

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Language is a set of signs and symbols used to pass messages across to people. Language, verbal and non-verbal, is a means of communication. In fact, the primary purpose of language is communication. Human beings express their thoughts, feelings and ideas through language. Alliances are formed through language. Language fuels social interaction. We depend on language whenever the need to speak arises. When we speak, we want to be heard, to be obeyed, to be respected, to be admired, and to be liked. We use language to support and enable these desires to be realised. Language turns beliefs and thought processes to reality.

Human languages are made up of words, and human beings do things with words. Because paralingualism has its own shortcomings, certain things cannot be achieved without words. Victoria Fromkin, Robert Rodman and Nina Hyams concur that "... without words we would be unable to convey our thoughts through language or understand the thoughts of others" (36). These words are used to sing, play, joke, curse, convince, inform, motivate, persuade, etc. People have linguistic needs, and language meets these needs. Words are usually spoken spontaneously, and as a result, people tend to undermine the power of words. A great deal of attention would be paid to the words we speak, if we understood the wind beneath their wings. Linguistic skills are daily improved because of the power of language to impact lives.

A speech writer's or orators' linguistic arsenal is filled with words. Every word in the lexicon of a language possesses valid meaning, and fulfils certain linguistic needs. But some words or linguistic strategies are very powerful. These powerful words are important in decision-making processes. Powerful words used as language is the total device of politicians to provoke the

winds and feelings of their audience and consequently to gain persuasion. Words that empower people have special meanings as they trigger emotional or psychological response. They tap into the reader's emotions, because they are very persuasive and irresistible. Their impact on hearers cannot be downplayed. It is worthy of note that these words ought to be used in the right context. Politicians and advertisers always employ these power words: new, you, because, instantly, happy, free, suddenly, mind-blowing, uncensored, scandalous, jaw-dropping, legendary, daring, refundable, authentic, etc, in order to arouse people's emotion.

Words are not just a collection of alphabets. They are cues. Words can be funny as they have the power to transform an answer from the negative into the affirmative. Some words – please, excuse me, sorry, thank you – have been termed magic words. They have the power to turn around emotions. The five – letter - word – sorry, is capable of subsiding anger. Words are used to arouse persons to take certain actions. They evoke curiosity. Words evoke empathy. A single word can make all the difference or change the course of action, and so language possesses immense power – the power to convince, to influence, to control, to persuade and to dissuade. The impact of the power of language depends solely on how we exercise it. Professionals like politicians, lawyers, doctors, advertisers and speech writers understand the power of words. These speech writers advertise their linguistic prowess through speech writing.

Speech writing is the art of writing a speech for public presentation. It requires creative writing skills. Style is to writing what salt is to food. Coming up with a good speech goes beyond merely stringing words together to have sentences. Speeches are written with clear intents and purposes – to explain, to persuade, to amuse, to inform, to entertain or to influence ideas. Speakers and listeners are different human beings from different backgrounds with separate belief systems and ideologies. They are usually evasive and sometimes deceptive. So, in order to get readers and listeners to agree to whatever a speaker/writer has to say, a speech writer needs to up the ante. A good speech ought to capture the attention of the audience, so speech writers employ different

attention-capturing strategies to give their speeches that flair. The piece of writing has to be lucid, interesting, informing and, above all, persuasive. Politicians often employ professional speech writers because the latter understand the power of language. Other public speakers, as well as speech writers, are not oblivious of this fact.

In public speaking, the usual aims are to inform, to persuade, to actuate and to entertain the public. The speaker, the message, the medium of communication, the audience and the effect of the message on the hearers are significant factors. In the light of this, public speakers – including politicians – tend to motivate and persuade their hearers. During manifestoes, rallies, campaigns inauguration and governance, politicians always speak in front of an audience. If this is done well, the person's reputation is enhanced. Public speaking is one out of their many political activities, and language brings it to pass. Politics works hand in hand with language, especially persuasive and emotive language.

Language and politics are intimately related as they influence each other. Language is an indispensable tool in politics. So, language and politics are in complementary distribution. They are dependent on one another. When we consider such linguistic issues in National Policy on Education as official language, minority languages, language hegemony, political correctness, language and national development and national language problems, we can say that language has become a political issue. Language is as much a political phenomenon as it is a social phenomenon.

Politics mostly concerns itself with acquiring power, so politicians choose their words carefully. The language of politics is persuasive. These politicians are aware of the power of language to influence thoughts, to persuade and control people's behaviour, so they choose language strategies that will aid in achieving their aim. They persuade their audiences with their assertion of power. These strategies are those of persuasion and motivation. People are always at the

mercy of language manipulators like politicians. Persuasive language convinces, so through it, people are convinced or diplomatically manipulated without the use of force. Language is argumentative and has the ability to change minds or people's behaviours. It is a very powerful tool in the hands of a skilled language user in getting what he wants. Persuasion deals with influencing the beliefs, attitudes, behaviours, intentions and thoughts of a set of people. In the art of persuasion, one gets the audience to see things as one sees them. Politicians employ persuasive language to get the populace to accept their views and support their political careers.

Citizens of any nation that are up to eighteen years are viable voters, and each voter gets to vote for just one political candidate. In the light of this, politicians employ the language of persuasion to sway the votes in their favour. They communicate through language. They use spoken words that will appeal to one and convince one to vote for them. These politicians use certain devices that will best relay their motives, promises, thoughts and ideas to their audience. Although elections are not won based on flamboyant speeches, but a persuasive speech can persuade and convince a large number of voters to align with a particular contender. Anyone running for an office and is armed with a captivating oratory, surely stands out from the rest. He or she is the darling of many voters. Osita Chidoka and Oseloka Obaze exemplified this in the just concluded Anambra State gubernatorial election. An exceptionally talented orator will always give passionate speeches that will motivate and persuade the audience. John Joseph concurs:

The prototypes of great leaders are also great orators, such as Churchill, or Roosevelt ... or Hitler. For the inspiring orator can also lead a people, or rather mislead them into believing that the narrow self-interests of the governing party are actually the interests of the people as a whole, when in fact, they work directly against the people (13).

Politicians usually employ rhetorical devices in their speeches because of their power of adding influence to language. Persuasive techniques in language are adopted; reasons and examples are presented in order to influence action and/or thought.

Language and politics are intertwined, so language is a powerful tool in the hands of politicians. They manipulate it to achieve different purposes. Persuasive language is used to persuade the people, while emotive language appeals to them in order to achieve the desired effect. Language is used to achieve their political dreams and aspirations. Political discourse is successfully carried out if language is utilised and manipulated well to persuade the audience.

Most political speeches in Africa are delivered in English. These African politicians avail themselves of the linguistic strategies inherent in this global language called the English language. These strategies comprise rhetorical devices and other figures of speech, politeness strategies, code-switching and code-mixing, emotive language and many others. The motive behind these strategies is persuasion. Language is used for the expression of emotions which is shown by the ability of persons to pour out much bottled nervous energy.

This perspective is crucial in the analysis of these two activists' speeches because of the sense of painful denials. In this regard, language can be used to show annoyance, anger and anxiety. Language is a social instrument and a vehicle by which unity is promoted in society. This is because society always comprises of different groups of people who probably use language in different forums based on such elements as background, education, social class, profession, gender, religion etc. Language therefore, has magical powers to influence, persuade, control and direct.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

It has been noted that language and politics are inseparable. Language drives every political activity, so language plays essential roles of influencing, motivating and ultimately persuading the audience. These political activists manipulate language in such a way that it becomes a good messenger that delivers their motives to the people in the best possible way. They purposively and deliberately employ rhetorical devices in their speeches to sway them into accepting their beliefs or ideas. But it has been found out that these activists sometimes resort to threats and hate speeches while trying to persuade their audience resulting in devastating consequences like war, hatred, and even prolonged freedom. The person's motives can also be misunderstood and misinterpreted. Consequently, it has become pertinent to analyse political speeches to find out how political activists employ language to achieve their aims or purposes. Political speeches have been grammatically, pragmatically and sociolinguistically analysed. Little or no research has been carried out towards comparing the analysis of the speeches of these two great African political activists; Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu, to find out the similarities and differences in the way they use language. This is the gap the research seeks to fill in knowledge, knowing the state of the nation. The researcher chose the two activists because both of them are not politicians asking for people's votes but they are both championing the course of their people. Both of them want emancipation for their people.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is as follows:

- To compare the rhetorical devices in selected political speeches of Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu.

- To discover if the use of rhetorical devices and/or hate language in political speeches can help politicians or activists persuade their audience and make them align with their political ideologies.
- To examine the limit to which rhetorical devices can add aesthetics and creativity to language.
- The study attempts to discover how the persuasive devices chosen by these activists helped them to achieve their goals.
- It equally delves into the intimate relationship between language and politics.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study makes a significant contribution to knowledge by highlighting the creative, persuasive and emphatic nature of rhetorical devices in speeches. This study creates awareness among second language learners of the English language on the persuasive and manipulative use of language by activists and other public speakers, and the effects these devices have on the audience. It helps students take cognizance of, and appreciate the use of rhetorical devices and other linguistic strategies in spoken languages and also help them to adopt rhetorical devices in making speeches. Language users also learn that rhetorical devices pave way for freedom of thought and expression. This work helps the government and its agencies to maintain peace and stability by avoiding speeches that may create hostility among its teeming population.

1.5 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study is delimited to A Comparative Analysis of Rhetorical Devices in Selected Political Speeches of Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu. It focuses on six political speeches of a former South African President/political Activist and a Nigerian Political Activist. They are:

- “I am Prepared to Die” 20 April 1964;
- Nelson Mandela’s Address at a Rally in Cape Town on his Release from Prison 11 February 1990;
- Nelson Mandela’s Address to the People of Cape Town, Grand Parade, on the Occasion of his Inauguration as State President 10 May 1994;
- Nnamdi Kanu’s Speech at 2015 World Igbo Convention in Los Angeles;
- Nnamdi Kanu’s Speech at Boys’ Technical College, Aba 27 August 2017;
- Nnamdi Kanu’s Latest Speech in Ohafia, Abia State 7 September 2017.

These will be analysed for their use of or absence of rhetorical devices and their effects on the polity.

1.6 Research Questions

These research questions would be used in the textual analyses in chapter four to find the ways these activists employed rhetorical devices in their speeches.

