influence the people”. In addition, Dwivedi (2015:66) notes that “any good speech defines issues and problems, reconstructs the thinking, and establishes a platform for the prospective change in the society.” As has been illustrated so far, Mandela’s rhetoric

acknowledges the problems South Africa has encountered, particularly racial oppression of the black people, but simultaneously it reconstructs the people's thinking to look to the future rather than the past and it offers positive change to influence the audience's belief in the future.

Another well-thought-out rhetorical technique is the use of adjectives with a positive connotation to arouse the interest of the audience. For example, the phrase "a united, democratic, non-racial and non-sexist government" combines carefully selected adjectives to make a point. The impression created by the use of these words is that the newly elected government is not biased compared to the apartheid regime, a sentiment that is likely to be shared by the audience. This shows how effectively political rhetoric can be applied to make the speaker's argument more striking and convincing.

The use of tense, as a linguistic aspect of political rhetoric, adds the power of conviction to the speech. The use of appropriate tense is evident throughout Mandela's inauguration speech. Although the simple present tense appears to dominate Mandela's speech, there is a noticeable usage of the present perfect tense. The following are examples of simple present tense statements in Mandela's speech:

Today all of us do...

All this we owe both to ourselves and to the peoples of the world who are so well represented here today.

We thank all our distinguished international guests...

We dedicate this day to all our heroes and heroines in the country.

According to Wang (2010), the simple present tense is used to create a close relationship between the speaker and his/her audience. Looking at the predominant use of the simple present tense in Mandela's speech, one can accept the validity of this assertion. Mandela's use of the present tense makes his audience feel relevant. Wang (2010) states that on the basis of the statistics of tenses, the simple present tense is the most frequently used in political speeches.

The present perfect tense has also been used in the speech for specific purposes. For example:

We have at least achieved our political emancipation.

We have triumphed in the effort to implant hope in the breasts of millions of our people.

The president uses the present perfect tense to remind the audience of events or actions that have just happened but whose results can still be felt at the moment of speaking.

The religious content of Mandela's speech is also worth looking at, to further explain the uniqueness of his rhetoric. Unlike Obama, Mandela makes little reference to religious content. The only reference to religious ideas is in his final words "God bless Africa", whereas Obama's speech seems to dwell much on this aspect in an attempt to get support from his western audience by capitalising on their religious beliefs. Aware of the diversity of religions in South Africa and painfully conscious of the role religion played in apartheid's segregationist treatment of black people, Mandela remains distant to religion as a rhetorical tool. Thus, his final words are not so much a reflection of his reverence for any particular God as they are simply a repetition of a popular political refrain in public speaking. This suggests that as a good orator Mandela knows when to use certain types of rhetorical tools and when not to use them. His rhetoric thus carries a distinct signature.

### **3.4. SUMMARY**

Both inaugural speeches by Obama and Mandela use nearly the same rhetorical devices, such as the plural personal pronouns “we”, “us” and “our” to bridge the gap between the speaker and their audiences. As noted earlier, this usage recalls the use of the royal “we” in Shakespearean plays which suggests that heads of state have the backing of the universe in their appointment to govern their people. Both concrete and abstract nouns have been repeatedly used in both speeches to achieve a specific purpose i.e. for drawing attention and for emphasis. The only difference in the two speeches is the use of language to accommodate the audience in terms of educational background and social status. Obama uses a simple, readable and non-academic type of language which sounds rather chatty and conversational to express his ideas through the simple present tense. Although Nelson Mandela uses the same tense, his speech appears to be more formal as he uses academic English, loaded with metaphors and complex adjectival phrases to describe the picture of a new South Africa in order to garner his audience’s support.

The speeches of these two statesmen are peppered with appropriate diction, repetition of ideas, declarative statements and adjectival nouns. The use of unusual word order in Obama’s speech, particularly in terms of making bold promises, makes his speech more effective; attention is paid to the current challenges, the history of the country and how the country’s problems can be resolved. He does this by making use of the simple past tense, simple present tense, and simple future tense. Similarly, Mandela uses appropriate tense to anchor his speech on a future rebuilt by all South Africans, irrespective of race, thereby dispelling any fear among certain segments of the population. This is one of the aspects that made him a world icon.

### **3.5. CONCLUSION**

It is evident that most political speeches apply rhetorical strategies or techniques which serve a persuasive function. This can also be an attempt to bring the audience close to the speaker. Appealing to the audience’s emotions and sympathy by using adjectival phrases has become another characteristic of most political speeches.



Repetition and the frequent use of emotive language in speeches, accompanied by the appropriate use of tenses in a very chatty or conversational language, makes some political speeches more memorable than others. As has been shown in this chapter, the speeches of Obama and Mandela have remained popular because of the profoundness of their rhetoric. The next chapter discusses the rhetoric of three other important political figures in contemporary politics.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL SPEECHES BY THABO MBEKI, MUHAMMADU BUHARI AND MMUSI MAIMANE**

#### **4.1. INTRODUCTON**

This chapter focuses on the political speeches of three different leaders: former South African president Thabo Mbeki, Nigerian president Muhammadu Buhari, and South African politician Mmusi Maimane. These speeches are analysed as follows: the speech of Thabo Mbeki first, then Buhari's, and lastly Maimane's. In this chapter, the following important elements of political rhetoric and persuasive speech are highlighted to demonstrate how language constructs power and how, in turn, power is used or misused through language: the use of pronouns, the use of the simple present tense, metaphorical vocabulary, the use of the future tense, exaggeration, negation, comparatives and personification. These language aspects have been used as rhetorical devices in the three political speeches to manipulate people's emotions, and are found to be a common thread in the speeches of all three men.

Noticeably, all three statesmen understood their audiences well, which accounts for their success as public speakers. According Kerri Morris (2008:44), rhetoric requires that a speaker understands his/her audience:

Rhetoric demands that we understand our audience. Those who hear our arguments are as important to the rhetorical situation as are the facts and details about the case. We have to be familiar with the background, knowledge, and worldview of our listeners, in order to make our argument sensible to them, and in order to deliberate with them about specific issues. We must know as much about our audience as possible in order to participate in deliberation helpfully.

Morris emphasizes the importance of speakers having intimate knowledge of their audience. This enables them to know when to pursue an argument and when to let it go, thus saving time and face. She states further:

For instance, if everyone in the room supports the policy we are advocating, we need not dwell on our argument; we may, in fact, not need to argue at all. However, if many audience members are new to the situation or to the group, we may need to provide essential background information in order to help them understand what's at stake. If the audience isn't aware that a problem exists, they may not be motivated to listen to proposed solutions. (Morris 2008:44)

Morris' view that a good understanding of one's audience is essential for effective rhetoric is one that many other scholars have alluded to in their work. For example, according to Koch (1998), through rhetoric, political elites attempt to draw attention to particular features of policy proposals while drawing attention from others, thereby increasing the importance and accessibility of those considerations. Goatly (2008:81) states that "the language we use predisposes us to think and act according to certain selective ways." Burke (quoted in Mackey 2005:6) notes that "rhetoric is not rooted in any past condition of human society. It is rooted in an essential function of language itself...and is continually born anew".

In line with the views of these scholars, this chapter argues that skilled politicians exploit the knowledge and aspirations of their audience to both discredit their opponents and garner credibility for themselves. They use language effectively to make new proposals, directly or indirectly. The effective use of such political rhetoric is evident in the political speeches of Mbeki, Buhari and Maimane.

## **4.2. SPEECH BY THABO MBEKI (1996)**

### **4.2.1 Thabo Mbeki's biography**

Thabo Mbeki was born in June 1942 in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa, in a village called Itunyusa. He was Deputy President to Mandela and he later became President after Mandela. Before his second term of office ended, he was forced to resign and he moved on to serve the African Union in various capacity. According to Gevisser (2009), Mbeki is a respectable politician, an intellectual with powerful negotiation skills. He has travelled extensively around the African continent and the

world. African countries he has visited include Tanzania, Ghana, Nigeria and Zimbabwe. He has also visited the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Hungary and Vietnam as a very successful ANC leader in exile. He was elected as a student union leader at the Sussex University in London in February 1963, three months after he had arrived campus in November 1962 (Gevisser 2009).

As a powerful young political activist, Mbeki's successes include mobilizing international support against the apartheid regime's law of detaining people for 90 days without trial. The result was that South African goods were boycotted in overseas countries. Mbeki stated in the student newspaper that the South African government's new restrictions were just a form of fascism. He added: "It is, therefore, our view that the students of South Africa could not stand aside while another Nazi-Germany is arising in our midst" (Gevisser 2009:88). Nazi-Germany, here, refers to the Nazi killings in the death camps during the Second World War. Mbeki's powerful political rhetoric prompted countries around the world to impose sanctions on South Africa.

Mbeki led the ANC group in exile to meet the leader of the Liberal opposition party in South Africa, Van Zyl Slabbert, in 1980 in Lusaka to discuss the "National Convention" in South Africa. In a tough session that lasted for seven hours, Mbeki pulled Van Zyl Slabbert aside and sold him his private opinion. If there were going to be 'two approaches' within the ANC to ending apartheid, he had no doubt whatsoever which would succeed. "Talking is better than killing", he stated (Gevisser 2009:192). The power of Mbeki's negotiating skills and the effects of his words on the South African delegation paved the way for Mbeki's meeting with Professor Piet de Lange, an academic and a very close advisor of PW Botha, and a chairman of the Afrikaner Broederbond – the secret society that was the ideological custodian of Afrikaner nationalism.

Again, Mbeki's persuasive reasoning and charm impressed Professor De Lange whose team and Mbeki's embraced each other. In 1986, Mbeki seduced the white

South Africans by announcing on American TV that targeting the white South African civilians would “corrupt our struggle” by transforming freedom fighters into murderers (Gevisser 2009:193). Mbeki’s persuasive political skills again allayed the fears of white South Africans in general, as the release of Nelson Mandela on 11 February 1990 was a precondition for political negotiations between the National Party and the negotiating team. Mandela was elected the first black President of the Republic of South Africa in 1994 with Mbeki as his Deputy President.

It is imperative to indicate at this point before getting into the speech analysis that when Mbeki delivered his famous speech “I am an African” at the adoption of the Republic of South Africa’s Constitution Bill on behalf of the ANC in 1996 as Deputy President, he was simply echoing a concept expressed by a young, brilliant lawyer and a prime mover of the ANC Youth League called Anton Lambede in 1943. Lambede also got this idea from reading the writings of African-American W.E.B. Du Bois and Jamaican Marcus Garvey who had their roots as South Africans together with Pixley ka Seme (Gevisser 2009). All of them regarded Africa as a black man’s home and called for its regeneration as a continent. In 1906 Pixley ka Seme, a founding member of the ANC, delivered an iconic speech in the USA while studying at Columbia University in which he stated: “I am an African, and I set my pride in my race over against a hostile public opinion” (Gevisser 2009:29). In the practice of political rhetoric, Lambede and later Mbeki adopted “I am an African” as they made their moral re-awakening speeches (Gevisser 2009).

#### **4.2.2 Analysis of speech by Thabo Mbeki**

The title of the speech “I am an African” is an assertion in the form of a simple present metaphorical language, which allows the speaker to sell his ideology to the audience and have them look up to him as the lead South African. The word “African” is inclusive of Afrikaners since the term “Afrikaner” is a Dutch word for “African”. The title appears to be personalised and does not show any link or connection with the Constitution that was to be presented in parliament when the speech was made (Gevisser 2009). Only later in the speech do we see a link to the Constitution.

Mbeki opens his speech in a formal manner appropriate to the setting of parliament, but also in a very dramatic manner which infuses the speech with some kind of political aesthetics designed deliberately to appeal to the sentiments of his audience. He states:

Chairperson,

Esteemed President of the democratic Republic,

Honourable Members of the Constitutional Assembly,

Our distinguished domestic and foreign guests,

Friends,

On an occasion such as this, we should, perhaps, start from the beginning.

So, let me begin.

I am an African. (Mbeki 1996)

This dramatic opening and the declaration “I am an African” suggests that Mbeki is about to tell his audience a story about the African continent. No doubt, the audience will be wondering “How are you an African?”, and thus he launches into a poetic speech about what makes him an African. He makes allusions to historical movements, figures and events which have significance for the audience, all in an effort to justify his Africanness.

The use of historical allusion is very pertinent in Mbeki’s speech. An example is captured in the following quotation:

I am formed of the migrants who left Europe to find a new home on our native land. Whatever their own actions, they remain still, part of me.

In my veins courses the blood of the Malay slaves who came from the East. Their proud dignity informs my bearing, their culture a part of my essence.

Mbeki here makes allusion to two important historical events familiar to his listeners: the arrival of the Dutch colonizers who later became the Afrikaners and the arrival of Malay slaves into the Cape. No doubt, members of these two groups would be present among his audience and therefore acknowledging them as part of his African identity inevitable wins their support.

Mbeki cleverly builds his identity out of both the African and Afrikaner communities in South Africa and attempts to make both parties feel relevant, accepted, and embraced under the ANC leadership. In other words, Mbeki seems to be saying “We are the same, whether Africans or Afrikaners. There is no need for Afrikaners to feel alienated or marginalised”.