1. What rhetorical devices are found in the speeches of these activists?
2. To what extent do rhetorical devices in political speeches persuade and manipulate the audience to support politicians and their ideologies?
3. To what degree do these politicians achieve discursive control and dominance through the use of rhetorical devices in their speeches?
4. To what extent does hate language in political speeches carefully examine social power abuse?

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELEVANT SCHOLARSHIP

The review of related scholarship is organized under the following subheadings:

- Conceptual Framework
- Empirical Studies
- Summary

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter seeks to provide valuable information on the language use of the two political activists; Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu. This further informs the researcher on the relevant issues, which include rhetoric, rhetorical devices and other figures of speeches applied by the activists in order to enable them influence their audience.

2.1 Rhetoric

The word rhetorical anchors on the idea of deploying words for the purpose of persuasion. According to Malmkijaer (17), rhetorical originates from the theory of how best a speaker or writer can by application of linguistic devices, achieve persuasion. Aristotle defined rhetorical discourse as the art of discovering all the available means of persuasion in any given case (qtd. in Abrams, 159).

From the insight above, it means that the primary goal of rhetorical is linked to the goal of political public speaking (persuasion). Classical rhetoricians concurred that rhetorical is the art of persuading an audience (Abrams, 159).

Rhetorical is one great act which comprises five other lesser acts invention, disposition, elocution and pronunciation. The ability of the speaker to persuade an audience has been linked to three forms of appeal: ethos, pathos and logos. Ethos deals with the speaker's ability to display a personal character which makes his speech credible. Pathos is conceived with the speaker's power of stirring the emotion of the audience and logos lies the power to provide truth by means of persuasive argument (168).

From the insight above, the primary goal of rhetorical is linked to the goal of political public speaking. Carefully crafted rhetorical is sometimes used to refer to persuasive strategies. Rhetorical can be usefully taught and practiced as a way of exploring all sides of an issue rather than for arguing for one against another. Aristotle (91) discovered three fundamental categories of political speech: "deliberative rhetoric" which is persuasive or dissuasive and concerned with future events. "Forensic" or judicial rhetorical is accusative or defensive and takes care of past events, while "epideictic" (or ceremonial) rhetorical is panegyric or discrediting and captures events in the present. Rhetorical is a public art capable of shaping opinion. Cicero argued that an eloquent speaker should among other things, be reputable and versatile. His contribution to rhetorical was how to support speakers in writing good speeches.

2.1.1 Rhetorical Devices in Political Text and Talk

Rhetorical is synonymous with persuasive language. It is defined as the art of employing certain figures of speeches, in speech and writing, with the aim of persuading an audience. Rhetorical can be described as the ability of a writer to persuade his/her audience. It is an art of discourse. Jean Nienkamp states that:

Traditional definitions of rhetorical focus on rhetorical as an intentional practice and often a specific genre of linguistic action. Rhetorical is seen as an "art," a

deliberately cultivated practice and pedagogy often limited to certain genres of overtly persuasive speech and writing, such as Aristotle's deliberative, forensic, and epideictic oratory. This limitation of rhetorical to common civic practices is seen as historically validated (2).

These rhetorical devices like simile, metaphor, personification, irony and other figurative expressions help politicians in making their political speeches. With these devices, they lure their audience and sway them to their side.

Brenda McGuigan defines rhetorical thus:

In reading, speaking or writing, rhetorical is a tool that enhances composition; its aim is to persuade, to inform, to express a personal thought, or simply to entertain the reader. What the formal study of rhetorical allows us to do is isolate exactly what it is we've done so that in the future we can do it again for a similar effect. Rather than haphazardly casting words on the page, letting our vague expectations guide us, we can carefully construct our writing, effectively using the rhetorical devices we have learned (3).

These definitions agree that rhetorical characterizes persuasive speech and writing. Certain rhetorical devices are employed to persuade. Rhetorical devices convey meaning and can evoke emotional response from readers or audiences. They are stylistic devices employed by a writer to persuade his/her audience. But McQuarrie and Mick believe that a rhetorical device "occurs when an expression deviates from expectation, the expression is not rejected as nonsensical or faulty, the deviation occurs at the level of form rather than content, and the deviation conforms to a template that is invariant across a variety of content and contexts" (425). Anne Christopher agrees when he states that:

A rhetorical figure has been traditionally referred to as an artful deviation from the usual or ordinary mode of expression, whether in speech or writing. It occurs when an expression departs from the norm, is not discarded as being unintelligible or defective, it deviates in form rather than content, and the deviation complies with a fixed pattern according to specific contents and contexts (773).

A rhetorical device is a literary style that increases the persuasiveness of a piece of writing. They carry additional meaning. Speakers use rhetorical devices to convey things to listeners with the sole aim of persuading them towards seeing something from a different perspective. Here, language is purposively used to elicit effect on the audience. Tom and Eves assert:

RHETORIC, THE DISCIPLINE of argumentation, is concerned not only with the message but with the determination of the most effective persuasive methods of presentation and frequently incorporates the use of rhetorical figures/devices” (39). Bearing in mind the invaluable help of rhetorical in speech and writing, certain processes have been put in place for the study of rhetoric.

Studies in rhetorical highlight the different ways in which texts are meaningful to a certain audience. Rhetorical studies analyse how people are empowered to effectively communicate.

Bitzer and Black assert that:

Rhetorical studies are properly concerned with the process by which symbols and systems of symbols have influences on beliefs, values, attitudes, and actions and they embrace all forms of human communication, not exclusively public address nor communication within any one class or cultural group (208).

Rhetorical devices go beyond the literal meaning of words to create literary, imaginative and creative effects. They make speeches and write-ups interesting and lively.

Commonly used rhetorical devices are: Simile, Assonance, Anaphora, Antithesis, Hyperbole, Parallelism, Metaphor, Alliteration, Allusion, Irony, Understatement, Hypophora, Epilexis, Chiasmus, Anadiplosis, Rhetorical question, Procataleptic, Erotises.

Simile

Simile is a part of speech that explicitly compares two distinct things by employing two connecting words; like and as. It can also serve as comparison for similar things. Brenda McGuigan concurs: “A *simile* is a device in which the writer compares two things that are already somewhat related... since *similes* conjure up strongly suggestive imagery, they lend new details to the main object” (41).

Simile sometimes compares the animate with the inanimate. According to Keith Reich, simile is “the figure in which there is a comparison of one figure with another, implying a certain resemblance between them. This is used either for praise or censure; e.g., (praise): “He entered the combat in body like the strongest bull, in impetuosity like the fiercest lion” (18). It is important to inform the audience and create certain images in their minds through simile.

Metaphor

A metaphor describes an object or a person in a way that is different from its literary sense. It is used as a referent of something else. It connects a subject with another, even when there is no existing relationship between the two objects. In metaphorical expressions, reference is made to something while referring to something else that has a semblance of that thing. Metaphors make implicit comparison of two things that have same characteristics. Reich defines metaphor as “the trope in which a word applying to one thing is transferred to another, because the similarity seems to justify the transference; e.g., “The recent arrival of an army suddenly blotted out the state” (14).

Alliteration

Alliterations are identified by their repetition of same consonant sounds at the beginning of a sentence or a phrase. According to Abrams:

The term is usually applied only to consonants, and especially when the recurrent sound occurs in a conspicuous position at the beginning of a word or of a stressed syllable within a word. It is used only for special stylistic effects, such as to reinforce the meaning.

Examples: When to the sessions of sweet silent thought
 I summoned up remembrance of things past
 I sigh the lack of many a thing I sought (7).

Anaphora

Anaphora is the figure in which the same word begin successive phrases; e.g., “Scipio razed Numantia, Scipio destroyed Carthage, Scipio brought peace, Scipio saved the state” (Reich 8). Put succinctly, it is the repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of succeeding clauses. Anaphora is a rhetorical device, and can be used to create emphasis.

Example: “There is a time for everything ,and a season for every activity under the heavens: a time to be born and a time to die, a time to plant and a time to uproot, a time to kill and a time to heal, a time to tear down and a time to build...” (Eccl.3:1-3)

Allusion

An allusion makes implicit reference to a place, a person or an event. It helps to widen the reader’s understanding. Although allusions are usually laconic, they are loaded with pieces of information. According to Nwachukwu-Agbada et al “The writer almost always assumes that the reader will recognise what is being referred to in the written passage. For instance, these days, a

reference to Nelson Mandela recalls freedom-struggle, apartheid in South Africa or qualitative African leadership as the case maybe.

Example: When I refused, she gave me money; perhaps she thought I was a Judas. (This is an allusion to Judas Iscariot's acceptance of money (7).

Antithesis

Antithesis is “the figure in which style is built upon contraries, using contrary in successive clauses; figure of speech: “When all is calm, you are confused; when all is in confusion, you are calm”. “While you deplore the troubles besetting him, this knave rejoices in the ruin of the state” (Reich 8). Antithesis is the rhetorical device that puts contrasting ideas together.

Brenda McGuigan maintains that:

Antithesis can also help to point out fine distinctions in an issue by presenting them together. By contrasting legality and morality, wisdom and learning, or success and happiness, you make your reader think about the subtle shades of difference between the concepts. When dealing with ideas that you think your reader might tend to think of as the same, joining them in antithesis can help set the stage for your argument (23).

Examples: To err is human; to forgive is divine.

Wealth is appealing, but poverty tastes like bitter waters.

Chiasmus

Chiasmus is a type of antithesis. It is a rhetorical device in which the second part of a sentence/expression is pitched against the first part. The parts are usually reversed to have a play on words. This is why it is called the crises-cross figure of speech. It is a sequence of two

phrases or clauses which are parallel in syntax, but with a reversal in the order of the corresponding words.

Examples: Works without show, and without pomp presides.

The years to come seemed waste of breath. A waste of breath the years behind

(Abrams, 162).

Anadiplosis

Anadiplosis is a rhetorical device in which the last word of a clause or sentence is repeated as the first word of the following clause or sentence. It is a form of repetition. The word anadiplosis comes from the Greek doubling or folding. The definition comes from the sense of repeating or doubling a term to make it more significant. It is a very effective rhetorical device commonly found in political speeches.

Example: And so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream rooted in the American dream.

(Martin Luther King Jr., *I have a dream speech*, qtd in Lucas, A7).