The title of the speech seems to have worked for him as a powerful rhetorical device to influence the response of his audience, particularly since he says this from a position of authority as Deputy President. The audience considers him experienced and knowledgeable. In addition, the title raises the audience’s hopes and expectations that the speaker would remain true to his beliefs and ideologies, and that, as an African, he will not change and betray them. Mbeki claims higher status or expertise than the audience. So the title itself serves as an effective rhetorical strategy on the part of the speaker to make his speech more powerful and memorable. Until today, the title is still popular in the public domain.

Mbeki uses the pronoun ‘I’ of the first person in order to signal his subjectivity and, perhaps, to make himself more involved in the world he is representing (i.e. the world of politics). For example, he states: “I owe my being to the Khoi and the San whose desolate souls haunt the great expanses of the beautiful Cape.” This statement is an attempt on Mbeki’s part to justify his current position as a leader of the ANC and his involvement in politics by establishing his heroic lineage. The Khoi and the San (now generally known as the Khoisan) are known, historically, to be the indigenous inhabitants of the country now known as South Africa, and being from this ancestry makes Mbeki a deserved leader of his people. The pronoun “I” is a rhetorical device

in the speech used to emphasize his origin and identity. The pronoun is used 34 times in the speech to try and distinguish himself from other politicians, in terms of political rhetoric and public speaking skills, in order to win the audience's support for him as a person and not just the ANC. This is markedly different from the speeches of Mandela and Obama which made more use of the plural pronoun than the singular one.

The use of the simple present tense in Mbeki's speech, coupled with references to historical figures and other significant places, shows Mbeki's indisputable knowledge of the South African landscape. This could also indicate his attachment to the environment – the wildlife and the topography – and that he could be trusted by listeners as there is no doubt in their minds that he is of the same nationality. He uses his vast knowledge of the environment to highlight his 'belongingness' to South Africa when he states dramatically:

At times, and in fear, I have wondered whether I should concede equal citizenship of our country to the leopard and the lion, the elephant and the springbok, the hyena, the black mamba and the pestilential mosquito.

A human presence among all these, a feature on the face of our native land thus defined, I know that none dare challenge me when I say – I am an African!

The idea of a "human presence" amidst lions, leopards, elephants, springboks, hyenas, black mambas and mosquitoes who claim equal rights of residence on "our native land" conjures his formidableness as a man, and erases any doubt whatsoever about him being a true South African 'son of the soil'. The combination of a forceful first person voice and dramatic expression is a strategic rhetorical device used by Mbeki to position himself as an authentic African speaking about being an African.

The simple present tense is dominant throughout the speech, and this is apt because it is a speech made on an august occasion when the Constitution of the country was to be adopted. After justifying why he can say he is an African, Mbeki



then proceeds to speak directly about the Constitution, emphasizing important details such as its significance at the time by using declarative expressions in the simple present tense:

It creates a law-governed society which shall be inimical to arbitrary rule. It enables the resolution of conflicts by peaceful means rather than resort to force. It rejoices in the diversity of our people and creates the space for all of us voluntarily to define ourselves as one people.

These three statements serve as an effective rhetorical device to convey the importance of the Constitution not only for the ANC government but for all South Africans. As Goatly (2008) notes, political rhetoric makes language memorable because it has the habit of being interesting and thought-provoking.

Mbeki's speech illustrates how language imposes the power of the speaker on the listeners. For example, Mbeki states: "I know that none dare challenge me when I say I am an African". This is an indirect threat to the listeners or audience not to challenge his opinion or his Africanness. It is also a subtle way of imposing his view on his listeners by suggesting that it is indisputable. Mbeki thus exploits his position as Deputy President to instil fear in his listeners and indirectly extort their support while discouraging any critical views against him.

The speech contains allusions to nature as a rhetorical device. The fact that the speaker "owes his 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 our native land" suggests his affinity with nature. It also suggests that Mbeki intends to maintain this link even within an urban environment since his life depends on it, in contrast to many people residing in the urban areas who have isolated themselves from nature by being trapped in their 'concrete jungles'. This rhetorical strategy is effective in moving the audience to believe in Mbeki, especially because the speech is made in Cape Town where the audience is familiar with the beauty of the seas and the mountains. By pledging solidarity with nature, including irritating mosquitoes, Mbeki shows the value of humans maintaining a relationship

with the landscape. This effectively projects him as a ruler who cares deeply for South Africa's flora and fauna and who will thus deploy any means possible to fight conservation problems such as rhino poaching.

The simultaneous use of comparatives and exaggerations are evident in the speech as powerful rhetorical devices. For example, Mbeki refers to the Khoi and the San as "they who fell victim to the most merciless genocide our native land has ever seen." This is an exaggeration in that it suggests that the "genocide" of the Khoisan was worse than anything South Africa had ever experienced, though there have been many other ethnic groups which have also experienced mass destruction. The comparatives carry presupposition and, used simultaneously with exaggeration, appear very manipulative as it is assumed that they are the unquestionable truth (Goatly, 2008). This use of language could have a profound effect on the audience, as they now begin to reflect on the "genocide". The effect can be both positive and negative: negative in that they may develop feelings of anger and hatred against the perpetrators of the "genocide" and positive in that they may be determined, like Mbeki, never to allow South Africa to experience such gross violence again.

The speech applies negation as part of its political rhetoric to warn its listeners about the painful past resulting from racial discrimination policies which benefited only the whites who "had imposed themselves as masters..." The "masters" here refer to the colonialists who oppressed the black majority. Mbeki then uses negation in a positive way to recall cruel memories which should teach us not and never to be inhuman again:

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.

Mbeki clearly wants to appear as an authority on the cruelty of past oppressions, thereby forcing his audience never to repeat the ills of the past.

Reference to religious concepts is made in the speech where the audience is reminded that “God created all men and women in His image.” The reference to the Christian “God” and “His image” at this point in the speech is meant to appeal to the spiritual side of the listeners, to move any in the audience who still harboured thoughts of racial superiority to accept the equality of all races as a Christian truth. This is very important as such equality is what the Constitution at hand endorses. One can see that Mbeki, unlike Mandela, is not weary of the complicity of the Christian religion in the oppression of black people in the past. Or perhaps his rhetoric is precisely to re-appropriate the same religion to change the mentality of the previous oppressors to accept that all humans are equal. This equality is particularly important before the law, which is why the Constitution is being put in place. It can therefore be said that Mbeki’s use of religious allusion in his speech cements his rhetoric where Mandela’s would have detracted from it.

Mbeki’s use of the future tense in reference to the contents of the Constitution document which state that “all our people shall be free from fear” and “Africa shall be at peace” is an indicator of the commitment to a future of the country that looks bright without racial segregation. He expresses gratitude by thanking the entire world for the birth of the founding document: the Constitution is given the qualities of a human being because it is born. This is personification which signifies the dawn of a new era of democracy in South Africa.

Famous as it is, Mbeki’s speech has been criticized by certain sections of the media for his ideologies of African Renaissance and his failure to conceptualise the African identity in its complexity. In his book, Mangcu (2008:84) confesses: “Part of my initial attraction to Mbeki’s African Renaissance message was that it brought the cultural dimension to our conception of freedom”. Mangcu, however, expresses his disappointment that cultural nationalism was used as a way of shielding or protecting corruption in the ANC-led government by government officials such as Allan Boesak, who misused donors’ funding, and Tony Yengeni who bought a luxury vehicle from the arms deal contracts (Mangcu 2008:85). Yengeni was later found guilty of defrauding parliament and was imprisoned for four years. Thus, political

commentators such as Mangcu (2008) have criticized Mbeki's speech for offering an elusive African renaissance.

Mbeki's leadership after the speech was made is no different from that of other South African leaders who come to power with bold promises, only to betray their people's expectations by developing an emotional distance with ordinary South Africans. Mbeki spent more time travelling abroad during his term as a president than paying attention to people in the rural villages and those in some urban areas who were experiencing severe service delivery problems. Indeed, Mbeki failed to live up to his Africanness by neglecting the same people he had claimed affinity with. As Mangcu puts it, "I had been fooled by the promise of his rhetoric" (Mangcu 2008:48).

Political rhetoric therefore is a very powerful weapon leaders use to secure their place in power. Ironically, these leaders tend to fail to meet their people's expectations. Mbeki failed to build and forge national unity in a country characterized by racial and economic inequality. All the ideas in his "I am an African" speech remained an illusion as a result of his lack of vision and arrogance of power. In the end, Mbeki appears to have caused his own downfall by ignoring the input of the same people who elected him as president.

### **4.3. SPEECH BY MUHAMMADU BUHARI (2015)**

#### **4.3.1 Muhammadu Buhari's biography**

Muhammadu Buhari was born in 1942. He ran for the office of the presidency of Nigeria in 2003, 2007 and 2011 without success. He, however, appeared as the presidential candidate of the All Progressive Congress (APC) in December 2014 for the March 2015 elections wherein he emerged victorious.

Buhari campaigned for the presidency despite the fact that President Goodluck Jonathan called for his disqualification from the race. Buhari was blamed for the

breach of the country's Constitution. One of the requirements for campaigning for the presidency is that the candidate has to have at least completed high school education. However, Buhari was unable to produce the credentials supporting such completion. He, nevertheless, entered the race and ran as candidate for the APC. He built his image as the anti-corruption champion. He was endorsed and supported in his campaign by the former president, Olusegun Obasanjo.

Apparently, Buhari could take such a bold step to run for elections because he had served as a military head of state in the past. There is no denying that Boko Haram caused a lot of disturbance during the term of office of President GoodLuck Jonathan, and it still continued to do so during the time of Buhari. But Buhari was thought of by many as someone who has what it takes to handle Boko Haram. This was because he received military training in Kaduna as well as in Great Britain, India, and the United States of America. Titled "My Manifesto and Vision for Nigeria", his election manifesto was a complete agenda for the improvement of the country's economic, political and social future. According to his manifesto, throughout Nigeria there was an ongoing debate about positive change, and part of the Buhari Manifesto preamble stated that "many Nigerians have completely lost faith in the country's ability to govern itself" (All Progressive Congress 2015). This is probably what garnered huge support for him to the point that he emerged victorious.

On 31 March 2015, President Jonathan conceded to election loss and congratulated Buhari for winning the elections, and Buhari was sworn in on 29 May 2015 as president of Nigeria. In his inauguration speech, Buhari promised to end the violence of Boko Haram from Nigeria in order to restore political stability, which had been stilted largely by the activities of Boko Haram. His message to the Nigerian people was that the future looked bright; that there would be freedom of expression, revival of the economy, creation of jobs and the total eradication of the Boko Haram group. He also argued that individual cooperation with the international community would help to increase the country's production, and the new government recommended hard work as the path towards prosperity. The detailed analysis of Buhari's speech

below discusses the various rhetorical strategies Buhari employs to convince his audience of his ability to bring change to Nigeria.

#### **4.3.2 Analysis of speech by Muhammadu Buhari**

Buhari's opening statements in his inauguration speech skilfully and strategically take the Nigerian audience in his confidence by showing that the newly elected government has achieved its mission of winning the elections as a result of joint efforts. He states:

I am immensely grateful to God who has preserved us to witness this day and this occasion. Today marks a triumph for Nigeria and an occasion to celebrate her freedom and cherish her democracy. Nigerians have shown their commitment to democracy and are determined to entrench its culture. Our journey has not been easy but thanks to the determination of our people and strong support from friends abroad we have today a truly democratically elected government in place.

Like Mbeki whose speech was analysed in the previous section, Buhari exploits religious allusion to build his rhetoric. The rhetoric of religion is applied from the onset to make his audience aware of his divine appointment: "I am immediately grateful to God who has preserved us to witness this day and this occasion." This is definitely an effective rhetorical device as it not only suggests that Buhari is humble and grateful, but more significantly it intimates that God is backing him up and therefore no Nigerian can oppose him. The introductory words are well chosen to appeal to the religious sentiments of all Nigerians as the reference to "God" does not differentiate the Islamic God from the Christian God. As an oratorical skill, this religious allusion is highly effective in creating a sense of religious unity and tolerance, something which was gravely lacking in Nigeria at the time Buhari came into power.

The rest of the introduction cleverly attributes his victory to the "the determination of our people and strong support from friends abroad", which has put in place "a truly

democratically elected government”. The adjectival phrase with which this introduction ends is a powerful rhetorical tool to convince the audience that the new government is a people’s government, elected by them out of free will. It is aimed at dispelling any thoughts of election rigging in the minds of the audience. Convincing his audience of this fact is important for Buhari to legitimise his leadership.

As with Mbeki before him, Buhari repeatedly uses the pronoun “I” in his speech as a way of distinguishing the individual from the group (his political party), such as when he says “I am immensely grateful to God” to indicate his personal appreciation to God for giving him victory. Significantly, the use of the “I” pronoun is also employed in situations where Buhari makes bold and solemn promises, such as “I intend to keep my oath and serve as President to all Nigerians”. With this kind of rhetoric Buhari creates a sense of optimism in the listeners. But he also uses the “I” when he makes strong assertions. For example, the statement “I belong to everybody and I belong to nobody” sends subtle messages to his own supporters, colleagues and those in the administration that they should not expect preferential treatment, and that he is prepared to serve all Nigerians equally. What more powerful tool can exist than this rhetorical device to create a sense of fairness! This is a tactic aimed at gaining more support, especially from among the ranks of the opposition.

Buhari also uses the “I” pronoun to project himself as a magnanimous winner who appreciates even the efforts and good deeds of his opponent and arch-rival, the outgoing President Jonathan. Like Obama who acknowledged the man whom he had beaten in the presidential race, President George Bush, Buhari thanks his opponent in his speech as a token of goodwill: “I would like to thank President GoodLuck Jonathan for his display of statesmanship in setting a precedent for us that has made our people proud to be Nigerians wherever they are”. The precedent Buhari refers to is the unexpected cooperation he received from President Jonathan and Jonathan’s willingness to accept defeat, as Buhari mentions in his next two statements: “Together we co-operated to surprise the world that had come to expect only the worst from Nigeria. I hope this act of graciously accepting defeat by the outgoing President will become the standard of political conduct in the country”. This

is political ego-messaging which Buhari deploys strategically to disarm Jonathan psychologically. At this point in the speech, it is very likely that even Jonathan's supporters would embrace Buhari and accept him as a good leader, one who pays homage to his predecessor. The above statement is by far the most potent rhetorical device intended to ease the tensions that might have existed between the two leaders and their respective followers.

Next Buhari personally thanks the people of Nigeria, both those who voted for him and those who did not, which is quite significant as a rhetorical ploy:

I would like to thank the millions of our supporters who believed in us even when the cause seemed hopeless. I salute their resolve in waiting long hours in rain and hot sunshine to register and cast their votes and stay all night if necessary to protect and ensure their votes count and were counted. I thank those who tirelessly carried the campaign on the social media. At the same time, I thank our other countrymen and women who did not vote for us but contributed to make our democratic culture truly competitive, strong and definitive. I thank all of you.

It is expected that Buhari will thank his voters for electing him into power, but to hear him thank even those who withheld their vote is unanticipated. This is a skilful mastery of persuasive language at work as his audience, both his voters and non-voters, are likely to begin seeing him as a divine figure with a huge propensity to forgive. Through the skilful manipulation of language, he manages to project himself as unbiased and to create the impression that he does not want to claim the victory for himself alone but for everyone of his countrymen and women, including those who did not support him. Such a performance of magnanimity is a feature of modern political speeches overloaded with political rhetoric.

Buhari couples his use of the "I" pronoun with use of the plural pronoun "we" along with the possessive pronouns "our" and "us", as a ploy to make his audience not to feel marginalised. When he says "I also wish to assure the wider international community of our readiness to cooperate and help to combat threats of cross-border



terrorism, sea piracy, refugees and boat people, financial crime, cyber crime, climate change, the spread of communicable diseases and other challenges of the 21st century”, he is suggesting that it is both his personal effort and the efforts of Nigerians, put together with the efforts of the international community, that will work to address these challenges. In this way, he does not marginalise any segment of his audience, making both local and international listeners, including Nigerians in the diaspora, feel part of this noble project.

In order to effectively create a sense of national cohesion, inclusiveness, duty, togetherness and belonging, Buhari makes use of the first person plural pronoun “we” in a particularly persuasive manner: “We can be a united people capable of doing what is right for our nation.” The use of “we” is also employed to create a sense of unity, like when Buhari says: “Together we co-operated to surprise the world” Another way in which the use of “we” is employed is to inculcate a sense of national pride and identity: “Furthermore, we are heirs to great civilisations.” This is followed up by Buhari mentioning a series of heritage and lineage accounts in order to express a sense of belonging and to sway the audience to his side: “Shehu Othman Dan Fodio’s caliphate, the Kanem Borno Empire, the Oyo Empire, the Benin Empire and King Jaja’s formidable domain. The blood of those great ancestors flow in our veins. What is now required is to build on these legacies, to modernize and uplift Nigeria”. With these words, Buhari constructs the rebuilding of Nigeria as a national project which is not only the responsibility of every Nigerian but also a task that “is by no means insurmountable” because Nigerians are descendants of great leaders. The rhetoric of successful leadership as an inherited legacy works to Buhari’s advantage in persuading his audience to believe that the challenges facing Nigeria are not untamable. The audience is more likely to give him their support in finding solutions to these challenges. Cleverly, Buhari acknowledges these challenges: “Insecurity, pervasive corruption, the hitherto unending and seemingly impossible fuel and power shortages”. This is clever because it positions him as an honest leader.

There is another way in which Buhari employs the use of “we” and that is to articulate the government’s commitment to meet its obligations of tackling existing challenges. He states with conviction: “We are going to tackle them head on. Nigerians will not regret that they have entrusted national responsibility to us. We must not succumb to hopelessness and defeatism. We can fix our problems”. The repeated emphasis on “we” suggests a determination to do that which is necessary for the good of the people of Nigeria. It is also a cleverly devised strategy to create a sense of ownership of the government, that is to say, that every individual Nigerian should feel that the government belongs to him/her and not just to those who voted for the winning candidate. However, indirectly it also puts the responsibility of fixing the problems on all Nigerians and therefore the citizens cannot complain to the government about its failures when from the start it was made known that the responsibility was shared between the government and the people. Note especially the subtle abnegation of duty implied in the statement “Nigerians will not regret that they have entrusted national responsibility to us”. The “us” here is ambiguous as it is not clear if it refers to Buhari as the state personified, to his party, or to both him and the party working in coalition with other parties. This ambiguity means that when it comes to accountability, it will be hard for the audience to hold any particular individual or party accountable. Thus, while the audience may be pleased that Buhari makes them an integral part of the process of change, they may easily miss his subtle ploy to deny them the rights to question him when things do not turn out as expected.

Buhari’s use of the plural pronoun “we” in this part of his speech stands in contrast to his use of the “I” pronoun later on when he states: “As far as the constitution allows me I will try to ensure that there is responsible and accountable governance at all levels of government in the country. For I will not have kept my own trust with the Nigerian people if I allow others abuse theirs under my watch”. It is quite striking that he changes from the presidential “we” to the individualised “I” when talking about accountability to the government. These two statements point to the possibility of Buhari personally taking matters into his hands rather than allowing state procedures to be followed. Since the Constitution is subject to interpretation, it is possible that some form of tyranny or authoritarianism may be justified using the Constitution.

Thus, Buhari seduces his listeners with rhetoric that seems to promise them all that is good but beneath the surface there lurks also promises of some things also not good.

Besides the use of pronouns in rhetorical delivery, Buhari's speech also makes use of adjectives in a skilful way to paint a picture of the "democratic culture" of the country Nigeria. The system has been described as "competitive", "strong", and also as "definitive". These words have been carefully chosen and the rhetoric calculated to garner the support of all citizens of Nigeria. But the target of Buhari's speech is not only his fellow countrymen and women; he also wants to win the confidence of foreign investors, and thus he speaks of a "viable" and "progressive" country. These are choice words and the rhetorical strategy is clearly aimed at improving the international image of the country.

Another rhetorical device in the speech of Buhari, as in the speeches of Mandela, Obama and Mbeki, is the use of the present and future tenses to convey very powerful messages in the simplest way possible. Buhari highlights problems and makes promises and pledges in the present tense, while using the future tense to propose possible solutions. For example, he states:

With depleted foreign reserves, falling oil prices, leakages and debts the Nigerian economy is in deep trouble and will require careful management to bring it round and to tackle the immediate challenges confronting us, namely, Boko Haram, the Niger Delta situation, the power shortages and unemployment especially among young people.

Since Boko Haram is perceived as posing a threat to the future stability of the country, it is imperative that the newly-elected president should address its violence. Buhari informs his audience that some progress has been made in curbing the Boko Haram insurgency, but "victory cannot be achieved by basing the Command and Control Centre in Abuja". Therefore, Buhari promises that "the command centre will be relocated to Maiduguri and remain until Boko Haram is completely subdued." His use of the future tense gives hope to his listeners who are in need of some optimistic

news. Other examples are: “we shall overhaul the rules of engagement to avoid human rights violations in operations”, “we shall improve operational and legal mechanism”, and “we shall rebuild and reform the public service.” All of this serves to convince the audience of his determination to solve the manifold problems affecting Nigerians.

As pointed out in the analyses of speeches in the previous chapter, the use of abstract nouns is a common rhetorical tool in political speeches. Buhari adds weight to his speech by mentioning common problems embedded in abstract nouns such as “unemployment”, “evil”, “crime”, “corruption”, “terrorism”, and “misery”, all of which he promises to fight. For example, he states: “Unemployment, notably youth unemployment, features strongly in our Party’s Manifesto. We intend to attack the problem frontally through revival of agriculture, solid minerals mining as well as credits to small and medium size businesses to kick-start these enterprises”. It is obvious that Buhari addresses a common problem that most politicians would address in their inauguration speech i.e. unemployment, which puts him in a positive light as a leader who cares about the wellbeing of his citizens. Several abstract nouns which are ‘buzz’ words in political speeches also feature in Buhari’s speech, such as “development”, “legacy”, “rules of engagement” and “labour”. These are all used in various statements to convince the audience of the new leadership’s potential to bring about positive change in Nigeria.

Persuasive speaking can also take the form of hyperbole. For example, note the obvious exaggeration in the statements made about Boko Haram, especially the one in which Buhari describes it as “a terrifying force, taking tens of thousands of lives and capturing several towns and villages covering swathes of Nigeria’s sovereign territory.” Tactfully, he manages to create a sense of alarm and impending danger, therefore emphasising the need for urgent measures to be taken against the onslaught. Furthermore, Boko Haram is described as a “mindless, godless group who are as far away from Islam as one can think of.” This is quite ironic considering that Boko Haram projects itself as an Islamist group operating mainly in Islamist parts of Nigeria. The calculated effect of Buhari’s castigation is to create hostility

towards Boko Haram by all Nigerians. But hyperbole can also be used to paint positive images as can be seen in the example: “The Nigerian press is the most vibrant in Africa.” In this way, hyperbole is used to give assurance. Buhari, as a skilful speaker and one who applies rhetoric, is trying to woo the media to his side, while at the same time trying to win the confidence of the general members of the public by portraying himself as a protector of press freedom.

Positive negation is another tactic used by political leaders who apply rhetoric as a means of persuasive speaking. Notice the following examples: “Nigerians will not regret that they have entrusted national responsibility to us” and “The Federal Executive under my watch will not seek to encroach on the duties and functions of the Legislative and Judicial arms of government.” Although these two statements are said in the negative, they convey positive ideas. The effect of this ploy is to give assurance and evoke goodwill which, in turn and in the long run, ensures cooperation from all citizens. The calculated effect is to put the listeners’ minds at ease and to make even the sceptics embrace the speaker’s views. Notice also how Buhari continues to use negation to convey positive ideas and articulate the government’s strategy and its commitment with regard to resolving problems. For example, Buhari states: “we will not allow this to go on”, referring to the ongoing electricity problems in Nigeria. Again, he uses negation to dispel the fears and doubts of others who might perceive him as a vindictive leader who will now take revenge on his opponents: “there will be no paying off of old scores.” This surely will put the minds of his opponents at ease, making room for winning their support.

Personification is another tactic loved by public speakers as a rhetorical device. As an example, Buhari states: “At home, the new government is basking in a reservoir of goodwill and high expectations.” One can imagine such a reservoir awaiting to open the floodgates of human activity in support of what is clearly a very popular government. Here follows another example of personification: “the federal government should [not] fold its arms and close its eyes to what is going on in the states and local governments.” The message is clear even to those who are blind that the new government intends to ensure effectiveness at all levels of governance.

Attributing human qualities of action and sight to the new government projects it as a government that has a vision to fight corruption at state and local levels.

The use of comparatives is yet another tactic employed by public speakers who use language as a means of persuasion. For example, “we shall examine the best way to revive major industries.” It is noteworthy that the incumbent is making subtle and almost veiled comparisons between the outgoing government and the new one. In a nutshell, Buhari is saying the old government did well, but the new one will outdo it because it aims at doing its best. Buhari manages to make the listener to actually hear the unspoken words. Notice also the use of negative comparison to convey positive messages: “We cooperated to surprise the world that had come to expect the worst from Nigeria.” Without actually saying so, Buhari implies that the previous government failed the Nigerian people by its mediocre or even less than mediocre performance, to the extent that the international community saw Nigeria as a nation of underperformers. But the new government is here to change all of that. This message is hanging in the air, although the actual words had not been uttered. Such is the power of rhetoric. Notice another subtle way of using comparison to convey rhetorical messages: “studies are underway to identify the quickest, safest, and most cost effective ways to bring light and relief to the Nigerians” The unspoken words in this tactful message is that the new government will perform in the superlative, unlike the previous one which did not demonstrate such excellence when embarking on planned operations.

Prepositions, too, can be used with learned skill to convey rhetoric messages in the art of persuasive speaking. Like Obama, Buhari likes to start his sentences with prepositions. For example, “At home we face enormous challenges”, “To achieve our goals we must consciously work”, and “For now, the armed forces will be fully charged with prosecuting the fight against Boko Haram.” This manner of speaking draws the attention of the listeners to the exact point where the speaker wants it to be directed, and that point is crucially put at the beginning of the sentence. This is a very tactful way of drawing attention and making emphasis.