Hyperbole

Hyperbole represents extreme exaggeration. It is used to create emphasis and create a mental picture in the audience's minds. Hyperboles, also, evoke emotions. Reich defines hyperbole thus:

It is the figure of speech in which one exaggerates the truth, whether for the sake of magnifying or minimizing something. This figure is used independently or with comparison; e.g., (independently): "But if we maintain concord in the state, we shall measure the empire's vastness by the rising and the setting of the sun".

(With comparison from equivalence): "His body was as white as snow, his face

burned like fire”. (With comparison from superiority): “From his mouth flowed speeches sweeter than honey” (13).

It is worthy of note that hyperbole needs to be tastefully done, so that it does not lose its use. It has to be strategically done. They are not substitutes for facts and figures. Brenda McGuigan warns:

Hyperbole is a powerful rhetorical form when used properly, but a terrible distraction when used improperly. It consists of exaggerating some part of your statement in order to give it emphasis or focus. *Hyperbole* is never meant to be understood literally by the reader, and one should take great care to make sure its intent is apparent. There are few things more damaging to a writer’s credibility than having *hyperbole* mistaken for fact, which destroys the point of the *hyperbole* (13).

Hypophora

It is the technique of asking a question, then proceeding to answer it” (McGuigan 26). It is a rhetorical strategy in which the speaker poses a question to his/her audience, but s/he proceeds to answer the question. Hypophora is also called antipophora or anthypophora.

Examples: “Why should you vote for me in the upcoming election? Because, I am better than others.”

“Do you know the difference between a leader and a follower? A leader is a good follower.”

“What made me run for this office? Our State needs to be fixed.

Rhetorical Questions

Unlike hypophora, rhetorical questions pose questions they have no intention of answering. The questions are asked for effect; therefore, answers are not expected. A rhetorical question is a question asked, not to evoke an actual reply, but to achieve an emphasis stronger than a direct statement, by inviting the auditor himself to supply an answer which the speaker presumes to be the obvious one. The figure is most used in persuasive discourse.

Examples: Gods! Shall the ravisher display your hair.

While the fops envy, and the ladies stare? (Abrams, 161)

Epiplexis

Epiplexis is a rhetorical device that interrogates. Although questions are posed, they are used to reprimand, rather than to expect answers. The user of epiplexis reproaches the audience in order to incite or convince them. An epiplexis can be used to chide, to express grief or to inveigh.

Examples: Why died I not from the womb?

Why did I not give up the ghost when I came out of the belly? (Job, 3:11)

Procatalepsis

This is a rhetorical device in which a speaker raises an objection to their argument and then immediately answers it. By so doing, they hope to strengthen their argument by dealing with possible counter-arguments before their audience can raise them. Procatalepsis is a rhetorical strategy by which a speaker or writer responds to an opponent's objections. According to Nicholas Brownless, it is an effective rhetorical device in that while appearing dialogic. In practice, it allows the author to remain in complete control of the discourse.

Examples: “Listen, Liz, I know this is tough to hear, but...

“I know what you’re going to say,” she cuts in, her voice quiet.

“I know what you’re going to tell me to do. Accept it. Move on. Try to forget about what happened to him... (Weaver Tim, 15)

Erotosis

This rhetorical device is a type of rhetorical question used to imply strong affirmation or denial.

This device is used for interrogation. Erotosis expresses emotions by asking questions, and disputes the uncertainty of incongruity.

Example: “Was I not born in the realm?

Were my parents born in any foreign country?

Is not my kingdom here? Whom have I oppressed?

What turmoil have I made in this commonwealth that I should be suspected to have no regard to the same?”(Queen Elizabeth 1qtd in www.thoughtco.com).

Understatement

An understatement is the opposite of a hyperbole. A speech writer employs an understatement to consciously make a situation look less serious. This rhetorical device trivializes issues.

Examples: A soldier arrests a protagonist for “carrying a dangerous weapon” even though all I had on me was a pen. (Femi Fatoba, qtd in Nwachukwu-Agbada, 4)

I have never lifted up a single stone (Abrams, 78)

These rhetorical devices are used to create specific and desired effects like persuasion. Aristotle developed three categories that describe how people use rhetorical to persuade. They are logos,

pathos and ethos; also known as rhetorical appeals/ethical strategies. These Greek words are used as modes of persuasion to sway an audience.

Ethos appeals to credibility or character. “An argument from *ethos* is based upon the character of the speaker” (Reich 3). The audience is persuaded through the credibility of the speaker’s character. It is left to the speaker to convince the audience that he/she is qualified to speak on the subject at hand.

Pathos is an appeal to emotion. “*Pathos* arguments deal with the ability of the orator to sway the emotions of the hearer” (Reich 3). English words like sympathy, empathy and pathetic are related to this concept. The speaker persuades the audience by appealing to their emotions by making a passionate plea or telling a convincing story.

Logos deals with logic and reasoning. “... *logos* arguments deal with logical proofs” (Reich 3). Facts and figures come to play in logos.

These rhetorical devices are used to persuade, to inform, to influence and to entertain. Persuasion is the first ulterior motive behind the use of rhetorical devices, others fall under persuasion. They are usually employed by professionals - like advertisers and politicians - in their discourse practices to persuade their audience. These devices achieve a special and desired effect on hearers and readers through their distinctive use of words. Political speeches are replete with these stylistic devices. Brenda McGuigan concurs:

It is no coincidence that the two groups who use rhetorical the most are also the two groups that are most interested in persuading others: politicians and lawyers. Look at almost any political speech written in the past few hundred years, and you’ll find many clever uses of rhetoric, for a good lawyer or politician wields

rhetorical like a surgeon wields a scalpel: with education, with confidence, and with precision (9).

2.2 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is an aspect of language study that interprets and encodes meaning beyond words or grammatical structures. It takes care of social phenomenon left unexplained by formal linguistic skill that should be studied from a formal structural point of view. Pragmatics delves into the social language skills we use in our daily interaction with others. They include what we say, how we say it, our body language and what is appropriate to the given situation.

The term “pragmatics” has been defined by various scholars and one of the definitions given is by Yul-Ifode (23), who explains pragmatics as:

The branch of linguistics that studies language from the user’s view point, that is from its functional perspectives. It deals with those principles that explain the reasons why people will use certain sentences and not others in specific situations. It can be said to be concerned specifically with the performance principles of language as it deals only with actual language usage. It deals with those aspects of the meaning of the utterances which are not captured in semantics. It is the study of the relationship between language and context, the role that context plays in the meaning of the utterance, the ability of the user to pair sentences with the context which would be appropriate.

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or a writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently ,more to do with the analysis of

what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves (Yule,1).

2.2.1 Pragmatic Manifestations in Political Discourse

Pragmatic manifestations in political discourse exemplify the relationship between discourse and some extra-linguistic contexts. Political discourse can be described as a complex form of human activity which is based on the recognition that politics cannot be conducted without language. Politics is the use of language in the constitution of social groups. Politics refers to people and the lives they lead in organised communities, rather than more narrowly to the battleground of conventional party politics. Politics like other social activities has its own code, a language variety particular to specific groups. Discourse, as one of those rituals, needs detailed analysis.

Pragmatics studies language in context. It focuses on the speaker's intended meaning, since what was said may be quite different from what was meant. Political language seeks to persuade and manipulate, so it is not surprising if it thrives in a context where what was said is different from what was meant. According to Ruth Wodak, "various pragmatic devices such as insinuation, allusions, word play, presuppositions and implicatures can be analyzed in their multiple functions in political discourse where they frequently serve certain goals" (203). Indede agrees; "Pragmatically speaking, all these devices are concerned with the meaning of the utterance, how what is said was meant by the speaker, and how the utterance is to be interpreted by the audience" (108).

2.2.2 Co-operative Principle

Grice introduced rules for conversations. He believes that humans ought to be cooperative in communication. Grice postulated the cooperative principle and its attendant super maxims. It is assumed that humans always speak the truth. Grice says: "make your conversational contribution

such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (45).

Grice’s Cooperative principle is based on four super maxims and sub-maxims of conversation:

The maxim of quantity:

- i) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)
- ii) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The maxim of quality:

- i) Do not say what you believe to be false.
- ii) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The maxim of relation:

- i) Be relevant.

The maxim of manner

- i) Avoid obscurity of expression
- ii) Avoid ambiguity
- iii) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- iv) Be orderly (Johnstone, 234).

The summary of these maxims is that people are expected to be informative, truthful, relevant and brief while communicating with fellow interlocutors. But people do not always stick to these maxims and sub-maxims in their speeches. Chilton and Schaffner assert:

Of course, we know people do not abide by all these normative maxims all of the time; but if the norms weren't norms, there would be no concept of lying, telling half-truths, evading the issue, being deliberately obscure. In the case of political discourse, speakers may be suspected of all these behaviours: they are being communicatively uncooperative and receive opprobrium. Politics may be a specific context in which the CP is recognized to be in jeopardy" (12).

Speech writers are usually indirect in their utterances, and could be more informative than is required. Their talk exchange may be shrouded in obscurity. The cooperative principle is not usually obeyed in political discourse. Generally, interlocutors do not always obey these maxims in conversations. During talk exchange, these maxims may be:

1. Violated
2. Opted out of
3. There may be a clash
4. Flouted

When the maxims are flouted, implicature is generated. Grice affirms:

A man who, by (in, when) saying (or making as if to say) that *p* has implicated that, may be said to have conversationally implicated that *q*, provided that (1) he is to be presumed to be observing the conversational maxims, or at least the Cooperative Principle; (2) the supposition that he is aware that, or thinks that, *q* is required in order to make his saying or making as if to say *p* (or doing so in those terms) consistent with his presumption; and (3) the speaker thinks (and would expect the hearer to think that the speaker thinks) that it is within the competence of the hearer to work out, or grasp intuitively, that the supposition mentioned in (2) is required (31).

Flouting a maxim “characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature; and when a conversational implicature is generated in this way, I shall say that a maxim is being *exploited* (Grice, 30). Political discourse practices endanger Cooperative principle.

2.2.3 Conversational Implicature

Implicature addresses implicit meaning. It addresses linguistic situations in which what was said by the speaker is totally different from what was meant (implicated). The literal content of the sentence is totally different from what was implicated. Implicature deals with the speaker’s intended meaning, which was not explicitly stated. Example:

Michael: Do you have salt?