There is yet another ploy loved by those who use rhetoric for the purpose of persuasion in public speaking, and that is the use of generalisations. As a rhetorical device, generalisations are preferred by public speakers to indicate that they do not take sides. In other words, they like to be seen as impartial so they can win the confidence of everyone listening to them. For example, “I thank you all” and “I intend to serve as President to all Nigerians”. It is a powerful tool for building trust and luring those who are indecisive and others who feel marginalised.

The use of double adjectival expressions as a rhetorical device to manipulate the audience can also be identified in the speech of Buhari, especially with reference to Boko Haram. For example, Buhari states: “Boko Haram is a *mindless, godless* group who are as far away from Islam as one can think of” (emphasis added). Here he implies that Boko Haram is incapable of thinking, that they have no faith in any kind of deity, and that their claims to Islam are false. This is calculated to alienate Boko Haram from the majority of Muslims who make up a huge part of the Nigerian population. By portraying Boko Haram as counterfeit Islamic criminals, Buhari inflames the fury of genuine Muslims against the Boko Haram. However, despite his tough stance on Boko Haram and his flowing rhetoric against the “group”, Buhari seems to have given the Boko Haram too much space to manoeuvre. The issue of the Chibok girls should have long been settled by his government. To date, there has been no clear resolution of the problem and the “Bring Back Our Girls” campaign continues.

Buhari ends his speech with a literary allusion to Shakespeare’s play *Julius Caesar* in which the idea of a “tide” and “flood” are related in the way in which they symbolise the greatness of a nation in overcoming its challenges:

Our situation somehow reminds one of a passage in Shakespeare’s  
*Julius Ceasar*:

There is a tide in the affairs of men which,  
taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;  
Omitted, all the voyage of their life,  
Is bound in shallows and miseries.

We have an opportunity. Let us take it.

With these words, Buhari urges all Nigerians to expend themselves to save their country from complete collapse. Such a dramatic close to his speech can only earn him resounding applause from his supporters, and admiration, however reluctant, from his opponents.

South African politician, Mmusi Maimane, equally makes use of literary allusions in his speeches. The next section discusses Maimane's political rhetoric.



#### **4.4. SPEECH BY MMUSI MAIMANE (2015)**

##### **4.4.1 Mmusi Maimane's biography**

Mmusi Maimane is a South African political leader of the official opposition party, the Democratic Alliance (DA). He was elected to that position on 10 May 2015. He is also the leader of the DA in the National Assembly since 29 May 2015. The speech under discussion was delivered by Maimane in response to President Jacob Zuma's State of the Nation address (SONA) in 2015 during the parliament debate that usually follows a SONA. The speech is tellingly titled "A broken man presiding over a broken society".

Maimane was born in June 1980. He was elected as Johannesburg mayoral candidate in 2011 in the municipal elections and helped the DA party to grow rapidly. He also served as the leader of the official opposition on the Johannesburg City Council until May 2014. Maimane then announced that he would join the race for federal heads of the DA on 10 May 2015. He faced a serious challenge as a leader when he was expected to discipline Kohler Barnard, after Barnard had expressed her opinion on Facebook in support of someone who had said life in South Africa was better under apartheid leader P.W. Botha than it is now. With Maimane's intervention, Barnard deleted the Facebook post, and this is one of the factors that led to Maimane's graduation to supremacy in the DA. Maimane later announced that the DA would introduce equity targets when candidates are to be selected for public office. These would make the party more diverse and reflective of the country's diversity. Maimane holds a BA degree in psychology from the University of South Africa, a Master's degree in Public Administration from Wits and a Master's degree in Theology from Wales University.

##### **4.4.2 Analysis of speech by Mmusi Maimane**

Maimane employs political rhetoric in ways that ultimately aim to persuade his listeners to withdraw support from President Jacob Zuma and redirect that support towards himself and the DA. He begins his speech by alluding to the passing of South Africa's literary giant, Andre Brink:

Eleven days ago we lost one of South Africa's literary giants, Professor Andre Brink. Our sadness at his passing is tempered only by the great literature he bequeathed us.

With this commemorative opening statement, Maimane establishes the theme of loss which he builds on in the rest of his speech to convey his ideology that South Africa is experiencing tremendous loss – loss of democratic vision, loss of jobs, loss of state capital and loss of values. He uses the plural personal pronoun “we” throughout, which suggests that this loss is a concern for all South Africans. Then he exploits Andre Brink's status as a social commentator to launch his attack on the existing leadership and simultaneously denote the possibility of a ‘better’ leadership:

Professor Brink taught us a powerful lesson. He taught us that you cannot blame a faceless system for the evils in society. It is human beings that perpetrate wrongs against others. And it is human beings that have the power to correct these wrongs. We would do well to heed this lesson as we debate the State of the Nation today.

As has been argued before, the use of plural pronouns is a powerful rhetorical instrument used by politicians to persuade listeners to embrace their views. Maimane's statement “We would do well to heed this lesson as we debate the State of the Nation today” reinforces the idea of inclusiveness, compelling South Africans to believe that he is on the same side as them in renouncing the “evils in society”. According to Goatly (2008), this rhetorical technique is powerful in regulating listeners' behaviour whereby they begin to think and act in support of the speaker's cause.

The title of Maimane's speech itself “A broken man presiding over a broken society” is a powerful rhetoric, because it creates a sense of pessimism in the present leadership and implies that change is needed to ‘rescue’ the nation from the president. Throughout the speech, Maimane reiterates his key thought of a broken South Africa ruled by a broken president, varying the diction to make different points to different listeners. When addressing the president directly, he states: “You are a broken man, presiding over a broken society”. Later when speaking to parliament as a whole he states:

Madam Speaker, I led my party out of this House on Thursday night because we could not sit by while our freedoms were destroyed right in front of us. When we emerged from this chamber, we heard the President reading the cold and empty words from his prepared text. They were the words of a broken man, presiding over a broken society.

To further enhance the image of a broken man presiding over a broken society, Maimane launches into a litany of expositions about President Zuma and the government over which he presides:

For 6 years, he [Zuma] has run from the 783 counts of corruption, fraud and racketeering that have haunted him from before the day he was elected.

For 6 years, this broken man has spent his waking hours plotting and planning to avoid his day in court.

In this broken man's path of destruction, lies a litany of broken institutions. Each one of them targeted because of their constitutional power to hold him to account.

A broken SARS, that should be investigating the fringe tax benefits from Nkandla, the palace of corruption that was built with the people's money.

A broken NPA, that should have continued with its prosecution of the President, without fear or favour.

A broken SIU, a broken Hawks, a broken SAPS. And so we could go on with the list of institutions President Zuma is willing to break to protect himself and his friends.

This is why we are a broken society.

Maimane's repetition of the phrase "a broken man" and "a broken society" becomes a refrain throughout his speech which posits the view that South Africa was on the brink of total collapse owing to Zuma's misguided leadership. Repetition is used effectively to attack the president and to portray him as a self-centred person responsible for all the social and political problems experienced by South Africans. The parallelism in the noun clauses "a broken man" and "a broken nation" conveys the idea of a South Africa in disarray owing to leadership by an unfit president. In this

instance, political rhetoric is used not only to withdraw listeners' sympathy from the president but also to redirect that sympathy to the speaker – a man who seems to be genuinely concerned about the plight of the nation. This observation confirms the view by Horne and Heinemann (2006) that language is often used in public speaking for manipulative purposes where speakers manipulate their listeners to 'buy' their point of view. Maimane certainly does that in his speech. "A broken man presiding over a broken society" is a rhetorical ploy to discredit the head of state and score political points with an already enraged audience. By referring to Zuma's corruption charges and the collapse of institutions such as SAPS, the NPA and the SIU, Maimane ingeniously constructs the image of a broken South Africa under an unfit leader. The effect is then a huge diversion of support from the president and the ANC.

Declarative statements also feature prominently in Maimane's speech as a way of emphasizing the conviction in his point of view. For example, he states: "it is true that the uneven legacy of the apartheid system weighs heavy on us. It is a fact that black children still do not have the same opportunities as white children". The declarations "it is true" and "it is a fact" suggest that these are incontestable ideas. Implicit in these claims is the notion that South Africans need to join the speaker in taking action to remedy these situations.

When Lucas (2012) describes public speaking as an art, we understand that it takes skilful planning to execute such an art. Although Maimane was highly emotional when he delivered his speech, it is evident that he put careful thought into choosing his words and arranging his ideas. There are numerous hyphenated words combining adjectives and nouns in his speech. The following are examples: "community-funded", "load-shedding", "war-roam", "mega-arm", "hard-working", "start-ups", "over-run", "anti-drug", "crime-fighting", "state-owned", and "fast-track". These words are used in statements that appeal to the listeners' sensitivity, compelling them to see the extent to which their country has been run down supposedly by Zuma and his cohorts.

Maimane also uses anecdotes to appeal to his listeners' sensitivity, cajoling them to withdraw support from Zuma and his cohorts. To illustrate this point, consider Maimane's anecdote about a struggling hospice in Atteridgeville:

In Atteridgeville, I met a good man running a hospice that is struggling more and more each day to care for the sick because all their money goes to fuelling a generator. This is their last line of defence against an electricity crisis that plagues them on a daily basis.

The daily struggle of this community-funded organisation is just one example of the devastating impact this electricity crisis is having on households, businesses, schools, hospitals, and countless other facets of society. In recounting this experience, Maimane deliberately uses the expression "community-funded organization" to convey the idea that this community is putting its money in the right place whereas Zuma is wasting state funds to bail out Eskom which then continues to exercise monopoly over power supply. The stark contrast in what the organisation does with its funds – to save lives – and what Zuma does with state funds – to support an organisation whose failure to deliver electricity endangered those same lives – points to the power of rhetoric in appealing to the emotions – not just the minds – of listeners.

Contrast is also effectively constructed in Maimane's speech through the use of calculated pauses and breaks. For example, describing the President's response to the eviction of opposition party members from parliament during SONA 2015, Maimane states: "You laughed while trampling Madiba's legacy – in the very week that we celebrated 25 years since his release". Maimane here contrasts Zuma's trampling of the Madiba legacy with the nation's celebration of Madiba's release. This contrast reveals a succinct irony. The impression created by this kind of political rhetoric is that the president is incapable of sustaining the country's vision for freedom and, therefore, not fit to hold office.

There is a noticeable use of negation in Maimane's speech as part of a political rhetoric to portray the president as dishonest and project himself as sincere.

Maimane states: “For you, Honourable President, are not an honourable man.” Maimane, undoubtedly, implies that the president is not trustworthy as he has broken his oath of office by not working in line with the Constitution. The president has been implicated in the Nkandla scandal which made headlines in both local and global media. Members of the public are already aware of this report. Maimane’s listeners are likely to throw their weight behind him since the image of the president has already diminished in the public media. Negation in this case is a powerful rhetorical device to extort political loyalty from an audience that is already sufficiently outraged by the president’s media scandals.

Negation is also used in Maimane’s speech for specific purposes. First, to show the sincerity of his argument, as in “But please do not take it literally.” The implication here is that the president should analyse what is being said and not just take the statement as it comes from the speaker’s mouth. Secondly, negation is an effective rhetorical device used to highlight the president’s dishonesty, as in the statement previously quoted “For you, Honourable President, are not an honourable man.” The impression created here is that the president is untrustworthy. This could also suggest that he is not fit for that position, a powerful political rhetoric to win support from the listeners. On the other hand, negation is used as a warning to the President. “Honorable president, we will never forgive you for what you have done.” This statement conveys to the audience the extent of the damage the president has caused, so much so that he does not deserve to be forgiven. According to Maimane, the president appears to have completely failed to work according to government policy. Because the above statement is preceded by claims that Zuma has trampled on Madiba’s legacy and “people don’t trust the police”, this political rhetorical device will make the audience align itself with the speaker because the president, it seems, is not serious.

Having succeeded in imprinting on his listeners’ minds the image of a broken man presiding over a broken nation, Maimane up-scales his rhetoric to catapult his audience into envisioning a new South Africa ruled by the DA, because of course a broken nation needs to be fixed and that can only be done by a party or individual

exhibiting a trustworthy public image. Maimane's rhetoric thus changes from the present tense to the use of the future tense, suggestive of his commitment to transform South Africa and fulfill his party's promises. He states:

Madam Speaker, change may seem slow, but it is coming. There is a swell starting to build and, when the wave crashes, it will sweep this broken man out of power. When that happens, we will be there to start fixing this broken society, and unleash the potential of South Africans.

That is why the party I lead in this Parliament will not join other parties in breaking down our institutions. Because one day, when we are in government, we will want those institutions and this Parliament to hold us to account.

The implication of the statement is that the ruling party is not responsible and accountable to the nation, and that they (the DA) will be able to carry out its duties when they are in government. This is the climaxing rhetorical device used to manipulate the audience and to use parliament as a platform for political point scoring. Other supportive statements of this rhetorical ploy are as follows:

And so we will look within the institution of democracy to hold this government to account and we will continue creating opportunities for all where we govern.

We will work tirelessly to build a truly democratic affirmative South Africa.

We will restore power to our people.

With these promises of better governance under the DA leadership, Maimane puts his party in a positive light, holding it up as the right party for South Africans to support.

To demonstrate what he calls "the abuse of power", Maimane uses exaggeration as part of his rhetorical device to destroy the image of the president. For example, "The abuse of power is happening at every level." The suggestion made by the above

statement is that there is no single government institution that is not characterized by corruption. This kind of rhetorical strategy is likely to be embraced by the listeners, and it is likely to make them side with the speaker as they may not have time to verify the validity of the statement at the moment of speaking.

Maimane continues to use exaggeration to present the president as paying little or no attention to the corruption going on in his government. When he says “we have mini-Zumas in governments and municipalities all over South Africa”, the phrase “mini-Zumas” is deliberately used to paint a negative picture of the president so that the audience must see him as the cause of their suffering since he allows mimics of himself to rule. The phrase “all over” is clearly an exaggeration aimed at escalating the extent of corruption in the country. This kind of rhetorical device would probably encourage people to develop a negative attitude towards the president.

Maimane’s speech contains comparatives as part of his rhetoric. He makes a comparison between the apartheid regime and the present to show that things have improved, though they are not where they should be. He states: “Much has been done to redress the past, make no mistake. Life in South Africa today is certainly better than it was during apartheid. But we need to hold ourselves to a much higher standard than that”. The word “better” as a comparative presupposes that living conditions during the apartheid era were not acceptable and that there is improvement since the new government came into power. This acknowledgement of the ANC government’s accomplishments in transforming the country is likely to put him in good standing with members of the ANC, even though he is demanding for more transformation.

In addition, the use of pauses, indicated by commas, in the speech is a rhetorical tool which indicates that the speaker expresses more than one idea in the same statement. In the following statement, there are two pauses: “A few hours later, in this house, our freedom to communicate was violated by an order to jam the telecommunications network.” This is followed by another statement with a similar



structure: “We knew, at that very moment, that our democratic order was in grave danger.” It is clear that Maimane wants the audience to digest what he is telling them since pauses allow time for thinking or reflection. This is an effective rhetorical device to ensure that he gets his audience’s full attention in support of his views.

Rhetorical questions have also been used in Maimane’s speech for various reasons. For example, Maimane states: “And so the question we must ask today is, what is holding us back from achieving Madiba’s vision?” The intention here is to remind the listeners about Madiba – a world-famous struggle icon – and what he has achieved for the people of South Africa. The question put to the audience indicates that there is some unwillingness or reluctance on the part of South Africans to make Madiba’s dream come true, and this is due to some stumbling block or obstacle – the President. Another example of a rhetorical question is as follows: “Where is the accountability from this man who claims to be our President, when all he can offer is more of the same?” The impression created by this question is that the president is irresponsible and also lacks qualities of leadership. It is suggested that this is the reason he is unable to work to make significant changes in the government. This type of rhetoric is likely to work for Maimane as it serves as an eye-opener for the audience who may now begin to question the degree of progress made since the President took over power. The question, indirectly, contains a powerful persuasive function as it calls for self-introspection.

Throughout his speech, Maimane consistently forces his audience to think carefully about the man they have as president. One of the ways he does this effectively is by presenting statistical data to back up his points. For example, referring to Zuma he states: “For 6 years, he has run from the 783 counts of corruption, fraud and racketeering that have haunted him from before the day he was elected.” By mentioning specific figures, Maimane emphasizes the vastness of the president’s alleged criminal activities, implying that no sane person would want such a man for a leader. To add to Zuma’s failings, he refers to the crisis of load-shedding, again using statistical data to back up his argument: “Load-shedding is a crisis that will take our economy to the brink of economic shutdown. Our economy has lost R300

billion since 2008 because, without a stable electricity supply, manufacturers cannot produce, investors are driven away and jobs are lost". The loss of R300 billion is a huge loss to any economy, for the figure itself is hard to imagine in tangible form. This statistical detail thus serves as a powerful rhetorical tool to make the audience see a need to replace Zuma with a new leader. Maimane makes this suggestion more directly when he states the following:

Despite all his past promises, what President Zuma failed to tell us last week was that, today, there are 1.6 million more South Africans without jobs than when he took office in 2009. Living, breathing human beings robbed of their feeling of self-worth, and their ability to provide for their families.

Using the unemployment statistics is undoubtedly a strong weapon against Zuma since many South Africans listening to Maimane from their televisions at home are likely to endorse his view that the unemployment rate has worsened under the Zuma administration. It is most unlikely that the unemployed would be thinking that global recession is more to blame for unemployment than a bad administration. Thus, Maimane capitalises on the existing problems faced by many ordinary South Africans to 'rubbish' the president, using statistical data convincingly to do so.

Despite the fact that Maimane's speech sounds confrontational and aggressive, the exclamation mark (!) appears only twice in the whole speech. In the first instance, Maimane states: "Our communities are being over-run by drug lords and the president said nothing about crime!" The exclamation here indicates disbelief, and the intension here is to send a strong message to the audience that the president has gone too far this time with negligence and that it is time the people do something about him. Maimane directly stirs the emotions of the audience for support. Surprisingly, the exclamation mark is again used at the conclusion of the speech when Maimane ends by saying "I thank you!". This confirms that he has been delivering his speech under very strong emotions which he has used to rally support against the President.

On the whole, Maimane's speech appears to be directed at Zuma as a president rather than at the ruling party, which seems to suggest the pursuit of a personal vendetta. Even where Maimane makes reference to the failures of the government as a whole, his judgements seem biased because he turns a blind eye to the fact that there have been a series of service delivery protests in black townships such as Gugulethu and Inyanga in the Western Cape where the DA is in control of the government. The manner in which he manipulates language to sway public support towards the DA confirms theoretical perspectives that political rhetoric in public speaking is an art designed to deceive people, condition their response to realities, and regulate their actions to the favour of the orator (Cohen 1998; Horne and Heinemann 2006; Lucas 2012). As illustrated above, Maimane deploys a number of rhetorical techniques to persuade and sway his audience to 'buy' his political ideologies. His speech exploits political rhetoric to enforce a message of pessimism in the present political dispensation under the leadership of President Jacob Zuma and optimism for a future South Africa governed by the DA.

#### **4.5. SUMMARY**

There is a noticeable use of similar rhetorical devices in the speeches discussed in this chapter. In all three speeches, the first person singular pronoun "I" and the first person plural pronoun "we" are commonly used, the former to distinguish the individual from the group and the latter to indicate inclusiveness. The simple present tense and the future tense form a significant part of these political speeches as new governments have to deal with current and future problems of their societies. These tenses are also useful in the sense that people are likely to understand the future better when comparing with the present. Aspects of language such as comparatives, exaggeration, punctuation and personification also feature in these political speeches as effective rhetorical devices as they cannot be separated from language itself either in spoken or written form. These speeches also make effective use of negation (positive and negative), allusions (historical, literary and religious), rhetorical questions, and statistical data to move audiences to see things from the speakers' perspectives. No doubt, Mbeki, Buhari and Maimane each had different agendas in their speeches, yet they all used language in similar ways to achieve their goals.

## **4.2. CONCLUSION**

This chapter has argued that the use of rhetorical devices by politicians in their interactions with their audiences is indicative of the power of language, because listeners tend to align themselves with political views in public gatherings based on the effectiveness of the language used to appeal to the audience's emotions. The speeches discussed in this chapter also demonstrate that the language of power is an integral part of political rhetoric where politicians also use their positions of authority to assert their power over people.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

As stated in Chapter One, this study had two objectives, namely, to identify and explain the various rhetorical devices used by politicians in public speaking and to establish the kind of discourses created through this kind of rhetoric. The selected political speeches which have been analysed and interpreted in Chapter Three and Chapter Four reveal several linguistic and stylistic elements which make up the rhetoric of Barack Obama, Nelson Mandela, Thabo Mbeki, Muhammadu Buhari and Mmusi Maimane. This study has shown that these politicians employ similar rhetorical tools to canvass support from their audiences.

Insight gained from the analyses and interpretation of the selected speeches indicates that the use of the first person pronoun “I” and its plural form “we” has enormous implications on the speaker’s positioning of himself vis-à-vis his audience. The plural form is more dominant in the speeches where it is used to indicate inclusiveness, collectiveness or a sense of togetherness between the speaker and his audience. In the case of Obama and Mandela, it is used to avoid marginalising any groups which may feel alienated because of racial difference or political affiliation. In the case of Buhari and Maimane, it is used to refer either to people as a whole or people within a political group, without marginalising any other groups. On the other hand, the singular form is used mainly to assert authority or define a clear ideological stance, such as in Mbeki’s “I am an African” speech. It is evident that in all the selected political speeches, the speakers have used these pronouns as rhetorical devices to win the audience’s support for their political ideologies, political parties or political visions.

Other significant rhetorical devices identified in the preceding two chapters are the combination of the present and future tense, the use of negative and positive negation, the use of exaggeration or hyperbole, the use of comparatives, and the use of personifications. These devices are inseparable parts of both the spoken and

written form of public addresses. The use of the present and future tenses in the spoken address is particularly important as new governments often have to deal with present and future challenges in society, and therefore they win over their subjects when they address these challenges. It was also highlighted that allusions are an effective rhetorical device used by the politicians to draw on historical, religious and literary realities to make their points. This was particularly the case with Mbeki, Buhari and Maimane. These allusions position these leaders as learned men who are also in tune with past and current events in their time.

Other notable rhetorical devices identified in the speeches and discussed in Chapter Three and Chapter Four include the following: the use of abstract nouns which resonate with the audience such as “unemployment”, “insecurity” and “legacy”; the use of rhetorical questions to provoke the audience to think in a particular direction; the use of anecdotes which evoke sadness; the acknowledgement of previous leaders; the use of adjectival and noun phrases to describe existing conditions; the use of conjunctions at the beginning of sentences to maintain an informal or conversational tone; the use of repetition to reiterate salient points; and the use of declarative statements to convey promises of change. It is clear from these speeches that each speaker attempts to persuade his audience to buy his ideologies, to support him or his party or to sustain whatever support they have already displayed.

As noted in the analytical chapters, discourses of power form the basis of the application of rhetoric in these speeches. The speakers both use the power of language to influence their audience’s thinking and actions and assert their power on their audience using carefully selected words. While their use of language may be impressive, it is noted that it is not always free of deceit. In line with theories of language and power highlighted throughout this study, it has been illustrated that political rhetoric is manipulative as much as it is convincing.

## **5.2. CONCLUSION**

The findings from this study indicate that it is important for rhetoric to be studied as a subject, so that members of the public can become aware of the manipulations of language in the public sphere. Since politicians can easily use language to manipulate and deceive people, it would be to the people's advantage to know how language constructs power. This study has shown that political rhetoric has two sides. On the one hand, it is a useful tool for politicians to use in reassuring their audiences of their commitment to leadership and transformation, as in the case of Obama and Mandela. On the other hand, it is a weapon that can be used to launch political wars as in Maimane's case or to blind people to real problems facing them as in Mbeki's and Buhari's speeches. Adequate knowledge of political rhetoric will therefore prevent listeners from being easy prey to the persuasive strategies of unscrupulous politicians. This study has shown that political rhetoric in public speaking is inseparable from political discourse formation. The five political speeches analysed in this study bear testimony to the power of rhetoric in building statesmen.

### **5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings outlined above, this study recommends the re-introduction of rhetoric into the curriculum in South African institutions of higher learning or where this is already taking place some emphasis on political rhetoric. Considering the political upheavals in South Africa at the present time, such a programme will result in conscientisation of the youth so that they are not easily lured into political movements which are underpinned by the selfish interests of their leaders. It will make the youth to be critical of the politics around them and not be gullible. The second recommendation is that further research be conducted on the political rhetoric of female politicians. This study has focused on male politicians only. However, it would be interesting to find out what constitutes the rhetorical ammunition of women leaders such as former DA leader Helen Zille, Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, and US 2016 presidential contestant Hilary Clinton. This will greatly enrich existing knowledge on political rhetoric in public speaking.

## REFERENCES

- African National Congress. 2014. Election manifesto. Retrieved from [www.anc.org.za.php3ft9630](http://www.anc.org.za.php3ft9630). Accessed 18 August 2015.
- All Progressive Congress. 2015. Securing Nigeria's future: The 2015 manifesto. Retrieved from <https://www.proshareng.com/admin/upload/reports/SecuringNigeriasFutureOurCommitment.pdf>. Accessed 18 August 2015.
- Bielsa, S.M. and O'Donnell, M. 2017. Language and power in English texts. Retrieved from <http://web.uam.es/departamentos/filoyletras/filoinglesa/Courses/LFC-SFL/PowerDoctoradoV9-readingsweek2.pdf>. Accessed 18 September 2017.
- Bradford, R. 1997. *Stylistics: The new critical idiom*. New York: Routledge.
- Brooks, C. and Warren, R.P. 1970. *Modern rhetoric*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Brummette, B. 2006. *Rhetoric in popular culture*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Buhari, M. 2015. Inaugural speech as President of the Republic of Nigeria, 29 May 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/05/read-president-buhari-inaugural-speech/> Accessed on 18 August 2015.
- Chartes-Black, J. 2005. *Politics and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphors*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cohen, J.R. 1998. *Communication criticism: Developing your critical powers*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- De Wet, J.C. 2013. *The art of persuasive communication*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. 2002. *Handbook of qualitative research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dwivedi, A.V. 2015. Mandelian rhetoric: An analysis of Nelson Mandela's political speeches. *Linguistics and Literature Studies* 3(2): 66-69.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis*. Boston: Wesley Publishers.
- Fowler, J.W. 1981. *Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Gunawan, S. 2010. Style of Obama's inauguration speech. *Kata* 12(1): 92-107. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/47716052\\_Style\\_of\\_Obama%27s\\_Inauguration\\_Speech](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/47716052_Style_of_Obama%27s_Inauguration_Speech). Accessed 18 August 2015.
- Hendricks, G. 1974. *The life and work of Thomas Eakins*. 1<sup>st</sup> edition. New York: Grossman Publishers.