Uche: Salt is sold on the market.

Uche implicitly refuses to give Michael some salt. He further tells him to go buy some for himself. Note that Uche’s talk exchange is more informative than is required. He, therefore, flouts the maxim of quantity, and generates implicature.

Politicians explore this option in political discourse. They do this “perhaps, because implied, if not explicitly verbalized, meaning can easily be disavowed” (Chilton and Schaffner 12). Although flouts generate implicatures, Grice believes that the maxims are still functional because hearers can infer implied meaning. Van Dijk defines political implicatures as “the specific political inferences that participants in the communicative situation may take on the basis of the speech and its context” (66).

Generally, pragmatic elements play defined roles in political discourse. They can be called the linguistic aspect of political discourse practices.

2.2.4 Hate Speech and Political Discourse

Many countries, like Nigeria, practice democracy, and in democratic nations, freedom of speech is allowed. Human beings have the ability to think and also vocalize their thoughts. A speech is an expression of thoughts and ideas through spoken discourse. It is a form of vocal communication. It can also come in the form of a written text. A speech is usually written and delivered, to an audience, through oral communication. Public speakers always strive to appeal to the audience. The speaker could also aim at persuading, motivating, and informing the audience. But when the speech includes demeaning, offensive, discriminatory and hurtful language, which is aimed to stigmatise a group of people, the speech is called hate speech. According to Wolfson, hate speech “generally includes offensive speech directed at minorities. In its most vulgar form, it includes the racial and sexist epithet, such as "kike" and "fag." At a more subtle level, or so it is argued, it includes books, cinema, and television images that demean a minority” (1). Tsesis argues that hate speech is ‘antisocial oratory that is intended to incite persecution against people because of their race, colour, religion, ethnic group, or nationality, and has a substantial likelihood of causing ... harm’ (211). Simpson defines hate speech thus:

Hate speech is a term of art in legal and political theory that is used to refer to verbal conduct – and other symbolic, communicative action – which wilfully expresses intense antipathy towards some group or towards an individual on the basis of membership in some group ... Hate speech thus includes things like identity-prejudicial abuse and harassment, certain uses of slurs and epithets, some extremist political and religious speech (e.g. statements to the effect that all Muslims are terrorists, or that gay people are second-class human beings), and certain displays of hate symbols (e.g. swastikas or burning crosses).

Hate speech stems from intolerance and indifference. It is an exhibition of indifference to a group of people's different ideologies on social, political and religious issues like ethnicity, race, religion, politics, sex and gender. Papanikolatos gives a varying definition of hate speech as "a moment in the process of forming national identities and its intensity varies depending on historical, social and political circumstances which may provide the conditions for establishing a more or less inflated national self as against the others" (10). She further defines it thus:

'Hate speech' in its most explicit manifestation, and at its most intense level, is the denial of the very existence of others as such within the borders of a particular state, that is, the negation of the existence of minorities, be they religious, cultural or ethnic ones. In this case the media attempt to stress the imaginary concept of a fully homogenous society. The negation of the existence of others may also go beyond the borders of a particular state, which brings forth the denial of the existence of certain ethnic identities (12).

Waldron gives a practical example of hate speech:

A man out walking with his seven-year-old son and his ten-year old daughter turns a corner on a city street in New Jersey and is confronted with a sign. It says: "Muslims and 9/11! Don't serve them, don't speak to them, and don't let them in." The daughter says, "What does it mean, papa?" Her father, who is a Muslim – the whole family is Muslim – doesn't know what to say. He hurries the children on... Other days he has seen them on the streets: a large photograph of Muslim children with the slogan "They are all called Osama," and a poster on the outside wall of his mosque which reads "Jihad Central". What is the point of these signs? We may describe them loosely as "hate speech", putting them in the same category as racist graffiti, burning crosses, and earlier generations of signage that sought to drive Jews out of fashionable areas in Florida with postings like "Jews and Dogs Prohibited". Calling these signs hate speech makes it sound as

though their primary function is expressive – but it is more than that. The signs send a number of messages. They send a message to the members of the minority denounced in the posters and pamphlets (2).

These definitions unanimously agree that hate speech covers expressions that instigate, elevate or upgrade religious, social, political or racial hatred due to intolerance. This intolerance is usually manifested through discrimination and hostility against a group of people who have different ideas, beliefs and ideologies. Intolerance to a people's sexual orientation, gender and national origin can also lead to hate speech. Hate speech can take the form of identity-prejudicial verbal abuse and harassment online, aspersion, slurs, epithets, graffiti, and extremist political and religious discourse. For instance, due to the issue of terrorism and Boko Haram insurgency in the Northern part of Nigeria where Muslims are ubiquitous, Nigerians seem to view every northerner as a terrorist. Weber captures this aptly:

The concept of “hate speech” encompasses a multiplicity of situations: – firstly, incitement of racial hatred or in other words, hatred directed against persons or groups of persons on the grounds of belonging to a race; – secondly, incitement to hatred on religious grounds, to which may be equated incitement to hatred on the basis of a distinction between believers and non-believers; – and lastly, to use the wording of the Recommendation on “hate speech” of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, incitement to other forms of hatred based on intolerance “expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism” (4).

When people employ hate speech, they want their voices to be heard. They want to promote their ideas, identities and ideologies to the detriment of other people's identities and ideologies. Hate speech infringes on people's dignity.

In Nigeria, hate speech is a crime. The Hate Speech bill tries to “eliminate” hate speech and discourage ethnic, religious or racial intolerance. The bill states stiff penalties for offences like ethnic hatred. It states that:

A person who uses, publishes, presents, produces, plays, provides, distributes and/or directs the performance of any material, written and/or visual, which is threatening, abusive or insulting or involves the use of threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour, commits an offence, if such person intends thereby to stir up ethnic hatred, or having regard to all the circumstances, ethnic hatred is likely to be stirred up against any person or person from such an ethnic group in Nigeria. A person subjects another to harassment on the basis of ethnicity for the purposes of this section where, on ethnic grounds, he unjustifiably engages in a conduct which has the purpose or effect of (a) violating that other person’s dignity or (b) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for the person subjected to the harassment (Godwin, par. 4 & 5).

This bill goes ahead to stipulate a minimum of a five-year jail term, and/or a fine of not less than ten million naira for culprits. Ultimately, the death penalty awaits anyone who causes another to die through hate speech. This bill encourages respect for different forms of diversity in a pluralistic society.

2.3 Persuasion

Persuasion is seen as an umbrella term which has powerful influence on all aspects of human life. Persuasion has been variously defined by different linguists. According to communication scholars:

Persuasion is a symbolic process in which communicators try to convince other people to change their attitudes or behaviour regarding an issue through the transmission of a message in an atmosphere of free choice.

Persuasion plays an important role in communication. People practice persuasive strategies in their daily life as means of influencing others by modifying their beliefs, values or attitudes. It is human communication that is designed to influence others by modifying others.

Karaf (20) defines persuasion as an art of verbal communication with the intention to assure someone to do something appropriate with the speaker's purpose for the present time. It now follows that the purpose of the speaker is to give the effect for the hearer or for doing something. Therefore, in persuasion, the speaker needs the effort for stimulating the addressees in taking decisions.

The Common Features of Archetype Cases of Persuasion

These common features comprise the things that are ordinarily involved when it is said that a person (a persuader) has succeeded in persuading another person (a persuadee).

- 1) When it is said that someone has been persuaded by another person, this necessarily means that a successful attempt at influencing the person has been carried out. This means that the concept of success is inherent in persuasion. A sentence like this: 'I persuaded Nneka, but failed' is totally wrong. One can say: 'I tried to persuade Nneka, but failed'. 'When one says': "I persuaded Nneka", it simply means that one succeeded in the attempt to influence Nneka.
- 2) Having said that persuasion is directly connected to success, it is worthy of note that certain persuasive goals are usually put in place in order to achieve success. The persuader works with the intent to achieve the persuasive goals.

- 3) Persuasion does not infringe on a person's free will and/or voluntary action. There is a measure of freedom for the persuadee. Perloff asserts: "Persuasion is an activity or process in which a communicator attempts to induce a change in the belief, attitude, or behaviour of another person or group of persons through the transmission of a message in a context in which the persuadee has some degree of free choice" (15). Daniel O'Keefe cites an example thus:

... a circumstance in which a person is knocked unconscious by a robber, who then takes the victim's money; one would not (except humorously) say that the victim had been "persuaded" to give the money. By contrast, being induced by a television and to make a donation to a charitable cause is obviously an instance of persuasion. When the persuadee's freedom is minimized or questionable, it becomes correspondingly questionable whether persuasion is genuinely involved; one no longer has a straightforward exemplary case of persuasion (4).

- 4) Persuasion takes place, if the persuasive goals were achieved through communication. The persuader communicates with the persuadee in order to achieve persuasion. Consider these two examples:

- a) Chinenye pushed her mentally- ill sister off a cliff.
- b) Chinenye talked her mentally - ill sister into jumping off a cliff.

The second example is a clear-cut case of persuasion, but the first example is not. The first example involves force, while the second example involves communication.

- 5) Persuasion theory focuses on the mental state of a person (persuadee) which has to be altered through communication. A change in the person's mental state leads to a change in behaviour. According to Robert Bostrom, "persuasion is the name we give to the type of communication that brings about change in people" (8).

In political speeches, politicians are the persuaders while the voters are the persuadees. These politicians employ certain persuasive goals to enable them to successfully influence the voters. They do not necessarily take away the voters' free will, but, in Nigeria, they could go to the extent of bribing voters. They do not put a gun to voters' heads and ask them to vote for them, campaigns are organised to communicate directly with the voters in order to change their mental state. They intend to change what people think of them as political candidates. The voters are influenced by influencing their mental states. In campaign speeches, these politicians deliver messages (speeches), which are replete with linguistic strategies that will influence the voters.

Persuasion theory lays emphasis on comprehending the effect of the message; whether positive or negative. Persuasive strategies are put in place in messages to influence the attitude of listeners. Persuasion theory, therefore, focuses on the audience and the content of the message.

Persuasion theory identifies four psychological factors of audiences.