- Horne, F. and Heinemann, G. 2006. *English in perspective*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G.N. and Short, M.H. 1981. *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Routledge.
- Leedy, P.D. and Omrod, J.E. 2013. *Practical research: Planning and design*. 10<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Pearson Education.
- Lucas, S.E. 2012. *The art of public speaking*. 11<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mackey, S. 2005. Rhetorical theory of public relations: Opening the door to semiotic and pragmatism approaches. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association, Christchurch, New Zealand, 4-7 July 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.anzca.net/documents/2005-conf-papers/231-a-rhetorical-theory-of-public-relations-opening-the-door-to-semiotic-and-pragmatism-approaches-1/file.html>. Accessed 18 August 2015.
- Maimane, M. 2015. A broken man presiding over a broken society. Speech presented during the State of the Nation Address Debate, 17 February 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.da.org.za/2015/02/broken-man-presiding-broken-society/> Accessed on 18 August 2015.
- Mandela, N. 1994. Inauguration speech as President of the Republic of South Africa, 10 May 1994, Pretoria. Retrieved from [http://www.mandela.gov.za/mandela\\_speeches/1994/940510\\_inauguration.htm](http://www.mandela.gov.za/mandela_speeches/1994/940510_inauguration.htm). Accessed on 29 July 2014.
- Mbeki, T. 1996. I am an African – Thabo Mbeki’s speech at the adoption of the Republic of South Africa Constitution Bill, 8 May 1996, Cape Town. Retrieved from <http://www.anc.org.za/content/i-am-african-thabo-mbekis-speech-adoption-republic-south-africa-constitution-bill>. Accessed on 18 August 2015.
- Morris, K. 2008. Rhetoric and the method of democracy. In Landis K. (ed.) *Start talking: A handbook for engaging difficult dialogues in the classroom*. Anchorage: University of Alaska Anchorage, 43-46.
- Nkealah, N. 2012. Female sexuality under the male gaze: Reading style and ideology in Bole Butake’s *The Rape of Michelle*. In Makhokha J.K.S., Obiero O.J. and West-Pavlov R. (eds) *Style in African literature: Essays on literary stylistics and narrative styles*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 353-380.
- Obama, B. 2009. Presidential inauguration speech, 20 January 2009. Retrieved from <http://obamaspeeches.com/P-Obama-Inaugural-Speech-Inauguration.htm>. Accessed on 29 July 2014.
- Olaosun, I.E. 2012. Incantation as discourse: A discourse-stylistic study of the confrontational scene of Ola-Rotimi’s *The Gods are not to blame*. In Makhokha

J.K.S., Obiero O.J. and West-Pavlov R. (eds) *Style in African literature: Essays on literary stylistics and narrative styles*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 423-437.

Olateju, A. 2012. Current trends in African verbal stylistics: The Yoruba example. In Makhokha J.K.S., Obiero O.J. and West-Pavlov R. (eds) *Style in African literature: Essays on literary stylistics and narrative styles*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 59-70.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1993. *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Wang, J. 2010. A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1(3): 254-261.

West, V. 2014. A style of his own: A rhetorical analysis of President Barack Obama's inauguration address. Undergraduate research paper, Hollins University.

Widdowson, H.G. 1996. Pedagogical stylistics analysis. In Weber, J.J. (ed.) *The stylistics reader: From Roman Jakobson to the present*. London: Arnold.

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A**

#### **BARACK OBAMA'S INAUGURATION SPEECH (20 JANUARY 2009)**

My fellow citizens:

I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors. I thank President Bush for his service to our nation, as well as the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition.

Forty-four Americans have now taken the presidential oath. The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet, every so often the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because We the People have remained faithful to the ideals of our forbearers, and true to our founding documents.

So it has been. So it must be with this generation of Americans.

That we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood. Our nation is at war, against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred. Our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the nation for a new age. Homes have been lost; jobs shed; businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly; our schools fail too many; and each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet.

These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics. Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping of confidence across our land – a nagging fear that America’s decline is inevitable, and that the next generation must lower its sights.

Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America – they will be met.

On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord.

On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn out dogmas, that for far too long have strangled our politics.

We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit; to choose our better history; to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.

In reaffirming the greatness of our nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned. Our journey has never been one of short-cuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the faint-hearted – for those who prefer leisure over work, or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things – some celebrated but more often men and women obscure in their labor, who have carried us up the long, rugged path towards prosperity and freedom.

For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in search of a new life.

For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West; endured the lash of the whip and plowed the hard earth.

For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and Gettysburg; Normandy and Khe Sahn.

Time and again these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked till their hands were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions; greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction.

This is the journey we continue today. We remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive, our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. Our capacity remains undiminished. But our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions – that time has surely passed. Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America.

For everywhere we look, there is work to be done. The state of the economy calls for action, bold and swift, and we will act – not only to create new jobs, but to lay a new foundation for growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place, and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and

run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. And all this we will do.

Now, there are some who question the scale of our ambitions – who suggest that our system cannot tolerate too many big plans. Their memories are short. For they have forgotten what this country has already done; what free men and women can achieve when imagination is joined to common purpose, and necessity to courage.

What the cynics fail to understand is that the ground has shifted beneath them – that the stale political arguments that have consumed us for so long no longer apply. The question we ask today is not whether our government is too big or too small, but whether it works – whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified. Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will end. And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account – to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day – because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government.

Nor is the question before us whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched, but this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control – and that a nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous. The success of our economy has always depended not just on the size of our Gross Domestic Product, but on the reach of our prosperity; on the ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart – not out of charity, but because it is the surest route to our common good.

As for our common defense, we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals. Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man, a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake. And so to all other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was

born: know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more.

Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks, but with the sturdy alliances and enduring convictions. They understood that our power alone cannot protect us, nor does it entitle us to do as we please. Instead, they knew that our power grows through its prudent use; our security emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint.

We are the keepers of this legacy. Guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort – even greater cooperation and understanding between nations. We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people, and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan. With old friends and former foes, we'll work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet. We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense, and for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken; you cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you.

For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus – and non-believers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth; and because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass; that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself; and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace.

To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward, based on mutual interest and mutual respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict, or blame their society's ills on the West – know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history; but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.

To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow; to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds. And to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty, we say we can no longer afford indifference to the suffering outside our borders; nor can we consume the world's resources without regard to effect. For the world has changed, and we must change with it.

As we consider the road that unfolds before us, we remember with humble gratitude those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains. They have something to tell us, just as the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington whisper through the ages. We honor them not only because they are guardians of our liberty, but because they embody the spirit of service; a willingness to find meaning in something greater than themselves. And yet, at this moment – a moment that will define a generation – it is precisely this spirit that must inhabit us all.

For as much as government can do and must do, it is ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this nation relies. It is the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job which sees us through our darkest hours. It is the firefighter's courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke, but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child, that finally decides our fate.



Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But those values upon which our success depends – honesty and hard work, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism – these things are old. These things are true. They have been the quiet force of progress throughout our history. What is demanded then is a return to these truths. What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility – a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task.

This is the price and the promise of citizenship.

This is the source of our confidence – the knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny.

This is the meaning of our liberty and our creed – why men and women and children of every race and every faith can join in celebration across this magnificent mall, and why a man whose father less than sixty years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most sacred oath.

So let us mark this day with remembrance, of who we are and how far we have traveled. In the year of America's birth, in the coldest of months, a small band of patriots huddled by dying campfires on the shores of an icy river. The capital was abandoned. The enemy was advancing. The snow was stained with blood. At a moment when the outcome of our revolution was most in doubt, the father of our nation ordered these words be read to the people:

“Let it be told to the future world...that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive...that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet [it].”

America. In the face of our common dangers, in this winter of our hardship, let us remember these timeless words. With hope and virtue, let us brave once more the icy currents, and endure what storms may come. Let it be said by our children's children that when we were tested we refused to let this journey end, that we did not turn back nor did we falter; and with eyes fixed on the horizon and God's grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of freedom and delivered it safely to future generations.

Thank you. God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **NELSON MANDELA'S INAUGURATION SPEECH (PRETORIA, 10 MAY 1994)**

Your Majesties

Your Highnesses

Distinguished Guests

Comrades and Friends

Today, all of us do, by our presence here, and by our celebrations in other parts of our country and the world, confer glory and hope to newborn liberty.

Out of the experience of and extraordinary human disaster that lasted too long, must be born a society of which all humanity will be proud.

Our daily deeds as ordinary South Africans must produce an actual South African reality that will reinforce humanity's belief in justice, strengthen its confidence in the nobility of the human soul and sustain all our hopes for glorious life for all.

All this we owe both to ourselves and to the peoples of the world who are so well represented here today.

To my compatriots, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld.

Each time one of us touches the soil of this land, we feel a sense of personal renewal. The national mood changes as the seasons change.

We are moved by a sense of joy and exhilaration when the grass turns green and the flowers bloom.

That spiritual and physical oneness we all share with this common homeland explains the depth of the pain we all carried in our hearts as we saw our country tear itself apart in a terrible conflict, and as we saw it spurned, outlawed and isolated by

the peoples of the world, precisely because it has become the universal base of the pernicious ideology and practice of racism and racial oppression.

We, the people of South Africa, feel fulfilled that humanity has taken us back into its bosom, that we, who were outlaws not so long ago, have today been given the rare privilege to be host to the nations of the world on our own soil.

We thank all our distinguished international guests for having come to take possession people of our country of what is, after all, a common victory for justice, for peace, for human dignity.

We trust that you will continue to stand by us as we tackle the challenges of building peace, prosperity, non-sexism, non-racialism and democracy.

We deeply appreciate the role that the masses of our people and their political mass democratic, religious, women, youth, business, traditional and other leaders have played to bring about this conclusion. Not least among them is my Second Deputy President, the Honourable F.W. de Klerk.

We would also like to pay tribute to our security forces, in all their ranks, for the distinguished role they have played in securing our first democratic elections and the transition to democracy, from blood-thirsty forces which still refuse to see the light.

The time for the healing of the wounds has come.

The moment to bridge the chasms that divide us has come.

The time to build is upon us.

We have, at last, achieved our political emancipation. We pledge ourselves to liberate all our people from the continuing bondage of poverty, deprivation, suffering, gender and other discrimination.

We succeeded to take our last steps to freedom in conditions of relative peace. We commit ourselves to the construction of a complete, just and lasting peace.

We have triumphed in the effort to implant hope in the breasts of the millions of our people. We enter into a covenant that we shall build the society in which all South Africans, both black and white, will be able to walk tall, without any fear in their

hearts, assured of their inalienable right to human dignity – a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world.

As a token of its commitment to the renewal of our country, the new Interim Government of National Unity will, as a matter of urgency, address the issue of amnesty for various categories of our people who are currently serving terms of imprisonment.

We dedicate this day to all the heroes and heroines in this country and the rest of the world who sacrificed in many ways and surrendered their lives so that we could be free.

Their dreams have become reality. Freedom is their reward.

We are both humbled and elevated by the honour and privilege that you, the people of South Africa, have bestowed on us, as the first President of a united, democratic, non-racial and non-sexist government.

We understand it still that there is no easy road to freedom.

We know it well that none of us acting alone can achieve success.

We must therefore act together as a united people, for national reconciliation, for nation building, for the birth of a new world.

Let there be justice for all.

Let there be peace for all.

Let there be work, bread, water and salt for all.

Let each know that for each the body, the mind and the soul have been freed to fulfil themselves.

Never, never and never again shall it be that this beautiful land will again experience the oppression of one by another and suffer the indignity of being the skunk of the world.

Let freedom reign.

The sun shall never set on so glorious a human achievement!

God bless Africa!

Thank you.

## APPENDIX C

### THABO MBEKI'S SPEECH – "I AM AN AFRICAN" (CAPE TOWN, 8 MAY 1996)

Chairperson,

Esteemed President of the democratic Republic,

Honourable Members of the Constitutional Assembly,

Our distinguished domestic and foreign guests,

Friends,

On an occasion such as this, we should, perhaps, start from the beginning.

So, let me begin.

I am an African.

I owe my 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 fragrances of nature have been as pleasant to us as the sight of the wild blooms of the citizens of the veld.

The dramatic shapes of the Drakensberg, the soil-coloured waters of the Lekoa, iGqili noThukela, and the sands of the Kgalagadi, have all been panels of the set on the natural stage on which we act out the foolish deeds of the theatre of our day.

At times, and in fear, I have wondered whether I should concede equal citizenship of our country to the leopard and the lion, the elephant and the springbok, the hyena, the black mamba and the pestilential mosquito.

A human presence among all these, a feature on the face of our native land thus defined, I know that none dare challenge me when I say – I am an African!

I owe my being to the Khoi and the San whose desolate souls haunt the great expanses of the beautiful Cape – they who fell victim to the most merciless genocide our native land has ever seen, they who were the first to lose their lives in the struggle to defend our freedom and dependence and they who, as a people, perished in the result.

Today, as a country, we keep an audible silence about these ancestors of the generations that live, fearful to admit the horror of a former deed, seeking to obliterate from our memories a cruel occurrence which, in its remembering, should teach us not and never to be inhuman again.

I am formed of the migrants who left Europe to find a new home on our native land. Whatever their own actions, they remain still, part of me.

In my veins courses the blood of the Malay slaves who came from the East. Their proud dignity informs my bearing, their culture a part of my essence. The stripes they bore on their bodies from the lash of the slave master are a reminder embossed on my consciousness of what should not be done.

I am the grandchild of the warrior men and women that Hintsa and Sekhukhune led, the patriots that Cetshwayo and Mphephu took to battle, the soldiers Moshoeshe and Ngungunyane taught never to dishonour the cause of freedom.

My mind and my knowledge of myself is formed by the victories that are the jewels in our African crown, the victories we earned from Isandhlwana to Khartoum, as Ethiopians and as the Ashanti of Ghana, as the Berbers of the desert.

I am the grandchild who lays fresh flowers on the Boer graves at St Helena and the Bahamas, who sees in the mind's eye and suffers the suffering of a simple peasant folk, death, concentration camps, destroyed homesteads, a dream in ruins.



I am the child of Nongqause. I am he who made it possible to trade in the world markets in diamonds, in gold, in the same food for which my stomach yearns.

I come of those who were transported from India and China, whose being resided in the fact, solely, that they were able to provide physical labour, who taught me that we could both be at home and be foreign, who taught me that human existence itself demanded that freedom was a necessary condition for that human existence.

Being part of all these people, and in the knowledge that none dare contest that assertion, I shall claim that – I am an African.

I have seen our country torn asunder as these, all of whom are 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 know what it signifies when race and colour are used to determine who is human and who, sub-human.

I have seen the destruction of all sense of self-esteem, the consequent striving to be what one is not, simply to acquire some of the benefits which those who had improved themselves as masters had ensured that they enjoy.

I have experience of the situation in which race and colour is used to enrich some and impoverish the rest.

I have seen the corruption of minds and souls as (word not readable) of 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.

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.

And so, like pawns in the service of demented souls, they kill in furtherance of the political violence in KwaZulu-Natal. They murder the innocent in the taxi wars.

They kill slowly or quickly in order to make profits from the illegal trade in narcotics. They are available for hire when husband wants to murder wife and wife, husband.

Among us prowl the products of our immoral and amoral past – killers who have no sense of the worth of human life, rapists who have absolute disdain for the women of our country, animals who would seek to benefit from the vulnerability of the children, the disabled and the old, the rapacious who brook no obstacle in their quest for self-enrichment.

All this I know and know to be true because I am an African!

Because of that, I am also able to state this fundamental truth 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.

The great masses who are our mother and father will not permit that the behaviour of the few results in the description of our country and people as barbaric.

Patient because history is on their side, these masses do not despair because today the weather is bad. Nor do they turn triumphalist when, tomorrow, the sun shines.

Whatever the circumstances they have lived through and because of that experience, they are determined to define for themselves who they are and who they should be.

We are assembled here today to mark their victory in acquiring and exercising their right to formulate their own definition of what it means to be African.

The constitution whose adoption we celebrate constitutes an unequivocal statement that we refuse to accept that our Africanness shall be defined by our race, colour, gender or historical origins.

It is a firm assertion made by ourselves that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white.

It gives concrete expression to the sentiment we share as Africans, and will defend to the death, that the people shall govern.

It recognises the fact that the dignity of the individual is both an objective which society must pursue, and is a goal which cannot be separated from the material well-being of that individual.

It seeks to create the situation in which all our people shall be free from fear, including the fear of the oppression of one national group by another, the fear of the disempowerment of one social echelon by another, the fear of the use of state power to deny anybody their fundamental human rights and the fear of tyranny.

It aims to open the doors so that those who were disadvantaged can assume their place in society as equals with their fellow human beings without regard to colour, race, gender, age or geographic dispersal.

It provides the opportunity to enable each one and all to state their views, promote them, strive for their implementation in the process of governance without fear that a contrary view will be met with repression.

It creates a law-governed society which shall be inimical to arbitrary rule.

It enables the resolution of conflicts by peaceful means rather than resort to force.

It rejoices in the diversity of our people and creates the space for all of us voluntarily to define ourselves as one people.

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

Our sense of elevation at this moment also derives from the fact that this magnificent product is the unique creation of African hands and African minds.

But it is also constitutes a tribute to our loss of vanity that we could, despite the temptation to treat ourselves as an exceptional fragment of humanity, draw on the accumulated experience and wisdom of all humankind, to define for ourselves what we want to be.

Together with the best in the world, we too are prone to pettiness, petulance, selfishness and short-sightedness.

But it seems to have happened that we looked at ourselves and said the time had come that we make a super-human effort to be other than human, to respond to the call to create for ourselves a glorious future, to remind ourselves of the Latin saying: Gloria est consequenda – Glory must be sought after!

Today it feels good to be an African.

It feels good that I can stand here as a South African and as a foot soldier of a titanic African army, the African National Congress, to say to all the parties represented here, to the millions who made an input into the processes we are concluding, to our outstanding compatriots who have presided over the birth of our founding document, to the negotiators who pitted their wits one against the other, to the unseen stars who shone unseen as the management and administration of the Constitutional Assembly, the advisers, experts and publicists, to the mass communication media, to our friends across the globe – congratulations and well done!

I am an African.

I am born of the peoples of the continent of Africa.

The pain of the violent conflict that the peoples of Liberia, Somalia, the Sudan, Burundi and Algeria is a pain I also bear.

The dismal shame of poverty, suffering and human degradation of my continent is a blight that we share.

The blight on our happiness that derives from this and from our drift to the periphery of the ordering of human affairs leaves us in a persistent shadow of despair.

This is a savage road to which nobody should be condemned.

This thing that we have done today, in this small corner of a great continent that has contributed so decisively to the evolution of humanity says that Africa reaffirms that she is continuing her rise from the ashes.

Whatever the setbacks of the moment, nothing can stop us now!

Whatever the difficulties, Africa shall be at peace!

However improbable it may sound to the sceptics, Africa will prosper!

Whoever we may be, whatever our immediate interest, however much we carry baggage from our past, however much we have been caught by the fashion of cynicism and loss of faith in the capacity of the people, let us err today and say – nothing can stop us now!

Thank you.

## **APPENDIX D**

### **MUHAMMADU BUHARI'S INAUGURATION SPEECH (ABUJA, 29 MAY 2015)**

I am immensely grateful to God Who Has preserved us to witness this day and this occasion. Today marks a triumph for Nigeria and an occasion to celebrate her freedom and cherish her democracy. Nigerians have shown their commitment to democracy and are determined to entrench its culture. Our journey has not been easy but thanks to the determination of our people and strong support from friends abroad we have today a truly democratically elected government in place.

I would like to thank President Goodluck Jonathan for his display of statesmanship in setting a precedent for us that has now made our people proud to be Nigerians wherever they are. With the support and cooperation he has given to the transition process, he has made it possible for us to show the world that despite the perceived tension in the land we can be a united people capable of doing what is right for our nation. Together we co-operated to surprise the world that had come to expect only the worst from Nigeria. I hope this act of graciously accepting defeat by the outgoing President will become the standard of political conduct in the country.

I would like to thank the millions of our supporters who believed in us even when the cause seemed hopeless. I salute their resolve in waiting long hours in rain and hot sunshine to register and cast their votes and stay all night if necessary to protect and ensure their votes count and were counted. I thank those who tirelessly carried the campaign on the social media. At the same time, I thank our other countrymen and women who did not vote for us but contributed to make our democratic culture truly competitive, strong and definitive.

I thank all of you.

Having just a few minutes ago sworn on the Holy Book, I intend to keep my oath and serve as President to all Nigerians.

I belong to everybody and I belong to nobody.

A few people have privately voiced fears that on coming back to office I shall go after them. These fears are groundless. There will be no paying off old scores. The past is prologue.

Our neighbours in the Sub-region and our African brethren should rest assured that Nigeria under our administration will be ready to play any leadership role that Africa expects of it. Here I would like to thank the governments and people of Cameroon, Chad and Niger for committing their armed forces to fight Boko Haram in Nigeria.

I also wish to assure the wider international community of our readiness to cooperate and help to combat threats of cross-border terrorism, sea piracy, refugees and boat people, financial crime, cyber crime, climate change, the spread of communicable diseases and other challenges of the 21st century.

At home we face enormous challenges. Insecurity, pervasive corruption, the hitherto unending and seemingly impossible fuel and power shortages are the immediate concerns. We are going to tackle them head on. Nigerians will not regret that they have entrusted national responsibility to us. We must not succumb to hopelessness and defeatism. We can fix our problems.

In recent times Nigerian leaders appear to have misread our mission. Our founding fathers, Mr Herbert Macaulay, Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Alhaji Ahmadu Bello, the Sarkin Daura of Sokoto, Alhaji Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Malam Aminu Kano, Chief J.S. Tarka, Mr Eyo Ita, Chief Denis Osadeby, Chief Ladokun Akintola and their colleagues worked to establish certain standards of governance. They might have differed in their methods or tactics or details, but they were united in establishing a viable and progressive country. Some of their successors behaved like spoilt children breaking everything and bringing disorder to the house.

Furthermore, we as Nigerians must remind ourselves that we are heirs to great civilizations: Shehu Othman Dan Fodio's caliphate, the Kanem Borno Empire, the Oyo Empire, the Benin Empire and King Jaja's formidable domain. The blood of those great ancestors flow in our veins. What is now required is to build on these legacies, to modernize and uplift Nigeria.

Daunting as the task may be it is by no means insurmountable. There is now a national consensus that our chosen route to national development is democracy. To achieve our objectives we must consciously work the democratic system. The Federal Executive under my watch will not seek to encroach on the duties and functions of the Legislative and Judicial arms of government. The law enforcing authorities will be charged to operate within the Constitution. We shall rebuild and

reform the public service to become more effective and more serviceable. We shall charge them to apply themselves with integrity to stabilize the system.

For their part the legislative arm must keep to their brief of making laws, carrying out over-sight functions and doing so expeditiously. The judicial system needs reform to cleanse itself from its immediate past. The country now expects the judiciary to act with dispatch on all cases especially on corruption, serious financial crimes or abuse of office. It is only when the three arms act constitutionally that government will be enabled to serve the country optimally and avoid the confusion all too often bedeviling governance today.

Elsewhere relations between Abuja and the States have to be clarified if we are to serve the country better. Constitutionally there are limits to powers of each of the three tiers of government but that should not mean the Federal Government should fold its arms and close its eyes to what is going on in the states and local governments. Not least the operations of the Local Government Joint Account. While the Federal Government cannot interfere in the details of its operations it will ensure that the gross corruption at the local level is checked. As far as the constitution allows me I will try to ensure that there is responsible and accountable governance at all levels of government in the country. For I will not have kept my own trust with the Nigerian people if I allow others abuse theirs under my watch.

However, no matter how well organized the governments of the federation are they cannot succeed without the support, understanding and cooperation of labour unions, organized private sector, the press and civil society organizations. I appeal to employers and workers alike to unite in raising productivity so that everybody will have the opportunity to share in increased prosperity. The Nigerian press is the most vibrant in Africa. My appeal to the media today – and this includes the social media – is to exercise its considerable powers with responsibility and patriotism.

My appeal for unity is predicated on the seriousness of the legacy we are getting into. With depleted foreign reserves, falling oil prices, leakages and debts the Nigerian economy is in deep trouble and will require careful management to bring it round and to tackle the immediate challenges confronting us, namely, Boko Haram, the Niger Delta situation, the power shortages and unemployment especially among young people. For the longer term we have to improve the standards of our



education. We have to look at the whole field of medicare. We have to upgrade our dilapidated physical infrastructure.

The most immediate is Boko Haram's insurgency. Progress has been made in recent weeks by our security forces but victory cannot be achieved by basing the Command and Control Centre in Abuja. The command centre will be relocated to Maiduguri and remain until Boko Haram is completely subdued. But we cannot claim to have defeated Boko Haram without rescuing the Chibok girls and all other innocent persons held hostage by insurgents.

This government will do all it can to rescue them alive. Boko Haram is a typical example of small fires causing large fires. An eccentric and unorthodox preacher with a tiny following was given posthumous fame and following by his extra judicial murder at the hands of the police. Since then through official bungling, negligence, complacency or collusion Boko Haram became a terrifying force taking tens of thousands of lives and capturing several towns and villages covering swathes of Nigerian sovereign territory.