- 1) An audience is always interested in gathering pieces of information; as a result, attention-capturing messages have to be designed in order to achieve that particular purpose.
- 2) Selective exposure: An audience will embrace a message that is in tandem with the ideas and opinions they already possess.
- 3) Selective perception: Audiences are bound to make their own choices. Embedded messages may be perceived differently, and conclusions made.
- 4) Selective memorisation: Opinions in a message will be better memorised if they are in tandem with the listener's previously held ideas and opinions. The length of the message is equally considered.

The Contents of the Message

Persuasion theory highlights four factors that facilitate the process of persuasion. They are:

- 1) The credibility and reputation of the speaker: If the speaker is placed on a pedestal, the level of persuasion is usually high, but if the speaker is considered incompetent, the level of persuasion is low. The level of persuasion affects the acceptance of the message by the audience. This is why aspiring political candidates, in Nigeria, employ some religious leaders to campaign for them.
- 2) The order of statements: Supporting opinions are placed either at the beginning of the message for primacy effect, or at the end of the message for regency effect.
- 3) Complete statements: If the content of the message was not welcome by the audience, the level of persuasion ought to be increased by the speaker. It behoves the speaker to make a comparative analysis of the subject using supporting and contrasting statements. Relevant topics should never be omitted, especially if the audience is not literate or knowledgeable about the topic.
- 4) Conclusions should be implicitly announced.

The process of communication in persuasion theory comprises communication – attitudes – behaviour. “Persuaders must intend to change another individual’s attitude or behaviour and must be aware (at least at some level) that they are trying to accomplish this goal” (Perloff 12). Little wonder Burgoon, Hunsaker and Dawson define persuasion as “a conscious symbolic act intended to form, modify, or strengthen the beliefs, opinions, values, attitudes, and/or behaviours of another or ourselves” (177).

Beliefs, values, motives, attitudes and behaviour have been identified as the main generators of the attitudes of people.

Belief

Belief has to do with trust and faith in something or someone. It shows a level of certainty about the existence of something. A person's belief system comprises a set of beliefs or principles that are mutually buttressed.

According to Lee McGaan, "the first term you should know is "BELIEF". In persuasion theory 'belief' refers to what people think is true or false, that is, the facts. When people say, "I believe in God," they are indicating that they think it is a fact that God exists (1).

Daniel O'Keefe asserts:

Sometimes, the focus of a persuasive effort will be some determinant of attitude, such as a particular belief about the attitude object. For example, an advertising campaign might try to persuade people that a product is environmentally friendly (as a means of influencing persons' attitudes toward the product and, eventually, product purchase). The appropriate assessment of the campaign's persuasive effectiveness would involve changes in that specific belief about the product... the belief that the product is environmentally friendly might well influence the overall attitude, but to see whether the target belief is changed by the persuasive effort, assessments of that belief would be needed (24).

Values

Values are principles. These values guide a person's action. It can also be called personal integrity. According to Lee McGaan, "The second term is "VALUE." "Value" refers to what we think is good or bad, right or wrong. When someone says, "I value education," that person means education is good, that it is right to pursue learning" (1)

Motive

A motive is a need or desire, which propels a person's action. It is a kind of stimulus to action. "Motive" refers to the audience member's self-interest. Motives are those desires we all have for positive outcomes for ourselves and our friends and families. When someone says, "I want to make more money" or "I want my family to be safe," they are describing motives" (McGaan 1).

Attitude

An attitude is a state of the mind, a particular feeling or opinion. This could be either positive or negative.

Attitude is central to the study of persuasion, because persuasion is considered a means of attitude change. "Persuasion takes place when a motivator is able to either change or confirm an existing attitude in the minds of listeners" (Hazel 2).

O'Keefe asserts:

If there is a predominant theme in treatment of attitudes, however, it is the view that an attitude is a person's general evaluation of an object (where "object" is understood in a broad sense, as encompassing persons, events, products, policies, institutions, and so on). The notion of an attitude as an evaluative judgment of (reaction to) an object is a common theme in definitions of attitude and ... is also implicit in traditional attitude assessment techniques (6).

"The fourth important persuasion term is "ATTITUDE." "Attitude" refers to what people like or dislike, favour or oppose. If someone asks, "what is your attitude toward President Bush?" they want to know if you like or dislike, favour or oppose him (and his policies)" (McGaan 1).

Behaviour

A person's behaviour explains how the person acts or behaves. It further explicates the manner in which the person conducts himself or herself. Behaviour involves action and response to stimulation.

McGaan posits:

Behaviour means intentional action. The action can be either verbal (e.g. signing a petition, saying "I do.") or physical (e.g. wearing a seat belt) but it involves doing something. Frequently the ultimate goal of persuasion is to gain behaviour from the receiver, although many persuasive messages represent only a small step toward that goal (1).

These values, beliefs, motives, and attitudes influence the people's behaviours. Persuasion has been seen as an enforcer of attitude change. O'Keefe says:

Whatever the particular characterization of the relationship, however, persuasion and attitude change has long been seen as closely linked. Even when a persuader's ultimate goal is the modification of another's behaviour, that goal is typically seen to be achieved through a process of attitude change – the presumption being that attitudes are "precursors of behaviour" (A.R. Cohen, 1964, p. 138), that "attitude change is a principal determinant of behavioural change" (Beisecker and Parson, 5).

A speaker usually surveys the beliefs and values of the proposed audience. Armed with that knowledge, s/he tends to change the attitude. These beliefs and values have already formed the identity of the people, so trying to change that belief is a difficult task. Persuasive strategies are usually put in place to make the change happen.

Persuasion theory has been critiqued based on the idea that trying to change people's existing values and beliefs has been proved to be ineffective.

In political text and talk, voters are persuaded to cast their votes for a certain candidate. They can be persuaded to swap their preference to another candidate. During governance, the populace can also be persuaded to endorse certain political practices, and endorse their political commitment to the present government.

This is achieved through communication. Messages, political speeches are prepared to that effect. The content of these messages is filled with certain persuasive strategies – like rhetorical devices – that will change (or confirm) the mental state of voters, thereby causing a behavioural change.

2.4 Language and Politics

Edward Sapir defines language as “a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols” (1). Bernard Bloch and George Trager define language as “a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates” (10). David Crystal believes that language is “the systematic, conventional use of sounds, signs or written symbols in a human society for communication and self-expression” (1). John Lyons posits that:

- (i) in phrases such as “sign language”, “the language of mathematics”, “the language of bees”, and “the language of flowers”, the word language is being employed in a related, but more general sense; (ii) that “in its more general sense, the term “language” may be defined as “a system of communication”, (iii) and in the narrower sense in which the linguist uses the term languages are the principal

systems of communication used by particular groups of human beings within the particular society (linguistic community) of which they are member (12).

These definitions point to the fact that language is used for communication. Language is a system of communication, known to humans, which uses arbitrary signs and symbols. Goats bleat, cats meow, horses neigh and dogs bark; but only human beings use language as a system of communication.

Politics is centred on power relations. It is a play on power, status and influence. It can be seen as a set of activities purposefully carried out to improve a person's status within a group. John Joseph defines politics thus, "the concept of politics may apply to any situation in which there is an unequal distribution of power, and where individuals' behaviour reflects the play of power or is guided by it" (3). But Chilton says:

On the one hand, politics is viewed as a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it ... on the other hand, politics is viewed as cooperation, as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty, and the like (3).

The delineating factor in these definitions is power. Power relations are established and sustained through language. The relationship between language and politics is mutual. Language is political, and politics can be linguistically analysed. This relationship between these two cannot be downplayed. They are dependent on one another. According to Aristotle,

Hence it is evident that the state is a creation of nature, and that man is by nature a political animal ... Now, that man is more of a political animal than bees or any other gregarious animals is evident. Nature, as we often say, makes nothing in

vain, and man is the only animal whom she has endowed with the gift of speech (xviii).

Aristotle's assertion of the political nature of man is based on man's gift of language. He can communicate his feelings and ideas about justice and the good. He believes that armed with language, man is able to have social interactions with fellow human beings. Alliances are formed, survival kicks in. Politics is indeed a part of the everyday existence of mankind. This does not necessarily mean partisan politics. Human beings always strive to survive. Relationships, partnerships, alliances and support groups are formed, daily. Chilton and Schaffner conclude:

What is clear is that political activity does not exist without the use of language. It is true that other behaviours are involved: for instance, physical coercion. But the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language. Conversely, it is also arguably the case that the need for language (or for the cultural elaboration of the language instinct) arose from socialization of humans involving the formation of coalitions, the signalling of group boundaries, and all that these developments imply, including the emergence of what is called reciprocal altruism (3).

We are being political when we interpret utterances to check the motives behind them. This relationship transcends speaking and writing, rather it highlights the different motives behind speaking and writing, and roles played by our utterances as humans. John Joseph concurs:

My language is shaped by who it is that I am speaking to, and by how my relationship with that person will be affected by what I say; the politics of identity shapes how we interpret what people say to us, and it becomes fundamental in deciding the truth-value of their utterances (3).

Language has a political dimension to it, but it is totally wrong to think of language as political. Robin Lakoff affirms, “Politics is language and, at the same time, language is politics, which are ultimately linked at a fundamental level” (13). John Joseph states “politics is the art, and language is the medium, whereby... (People) position themselves to get what they need, and beyond that, what they want” (347). Stephen May concurs:

A key reason why such a broader socio-historical, socio-political research approach is necessary is because for much of its history, linguistics as an academic discipline has been preoccupied with idealist, abstracted approaches to the study of language. In short, language has too often been examined in isolation from the social and political conditions in which it is used ... This historical, political, approach to language has also been a feature of sociolinguistics, despite its emphasis on the social, and of many discussions of language and politics as well (255).

Another dimension to the connection of politics to language is that of certain rules and laws guiding language use in countries. These laws ensure that mutual rights and responsibilities of minority and majority groups are recognised. Some languages have been politically termed majority and minority languages in different countries.

A majority language is the language of wider communication – the dominant language. It is the language spoken by the majority of people in a country. This language adorns prestige on its speakers. Minority languages, on the other hand, are languages spoken by the minority of the population. These laws have posed a problem because, in a country like Nigeria, the so-called majority language is actually spoken by a lesser number of the population. Apparently, unequal power relations play out between these languages.

May assert:

Advocates of MLR argue that the establishment of majority-minority language hierarchies is neither a natural process nor primarily even a linguistic one. Rather, it is a historically, socially, and politically constructed process ..., and one that is deeply imbued in wider (unequal) power relations. Following from this, if languages, and the status attached to them, are the product of wider historical, social, and political forces, there is, in turn, nothing “natural” about the status and prestige attributed to particular majority languages and, conversely the stigma that is often attached to minority languages, or to dialects (260).

Some countries, like Canada, have language rights like the minority language rights which they speak of. If one language is promoted, while other languages are relegated to the background, inter-ethnic tension comes to play. Joseph concurs: “differences in the perceived performance of language use are in fact mirroring the social disparities of power and power relations which enable leading elite to determine what the optimal performance of language usage ought to be (59).

Linguistic choices are politically motivated. They are subtly forced on language users, because these linguistic choices are not free choices. To an extent, the English language is seen as a measure of intelligence because of its status as a prestigious language. Therefore, people use it because of that prestige adorned on it. Joseph states:

Who has ability to make choices where language is concerned? Power and politics are fundamentally about whose will, whose choices, will prevail. Who has the power to determine what is good and bad English, or what is grammatically right or wrong in any language? Who should decide on the language or languages of education in a multilingual setting? Who determines what is acceptable or

offensive in a given language at a given time, and how? When I believe I am making choices in language, are they actually being forced upon me by some hegemonic structure or by the language itself? Are my interpretations of what I read and hear really mine, or are they too forced upon me by corporate and governmental interests seeking to control the way I perceive and think? (17).

Although no language is inferior to the other, language has also been politicised in terms of categorisation. Some languages have been termed standard languages, and others non-standard language. Some have been called mutually intelligible, while others are said to be mutually unintelligible. Some words, also, have been called offensive or vulgar. Language is being controlled in this sense. Every discipline has its own register. The politics of language use also plays out in diglossia. Diglossia is “one particular kind of standardization where two variables of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play” (Ferguson, 65). In diglossic situations, one language variety is considered the high variety, and the other variety is called a low variety.

Joseph posits:

In most of the world, the linguistic condition is one of the stable bilingualism or multilingualism, or the not-quite-bilingualism known as diglossia, in which two quite divergent linguistic systems co-exist in a community that recognizes them as forms of ‘the same language’, but with one of them reserved for use in especially prestigious functions. In all these types of non-monolingualism, the choice of which language to use in a particular circumstance is a political matter in two senses. This is because, firstly, it simultaneously depends upon and determines the relationships among the speakers, and secondly, because sanctions of some sort are likely to follow from a wrong choice (10).

This analysis from Joseph suggests a hegemonic relationship between both varieties of a language. One could therefore conclude that every act of language is potentially political. They are politically motivated. Utterances are politically motivated, even when they are not; they have the capacity to place the speaker on a pedestal with his/her hearers. John Joseph concludes, “to ignore the manifold and sweeping ways in which language functions to position people relative to one another is to have a partial and distorted conception of what language is about (Joseph 19). Chilton and Schaffner concur: “politics cannot be carried out without language and that it is the use of language in the composition of social groups that leads to what is called politics” (206).

There is inherent power in language. Power relations can be changed and/or maintained through language. Politicians have discovered this power, and are using it to achieve many aims. Chilton concurs that:

Political actors recognize the role of language because its use has effects, and because politics is very largely the use of language, even if the converse is not true – not every use of language is political. The point has been to try to convince you that language is important for political life (15).

Joseph concurs that, “...there is a further linguistic-political dimension on how those in power, or desiring power, deploy language in order to achieve their aims” (30-55). This is traditionally, the domain of rhetoric defined by Aristotle as “the art of persuasion” (4).

2.5 Political Discourse

Political discourse is an area in discourse analysis. Political discourse means discourse in politics. Discourse represents analysis of written, verbal or non-verbal language. Political

discourse focuses on discourse in political meetings like campaigns, manifestoes, debates, presidential speeches, but it may not be limited to discourse practices in these political gatherings or by politicians. Tongtao Zheng says: “Political discourse should not be restricted only to settings such as parliamentary proclamations, speeches and election campaigns but also apply to all linguistic manifestations that may be considered political” (1). But according to Teun Van Dijk;

Political discourse is identified by its *actors or authors, viz.*, politicians. Indeed, the vast bulk of studies of political discourse are about the text and talk of professional politicians or political institutions, such as presidents and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, both at the local, national and international levels (12).

Political discourse means different things to different discourse analysts. The definition of political discourse has been problematic. It has been delineated to cover issues of control, power, conflict and influence. According to John Wilson,

... one needs at the outset to consider the reflexive and potentially ambiguous nature of the term *political discourse*. The term is suggestive of at least two possibilities: first, a discourse which is itself political; and second, an analysis of political discourse as simply an example discourse type, without explicit reference to political content or political context. But things may be even more confusing. Given that for some definitions almost all discourse may be considered political ..., then all *analyses* of discourse are potentially political, and, therefore, on one level, *all* discourse analysis is political discourse (398).

Although these definitions have a slight difference between them, they agree that political discourse deals with discourse practices by politicians. They also agree that political discourse

ought to have political context; whether formal or informal. Political discourse is usually employed by politicians and political supporters whose aim is to achieve political goals. Chilton and Schaffner conclude:

If ‘politics’ is confined to *institutional* politics – parliamentary debates, party conference speeches, and the like, and generally more overtly linked to ideology, then the objects of study for political discourse analysis can be easily circumscribed. But everyday conflicts – say between men and women, workers and managers, policemen and black youths, even schoolchildren and teachers – are sometimes by some people characterized as ‘political’. However, it is probably useful to maintain a distinction between institutional politics and everyday politics (6).

Wilson concurs, “...by treating all discourse as political, in its most general sense, we may be in danger of significantly over generalising the concept of political discourse” (398).

It can be gathered from these assertions that, although everyday language use of citizens can be political, a line should be drawn between political discourse practices by politicians and that of other citizens; that is formal and informal political talks. Political discourse deals mainly with discourse practices in institutional politics.

In political discourse, the political language employed is the focus. Political language is “who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasions, and in what goals” (Van Dijk, 225). This may take the form of written and/or spoken communication. Political discourse focuses on the way language is adopted in the world of politics. Wilson says: “but certain core features will, and must, remain constant in the field of political discourse, and central to this is the role of language and language structure, and its manipulation for political message construction and political effect” (411).

Political discourse is woven around political texts. These texts are divided into two:

1) Texts that discuss political ideas, beliefs and practices of society or some part of it but the text producers need not be solely politicians. 2) Texts which are crucial for the formation of a political or ideological community, or group, or party. From this perspective, finer distinctions are drawn: a) inner-state discourse (domestic) and inter-state discourse (foreign policy and diplomacy); b) internal political discourse (politicians talking, planning and discussing among themselves), and external-political discourse (politicians communicating with the public) (Chilton and Schaffner, 214).

Politicians use certain linguistic strategies in their texts and talk. They use language to “manipulate” the public to believe in them. “Political language is concerned with presenting and selling a positive image to others. The success of this merchandising depends on the linguistic skills employed, which ... may include persuasion, seduction, conviction, pledging or pretence, among other actions” (Salem 82).

Language is always manipulated to get a certain political effect. This creates a balance between linguistic analysis and political analysis, thereby highlighting the relationship between language and politics. The reason behind choosing these specific choices is to persuade the audience. This is usually the first step in politics. If the majority of the public are strongly persuaded to stand with a political actor, the politician will achieve his/her political aims and aspirations, elections will be won, impeachments will not be carried out, and recalls will not happen.

As stated earlier, politicians are not oblivious of the power of language to manipulate thoughts and actions. They employ different linguistic strategies in their political texts and talks.

2.6 Nnamdi Kanu and IPOB

Nnamdi Kanu is a political activist who is of British –Nigerian nationality. He is the known leader of the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) and also the director of Radio Biafra- a London based radio station. Nnamdi was born in September, 1967, in Isiama Abia State, Nigeria, to the family of the Royal Highness Eze Israel Kanu.

IPOB has only one weapon with which to fight Nigeria and that is civil disobedience not armed conflict. The main agenda of IPOB is to separate the South East and some parts of South-South regions from the rest of Nigeria. IPOB hopes to achieve this separation through referendum. He had a strong feeling that the Igbo's are seriously marginalized and relegated to the background in terms of development. Wanting to be a "Saviour" that would lift the South-South out of their pains plunge them into utopia as he advocates change and a Republic of Biafra. The struggle for Biafra did not start in the 20th century, however Kanu, reignited this fight in 2012 when he formed the IPOB organization to champion the quest of the Igbo people to have their own Nation outside Nigeria.

He came to limelight when he was arrested by the Department of State Security (DSS) on the 14th day of October, 2015 on charges of treason.

He was kept in prison for one year and half without trial. He was eventually released on 8th April, 2017 on bail. He is not only known for controversial politics but he has other controversial views such as his proclamation of believing in being a Jew and that Igbo people are of Jewish descent. He is known to endorse violence to actualize Biafra and sometimes when asked about such statements of his, he shifts his stance by giving explanations that somehow do not correspond to the interpretation people had hitherto given to his earlier statements.

One of such statements is the one he made on 5th of Sept, 2015 as a guest speaker at the World Igbo congress held in Los Angeles California “we need guns and we need bullets”. People assumed he meant that he needed guns and bullets to better fight for the actualization of an Independent State of Biafra. But asked in an interview in June 29, 2017, he said that he only implied that he wanted guns and bullets to better defend the Igbo people from incessant attacks by the Fulani Herdsmen.

He was finally arraigned on 23 November, 2015, in an Abuja Magistrate Court for charges of criminal conspiracy, intimidation and membership of an illegal organization by the Nigeria’s Department of State Service (DSS). Pro-Biafra protesters carried placards throughout the court premises. Protesters wore T-shirts and caps with inscriptions like "Biafra Now or Never", "Buhari Release Kanu for Us", "On Biafra We Stand".

On October 2015, he was released on bail by Justice Binta Nyako on health reasons. Kanu disappeared from the public scene after his home was raided by the military in September, 2017.

2.7 Nelson Mandela and South Africa

The South African activist and former President helped to bring an end to apartheid. He has been a global advocate for human rights. A member of the African National Congress Party which started in 1940, he was a leader of both peaceful protests and armed resistance against the white minority’s oppressive regime in a racially divided South Africa.