Boko Haram is a mindless, godless group who are as far away from Islam as one can think of. At the end of the hostilities when the group is subdued the Government intends to commission a sociological study to determine its origins, remote and immediate causes of the movement, its sponsors, the international connexions to ensure that measures are taken to prevent a recurrence of this evil. For now the Armed Forces will be fully charged with prosecuting the fight against Boko haram. We shall overhaul the rules of engagement to avoid human rights violations in operations. We shall improve operational and legal mechanisms so that disciplinary steps are taken against proven human right violations by the Armed Forces.

Boko Haram is not only the security issue bedeviling our country. The spate of kidnappings, armed robberies, herdsmen/farmers clashes, cattle rustlings all help to add to the general air of insecurity in our land. We are going to erect and maintain an efficient, disciplined people – friendly and well-compensated security forces within an over-all security architecture.

The amnesty programme in the Niger Delta is due to end in December, but the Government intends to invest heavily in the projects, and programmes currently in place. I call on the leadership and people in these areas to cooperate with the State

and Federal Government in the rehabilitation programmes which will be streamlined and made more effective. As ever, I am ready to listen to grievances of my fellow Nigerians. I extend my hand of fellowship to them so that we can bring peace and build prosperity for our people.

No single cause can be identified to explain Nigerian's poor economic performance over the years than the power situation. It is a national shame that an economy of 180 million generates only 4,000MW, and distributes even less. Continuous tinkering with the structures of power supply and distribution and close on \$20b expanded since 1999 have only brought darkness, frustration, misery, and resignation among Nigerians. We will not allow this to go on. Careful studies are under way during this transition to identify the quickest, safest and most cost-effective way to bring light and relief to Nigerians.

Unemployment, notably youth unemployment features strongly in our Party's Manifesto. We intend to attack the problem frontally through revival of agriculture, solid minerals mining as well as credits to small and medium size businesses to kick-start these enterprises. We shall quickly examine the best way to revive major industries and accelerate the revival and development of our railways, roads and general infrastructure.

Your Excellencies, My fellow Nigerians I cannot recall when Nigeria enjoyed so much goodwill abroad as now. The messages I received from East and West, from powerful and small countries are indicative of international expectations on us. At home the newly elected government is basking in a reservoir of goodwill and high expectations. Nigeria therefore has a window of opportunity to fulfill our long-standing potential of pulling ourselves together and realizing our mission as a great nation.

Our situation somehow reminds one of a passage in Shakespeare's  
*Julius Ceasar*:

There is a tide in the affairs of men which,  
taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;  
Omitted, all the voyage of their life,  
Is bound in shallows and miseries.  
We have an opportunity. Let us take it.

Thank you

Muhammadu Buhari

President Federal Republic of NIGERIA

and

Commander in-chief-of the Armed forces

## **APPENDIX E**

### **MMUSI MAIMANE'S SPEECH IN RESPONSE TO SONA 2015 – "A BROKEN MAN PRESIDING OVER A BROKEN SOCIETY" (CAPE TOWN, 17 FEBRUARY 2015)**

Madame Speaker,

Honourable President and Deputy President

Honourable Members

Fellow South Africans

Bagaetsho

Dumelang,

Eleven days ago we lost one of South Africa's literary giants, Professor Andre Brink. Our sadness at his passing is tempered only by the great literature he bequeathed us.

Professor Brink taught us a powerful lesson. He taught us that you cannot blame a faceless system for the evils in society. It is human beings that perpetrate wrongs against others. And it is human beings that have the power to correct these wrongs.

We would do well to heed this lesson as we debate the State of the Nation today.

Because, if we are to succeed as a nation, we need to start believing in the power of human agency. We need to resurrect the idea that the choices we make, and the actions we take, matter.

It is true that the uneven legacy of the apartheid system weighs heavy on us. It is a fact that black children still do not have the same opportunities as white children. This is a human tragedy that nobody in this House should ever accept.

Much has been done to redress the past, make no mistake. Life in South Africa today is certainly better than it was during apartheid. But we need to hold ourselves to a much higher standard than that.

We need to become the nation that President Nelson Mandela helped us believe we could become. A place of hope, prosperity, selfless leadership and mutual respect.

And so the question we must ask today is: what is holding us back from achieving Madiba's vision?

We can blame apartheid. We can blame the global financial system. We can even blame Jan van Riebeeck.

But in our hearts, we know what the problem is. We have allowed those in power to become bigger than our institutions, breaking them down bit by bit.

We have allowed one powerful man to get away with too much for too long. This man is here in our presence today.

Honourable President, in these very chambers, just five days ago, you broke Parliament.

Please understand, Honourable President, when I use the term “honourable”, I do it out of respect for the traditions and conventions of this august House.

But please do not take it literally. For you, Honourable President, are not an honourable man.

You are a broken man, presiding over a broken society.

You are willing to break every democratic institution to try and fix the legal predicament you find yourself in.

You are willing to break this Parliament if it means escaping accountability for the wrongs you have done.

On Thursday afternoon, outside this House, Members of Parliament were being arrested and assaulted by your riot police.

A few hours later, inside this House, our freedom to communicate was violated by an order to jam the telecommunications network.

Not long after, armed police officers in plain shirts stormed into this sacred chamber and physically attacked members of this House.

This was more than an assault on Members of Parliament. It was an assault on the very foundations of our democracy.

Parliament's constitutional obligation to fearlessly scrutinise and oversee the Executive lost all meaning on Thursday night.

The brute force of the state won. And the hearts of our nation broke.

We knew, at that very moment, that our democratic order was in grave danger.

And what did you do?

You laughed. You laughed while the people of South Africa cried for their beloved country.

You laughed while trampling Madiba's legacy – in the very week that we celebrated 25 years since his release.

Honourable President, we will never forgive you for what you have done.

Madam Speaker, I led my party out of this House on Thursday night because we could not sit by while our freedoms were destroyed right in front of us.

When we emerged from this chamber, we heard the President reading the cold and empty words from his prepared text.

They were the words of a broken man, presiding over a broken society.

For 6 years, he has run from the 783 counts of corruption, fraud and racketeering that have haunted him from before the day he was elected.

For 6 years, this broken man has spent his waking hours plotting and planning to avoid his day in court.

In this broken man's path of destruction, lies a litany of broken institutions. Each one of them targeted because of their constitutional power to hold him to account.



A broken SARS, that should be investigating the fringe tax benefits from Nkandla, the palace of corruption that was built with the people's money.

A broken NPA, that should have continued with its prosecution of the President, without fear or favour.

A broken SIU, a broken Hawks, a broken SAPS. And so we could go on with the list of institutions President Zuma is willing to break to protect himself and his friends.

This is why we are a broken society. Because the abuses do not stop at the door of the Union Buildings. The power abuse is happening at every level. We have mini-Zuma's in governments and municipalities all over South Africa.

In Mogalakwena, I met a woman who had not been able to wash for days because there was no water.

The lack of water in Mogalakwena is not a system failure. It is a failure of local politicians to put the people first. In this community, service delivery has come to a standstill as ANC councillors wage a factional war over access to the spoils of power.

Local police officers with a duty to serve the community have been co-opted by factions to intimidate residents and suppress protest. As the war rages on, rubbish piles up in the streets, sewage pipes continue to leak, and the taps run dry.

All because of these broken men, presiding over broken towns and cities. They learned from the best.

In Atteridgeville, I met a good man running a hospice that is struggling more and more each day to care for the sick because all their money goes to fuelling a generator. This is their last line of defence against an electricity crisis that plagues them on a daily basis.

The daily struggle of this community-funded organization is just one example of the devastating impact this electricity crisis is having on households, businesses, schools, hospitals, and countless other facets of society.

Where is the accountability from this broken man who claims to be our President, when all he can offer is more of the same? All he does is promise to keep bailing out Eskom and secure its monopoly over our power supply.

Load-shedding is a crisis that will take our economy to the brink of economic shutdown. Our economy has lost R300 billion since 2008 because, without a stable electricity supply, manufacturers cannot produce, investors are driven away and jobs are lost.

That is why Mr President when you stand here and promise the same jobs every year that never materialize, we simply cannot believe you. On Thursday the President said that the NDP's ambition to grow at 5% by 2019 is at risk as a result of slow global growth and domestic constraints. How then are other SADC countries

growing at an average of 5.6% facing the same external pressures? The answer is our real constraints are because of the policy failures of this government.

In his 9 point plan he failed to address the need for solid economic infrastructure. He left the electricity monopoly with Eskom. Gave the broadband monopoly to Telkom. And left SANRAL to toll our roads in Gauteng. The legacy of this will be more government bailouts and failing infrastructure, leading us to more job losses, more debt and a broken state.

The broken man who broke our economy.

Despite all his past promises, what President Zuma failed to tell us last week was that, today, there are 1.6 million more South Africans without jobs than when he took office in 2009. Living, breathing human beings robbed of their feeling of self-worth, and their ability to provide for their families.

From Ikageng, to Nelson Mandela Bay, to Soweto, I met unemployed youth who have lost hope of finding a job. They are the victims of an unequal education system that serves the interests of a powerful teacher's union over learners, and where poorer schools go without textbooks, desks and proper classrooms.

The consequence, as parents in Riverlea told me, is that crime and drugs continue to enslave our youth, and druglords operate freely in our communities.

This is the state of our broken society, battling under the burdens of unemployment, crime, power cuts, and an unequal education system.

South Africa may be a broken society under a broken President, but the spirit of our people is a lot harder to break.

We are still standing as a people today because South Africans were able to free ourselves from the worst forms of oppression under Apartheid.

Today we have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights that is admired across the world.

We have an obligation to future generations of South Africans to make sure we continue the fight for a fairer society, where there is greater opportunity for all to live a better life, and where the rights and freedoms granted to us by the Constitution are protected.

But on Thursday we received a criminally weak account of the State of the Nation from a broken President.

We can have a stable electricity supply in South Africa, but a war-room is not going to solve it.

The President knows what needs to be done to keep the lights on: break the Eskom monopoly. As long as they are in charge of the national grid they will act to prevent any meaningful contributions by independent power producers to our electricity supply.

He must also abandon the R1 trillion nuclear deal – future generations will pay for this in electricity price hikes while we wait over a decade to see any power. And of course the secrecy behind this deal means there is scope for corruption on a mega-Arms deal scale.

We can and we must have a more equal education system, where schools are properly resourced, teachers are well-trained, and there is commitment and leadership from school principals.

There are many hard-working educators out there, but the President ignored the need to hold principals and teachers accountable when they fail our children.

We believe it is possible for entrepreneurs to flourish, with an economy that grows at 8% and creates millions of jobs if we make the right choices.

But the government's ideas are stale. We need economic infrastructure that is reliable. We need tax incentives for established business people to participate in mentorship programmes. We need a National Venture Capital Fund to fund start-ups. We need to rollout Opportunity Centres where advice and support is readily available. We need a real Youth Wage Subsidy that benefits even the smallest of businesses.

We believe it is possible for our country to be a place where the streets are safe and communities are healthy places to raise families, where the police properly managed and trained.

But while our communities are being over-run by druglords and the President said nothing about crime! Where are the specialized anti-drug units? Drug crime has doubled since they were taken away.

People don't trust the police, but if the SAPS is going to have its integrity restored, it needs to start with the national police commissioner.

Our crime-fighting institutions such as the Hawks, the NPA, and the SIU must be led by people committed to fairness and justice, and free from interference by powerful political interests.

We believe it is possible to realize a vision of South Africa where every effort is made to redress the legacy of Apartheid through a land reform programme that truly benefits those who were denied access to land.

All the President has offered us is a populist proposal to ban foreign land ownership. This will only kill investment and jobs.

The 17.5 million hectares of fertile soil in communal land areas must be unlocked for reform purposes. State-owned land must be fully audited and used to fast-track redistribution to deserving beneficiaries. And farmworkers must become farm-owners in partnership with commercial farmers, through the NDP's system of identifying and purchasing available land on the market. But we all know, Mr President, that half the people sitting behind you don't support the NDP and will not implement it.

Only through bold reforms that go to the heart of the problem will we meaningfully redress the legacy of restricted access to land.

Madam Speaker, the tide is turning in our country. As Professor Brink wrote in his most celebrated work, *A Dry White Season*:

“The image that presents itself is one of water. A drop held back by its own inertia for one last moment, though swollen of its own weight, before it irrevocably falls... as if the water, already sensing its own imminent fall, continues to cling, against the pull of gravity, to its precarious stability, trying to prolong it as much as possible.”

Madam Speaker, change may seem slow, but it is coming. There is a swell starting to build and, when the wave crashes, it will sweep this broken man out of power. When that happens, we will be there to start fixing this broken society, and unleash the potential of South Africans.

That is why the party I lead in this Parliament will not join other parties in breaking down our institutions. Because one day, when we are in government, we will want those institutions and this Parliament to hold us to account.

And so we will work within the institutions of democracy to hold this government to account, and we will continue creating opportunities for all where we govern. We will work tirelessly to build a truly democratic alternative in South Africa. We will restore power to our people.

I thank you!