Apartheid is a culture that centres on white supremacy and discrimination against black people. It represents racial segregation which was enforced by an all-white government. The blacks, although they were the majority of the population, were made to live separate lives from their white counterparts. The blacks did not have the luxury and privileges enjoyed by the whites.

Nelson Mandela, as a political activist, vehemently opposed apartheid. His actions landed him in prison for nearly three decades. This was the period Africans suffered great discrimination by the whites in South Africa.

In 1961, Nelson Mandela co-founded and became the first leader of Umkhonto we Sizwe (“Spear of the Nation”), a new armed wing of the ANC. Several years later, he described the reasoning for this radical departure from his party’s original tenets thus: “[I]t would be wrong and unrealistic for African leaders to continue preaching peace and nonviolence at a time when the government met our peaceful demands with force. It was only when all else had failed, when all channels of peaceful protest had been barred to us, that the decision was made to embark on violent forms of political struggle.” On August 5, 1962, he was arrested and subsequently sentenced to five years in prison for leaving the country and inciting a 1961 workers’ strike. The following July, police raided an ANC hideout in Rivonia, a suburb on the outskirts of Johannesburg, and arrested a racially diverse group of MK leaders who had gathered to debate the merits of a guerrilla insurgency. Mandela and seven others narrowly escaped the gallows and were instead sentenced to life imprisonment during the so-called Rivonia Trial, which lasted eight months and attracted substantial international attention. Mandela admitted to some of the charges against him while defending the ANC’s actions and denouncing the injustices of apartheid. He ended with the following words: “I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.”

Nelson Mandela spent the first 18 of his 27 years in jail at the brutal Robben Island Prison, a former leper colony off the coast of Cape Town, where he was confined to a small cell without a bed or plumbing and compelled to do hard labour in a lime quarry. As a black political prisoner, he received scantier rations and fewer privileges than other inmates. Mandela and his fellow

prisoners were routinely subjected to inhumane punishments for the slightest of offenses; among other atrocities, there were reports of guards burying inmates in the ground up to their necks and urinating on them.

These restrictions and conditions notwithstanding, while in confinement Mandela earned a bachelor of law degree from the University of London and served as a mentor to his fellow prisoners, encouraging them to seek better treatment through nonviolent resistance. He also smuggled out political statements and a draft of his autobiography, “Long Walk to Freedom,” published five years after his release. Despite his forced retreat from the spotlight, Mandela remained the symbolic leader of the anti-apartheid movement. In 1980, Oliver Tambo introduced a “Free Nelson Mandela” campaign. In 1982, Mandela was moved to Pollsmoor Prison on the mainland, and in 1988 he was placed under house arrest on the grounds of a minimum-security correctional facility. The following year, newly elected president F. W. de Klerk lifted the ban on the ANC and called for a non-racist South Africa. On February 11, 1990, he ordered Mandela’s release. After attaining his freedom, Nelson Mandela led the ANC in its negotiations for an end to apartheid and the establishment of a multi-racial government. On May 10, 1994, Mandela was sworn in as the first black president of South Africa.

2.8 Empirical Studies

Several research works have been carried out by various researchers in attempt to decipher the use of language and hate speech by many political leaders and activists. Some of the works are being reviewed by the researcher.

Chika Ojukwu in 2016, researched on Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Nelson Mandela. The research was carried out to analyse selected political speeches of Nelson

Mandela using the speech Act Theory. The aim was to find out if Mandela's speeches have been effective or not. The researcher also investigated meaning, intentions and perlocutionary acts of the speeches. The study investigated the speeches to find out how Nelson Mandela achieved his intentions using the Speech Act theory. Four political speeches of Nelson Mandela formed the data for the study. The researcher concludes that language is a powerful weapon in getting to the political thoughts and ideologies of politicians. The findings of the study say that Mandela uses his speeches to enlighten, persuade, convince and inspire. The researcher notes that the utterances are either implicitly or explicitly stated.

In 2015, Nkechi Ike-Nwafor carried out a research titled *Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Political Campaign Speeches of Gubernatorial Candidates in South-Western Nigeria 2007-2014*. The purpose of the study was to investigate how power relations are sustained in campaign texts. The theoretical framework for the study is Norman Fairclough's *Members Resources*, Van-Dijk's socio-cognitive approach and Halliday's system of mood and modality. Eight political speeches of different gubernatorial candidates in western Nigeria formed the data. The researcher concludes that the gubernatorial candidates used language as a strategy of domination and supremacy. Asymmetrical power relations were also created through their campaign texts.

Okoro Nkechinyere equally researched on *Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari in 2016*. The aim of the study was to identify the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts in the political speeches of President Muhammadu Buhari. The data comprised five speeches by the president during the 2015 presidential campaign. The speech act theory formed the theoretical framework. The researcher discovered that the speeches were replete with assertive and commissive illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, which are persuasive strategies that characterise political speeches.

In 2016, Ajewole Orimogunje and Christiana Oluremi studied *A Stylo-Rhetorical Analysis of Obafemi Awolowo's "It is not Life that Matters"*. The purpose of the research was to show Awolowo's use of language as a technique for influencing his audience. Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar was used for analysis. The researcher found out that Awolowo adopted English as a measure of persuasion. The research brings the effectiveness of Awolowo's use of language to the fore.

Sohrab Rezaei and Niloofar Nourali in 2016, researched on *Language and Power: The Use of Persuasive Techniques in Iran and U.S. Presidential Speeches*. Four political speeches from President Barack Obama and President Rouhani formed the data. It was noted that the presidents used persuasive techniques, although they differ dramatically, in their speeches. The researcher also noted that President Rouhani is more persuasive than President Barack Obama. President Obama employed metaphor in his speeches more than any other rhetorical device.

Moses Alo in 2012, researched on: *A Rhetorical Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Prominent African Leaders*. The aim was to investigate how African leaders persuade Africans on certain political and socio-economic policies. The focus was on the various rhetorical and persuasive strategies employed by these African leaders. Data were taken from sixteen political speeches of some African presidents. Fairclough's socio-semiotic model of critical discourse analysis and Aristotelian rhetorical were used as theories for the study. The researcher noticed that persuasive strategies recurred in their speeches.

In 2007, Emma Ezejideaku and Esther Ugwu researched on *The Rhetorical & Propaganda of Political Campaigns in Nigeria*. The research examined the language of political campaigns in Nigeria. The study reveals that the campaigns rely heavily on rhetoric, propaganda and some linguistic devices.

Ikenna Kamalu and Patience Bana Iniworikabo in 2016, researched on *Metaphors in Selected Political Speeches of Nigerian Democratic Presidents*. The study employed conceptual metaphor theory of Lakoff and Johnson for analysis of data. Data comprised political speeches of three former presidents of Nigeria. The researcher discovered that metaphors are quite resourceful in political communication, and the speakers utilised them in their speeches.

Amaechi Enyi investigated on *Rhetorical Diplomacy: A Study of Nigeria's President Muhammadu Buhari's Speech to the 70th Session of the United Nations General Assembly-September 2015*. The research was hinged on the speech act theory of Austin and Searle. The researcher discovered the use of expressive, assertive, commissives and direct speech acts by the president. These illocutionary acts were used to communicate Nigeria's challenges to the world. It was noted that the president did not make use of verdictive and declarative illocutionary acts.

Remi Aduraola and Chris Ojukwu in 2013, researched on *Language of Political Campaigns and Politics in Nigeria*. The researcher employed the purposive sampling technique to analyse the language and communicative contents of some political messages and slogans in the 2011 campaigns in Nigeria. Fifty-one newspaper advertisements and handbills formed the population. Twenty-one were sampled for the study. The researcher noted that language is a significant part of influence in reducing tensions between needs and social realities.

In 2010, Luu Trong Tuan investigated on *Rhetorical Structures in the Language of Vietnamese Advertisements*. The problem of the research was that the longstanding and widespread use of rhetorical figures in advertising has been ignored in consumer research. The research builds a framework for categorising rhetorical figures that distinguish figurative texts from non-figurative texts. The research concludes that text-centred approaches to advertising help to attract attention.

In 2009, Lena Kulo researched on *Linguistic Features in Political Speeches: How Language can be used to Impose Certain Moral or Ethical Values on People*. The aim of the study was to

investigate implicit statements in the language of politics. The data for the study comprised two political speeches by President Barack Obama and Senator John McCain during the 2008 presidential campaign. The research concluded that both politicians employed rhetorical strategies to convey their ideas of morality to the public. The researcher noted that it is pertinent to note how politicians use rhetorical strategies to convince their audience.

In 2017, Saku Korhonen carried out a research titled “The Rhetorical of Blame and Bluster: An Analysis of how Donald Trump Use Language to Advance his Political Goals”. Informal tweets from Donald Trump’s Twitter account, *@realDonaldTrump*, from 2016-2017 formed the data for the study. The research concludes that Trump’s rhetorical cannot be denied. After all, he is the current president of America. He uses it to change the public perceptions of happenings in the United States of America.

Barnali Chetia (2004) conducted a research on Rhetorical Devices in English Advertisement Texts in India: A Descriptive Study. The paper attempted a study of rhetorical devices found in English advertisements in India. The researcher found out that rhetorical is a strategy used to influence thoughts. He also noted that advertisements are replete with personification, simile, metaphor and others.

Alaba Akinwotu in 2013, researched on Rhetorical in Selected Speeches of Obafemi Awolowo and Moshood Abiola. The problem of the research was that little research has been done on the deployment of rhetorical by notable Nigerian political figures. The work examined the communicative intentions and persuasive techniques used by Moshood Abiola and Obafemi Awolowo in their political speeches. Aristotle’s theory of rhetorical was used as the theoretical framework. It was noted that the speeches used two types of rhetoric; combat and tact.

Amitabh in 2015, examined Mandelian’s Rhetoric: An Analysis of Nelson Mandela’s political speeches. The paper presented an analysis of Nelson Mandela’s political speeches in relation to

the linguistic devices used in his political rhetoric, such as metaphor, analogies, repetition. The main goal of Amitabh's study was to address how effectively this African leader employed these devices in the linguistic persuasion unlike most Nigerian activists who prefer threats and hate speeches while addressing the public.

This study compares the analysis of rhetorical devices in selected political speeches of Nelson Mandela of South Africa and Nnamdi Kanu of Nigeria. So many research works have been carried out on rhetorical devices used by politicians in different circumstances but not much have been done on comparing activists using both rhetorical devices and hate speech at the same time, instead, comparisons have been done on the use of the different devices individually. The researcher chose these two activists to decipher the similarities in them, as well as the differences in the way they use language.

Nelson Mandela used rhetorical devices and emotive languages while Nnamdi Kanu employs both rhetorical devices and hate speeches. This is the gap this study intends to fill in the world of knowledge.

2.9 Summary

In communication, a lot of actions can take place through words, because words have inherent power. Persuasion is one of these actions, and it is carried out through words. Messages that have the intent to persuade are usually filled with certain persuasive goals. Political speeches, which are replete with rhetorical devices, are clear examples of those messages. This research investigates the use of rhetorical devices by certain group of activists in their messages (political speeches) with the intent to influence and persuade their audience.

The review of related literature examines how other researchers have pragmatically and linguistically analysed political speeches. But this work focuses on how political activists employ rhetorical devices to persuade people to agitate over the suppression of a group of people over the entire populace (nation). A lot of valuable works on speech analysis have been done on rhetorical but little or no research has been carried out on comparing the rhetorical speeches of Nelson Mandela from South Africa and that of Nnamdi Kanu from Nigeria to differentiate between the ways the two activists use rhetorical devices either to persuade or to delineate the audience. This is the gap this study intends to fill. One can see that the purpose of this research is ultimate as other researches should be carried out on another platform.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Theoretical Framework

The theories for this research are Persuasion Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis Theory. These explain the theories adopted for the study.

3.1.1 Persuasion Theory

Persuasion Theory is a mass communication theory that can be applied in politics, advertising and conflict resolution. “Persuasion ... is central to public relations: in that it is able to influence target public” (Smith, 1). Daniel O’Keefe defines persuasion as “a successful intentional effort at influencing another’s mental state through communication in a circumstance in which the persuadee has some measure of freedom” (5). These definitions agree that the primary purpose of persuasion is the intent to influence.

Persuasion Theory deals with messages directed at surreptitiously changing the attitudes and mind-set of listeners. The idea is to influence the listener without employing any kind of force. The audience is persuaded, and not manipulated. In this theory, emphasis is laid on the most desirable persuasive effects of propaganda. Speeches are delivered with the clear intent of persuasion, instead of just stringing words together to form sentences. In political discourse, political leaders deliver persuasive messages which they believe would sway the voters.

3.1.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is an approach to discourse that explores language in connection with its socio-political contexts. It equally explores how societal power relations are established and reinforced using language, because language is a form of social practice. Critical discourse

analysis deals with the way social relations, identity, knowledge and power are all constructed through texts and talks. Robbin Wooffitt defines it thus: “broadly put, it is concerned to analyse how social and political inequalities are manifest in and reproduced through discourse” (137).

But Van Dijk states:

Critical Discourse Analysis... is a special approach in discourse analysis which focuses on the discursive conditions, components and consequences of power abuse by dominant (elite) groups and institutions. It examines patterns of access and control over contexts, genres, text and talk, their properties, as well as the discursive strategies of mind control. It studies discourse and its functions in society and the ways society, and especially forms of inequality, are expressed, represented, legitimated or reproduced in text and talk (24).

He further reiterates: critical discourse analysis is “a type of discourse analysis research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts” (352). In the same vein, Wetherell, Taylor and Yates define critical discourse analysis as:

...the study of talk and texts. It is a set of methods and theories for investigating language in use and language in social contexts. Discourse research offers routes into the study of meanings; a way of investigating the back-and-forth dialogues which constitute social action, along with the patterns of signification and representation which constitute culture (i).

Critical discourse analysis is an implicit political study of discourse, because it investigates certain structures and strategies in political text and talk. It investigates political discourse and highlights any form of persuasion or manipulation in the discourse; like rhetorical devices.

Van-Dijk posits:

Among the descriptive, explanatory and practical aims of CDA-studies is the attempt to *uncover, reveal* or *disclose* what is implicit, hidden or otherwise not immediately obvious in relations of discursively enacted dominance or their underlying ideologies. That is, CDA specifically focuses on the strategies of *manipulation, legitimation, the manufacture of consent* and other discursive ways to influence the minds (and indirectly the actions) of people in the interest of the powerful. This attempt to uncover the discursive means of mental control and social influence implies a critical and oppositional stance *against the powerful and the elites*, and especially those who abuse their power (18).

This theory considers how public speakers manipulate text and talk. Politicians always persuade people and influence their minds. People's attitudes and views are affected and changed. All these are achieved through text and talk and/or the power, status and credibility of the speaker. This limits the power and freedom of the less powerful. Public speakers, especially politicians, tend to lie, manipulate and persuade their audiences, and the people may lack sufficient information on these strategies to detect the lies and manipulations. In the light of this;

CDA studies the ways in which such influence and control of the mind is socially or morally illegitimate, e.g., when powerful speakers self-servingly control the minds of others in a way that is in the interest of the powerful. Since action is based on mental models of actors, models which in turn embody social knowledge and attitudes, influencing such models or the beliefs on which they are based may be an effective way to (indirectly) control the actions of other people (van Dijk, 22).

The assumption is that the asymmetrical power relation between speakers and hearers is due to the unequal access to linguistic and social resources. Critical discourse analysis demystifies the power relations of everyday text and talk.

Some Approaches to the Study of Critical Discourse Analysis

Some scholars have come up with different approaches to the study of critical discourse analysis. Generally, critical discourse analysis investigates the larger attributes of the production and consumption of discourse (text and talk). But different scholars have come up with some of their own approaches to the study.

Norman Fairclough employs the Marxist perspective on social conflict. He draws theoretical objectives from linguistics and sociolinguistics, because sociolinguistics studies language in relation to its social context. It also studies language and power relations. Fairclough believes that discourse is a form of social practice, and that the task of critical discourse analysis is to highlight social inequalities that are associated with the capitalist system which are seen in discourse. Van Dijk, on the other hand, pays attention to the role of cognition in interpreting text and talk (discourse practices). Robin Wooffitt says:

He argues that we need to understand the role of social cognitions and representations – ways of thinking about the world which emerge from social activities – in order to understand how wider inequalities inform particular discursive or interpretative acts. Cognition is thus the theoretical interface between discourse and dominance (138).

Van Dijk takes a socio-cognitive approach to the study of critical discourse analysis. He takes social cognition as the link between text and society. He defines social cognition as “socially shared representations of societal arrangements, groups and relations, as well as mental

operations such as interpretation, thinking, thinking and arguing, inferencing and learning” (257). He also believes that there is a relationship between discourse and some social factors like racism. Van Dijk is of the opinion that the production of text that contains some underlying bias like vulgar and derogatory words is due to an activation of some cognitive constructs.

Another scholar is Ruth Wodak, who takes a discourse-historical stand. She analyses discourse in a wider context (institutional, political, media and gender), and proposes the four levels of discourse thus:

- a) The actual or immediate use of language or text;
- b) The relationship between utterances, texts, discourses and genres;
- c) The extra-linguistic sociological and institutional context of discourse;
- d) The socio-political and historical contexts.

She proposes a relationship between discourse practices and certain fields of action in which they occur, that is to say that discourse is context dependent. Wodak always seeks to highlight the interrelatedness between power and dominance, in text and talk, across these four contextual levels of discourse so this theory best suits this work as it dwells on certain strategies of political discourse.

The different approaches to the study of critical discourse analysis notwithstanding, the general factor is that critical discourse analysis highlights the role of discourse in producing and sustaining social inequalities, that is, asymmetrical power relations. According to Fairclough and Wodak, emphasis is on “substantively linguistic and discursive nature of social relations of power” (272). It dwells on certain strategies of text and talk that establishes and sustains power relations, and seeks to emancipate the minority. Because critical discourse analysis concerns itself with issues of power and inequality, it is safe to say that it is interested in certain social issues. Theoretically, its focus is on the relationship between discourse and dominance.

Critical discourse analysis is the bridge between linguistic features and socio-political contexts. Critical discourse analysts are of the opinion that if one wants to comprehend how language works, one must connect it to some social and political contexts.

The general point of analysis in critical discourse analysis is text. Texts are “materially durable products of linguistic actions” (Wodak 66). These texts are products of discourse. Critical discourse analysis is deeply rooted in textual and linguistic analysis. Particular texts-like political speeches serve specific purposes and functions. In textual analysis, sentence and word level analysis are used. Choice of words is also considered. So, critical discourse analysis focuses on how concepts and actions are portrayed in official texts. In text analysis, critical discourse analysis finds out the “structures, strategies or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction or communicative events that play a role in production or reproduction of unequal power relations” (Van Dijk 250).

This theory has been critiqued for using a few texts that are limited length-wise. These texts are also believed to have been randomly and arbitrarily selected. The idea is that the texts are representatives of the writer’s bias. It has also been critiqued for employing vague concepts and analytical models.

3.1.3 Speech Act: Language as Action

Actions are not always louder than words. Humans can do a multitude of things with words. Words accomplish things. Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams assert, “You can use language to do things. You can use language to make promises, lay bets, issue warnings, christen boats, place names in nomination, offer congratulations, or swear testimony. The theory of speech acts describes how this is done” (175). Speech act theory concerns itself with the many ways in which words can be used to carry out actions. Chilton and Schaffner posit:

... taking action is not always just a matter of physically affecting the external world (as in pressing a button, opening a door, striking another person...). Taking action is also done in and through speech (and writing), as in issuing a command, making a pledge, asking for information, threatening to kill someone, declaring a war, marrying someone to someone, baptizing a child, making an accusation in a court of law, signing a death warrant, drawing up a binding contract (10).

Language facilitates human interaction. Besides physical activities, there are certain actions that can only be performed by words. Language is used to persuade, to insult, to promise and to beg. These actions are speech acts. These actions need not be physical activities. Speech acts are “utterances that serve to accomplish the speakers’ goals, such as requesting, apologizing, promising, denying, expressing emotion, complaining, etc” (Saville-Troike 194).

Elizabeth Black states:

The term speech act does not refer simply to the act of speaking, but to the whole communicative situation, including the context of the utterance (that is, the situation in which the discourse occurs, the participants and any preceding verbal or physical interaction) and paralinguistic features which may contribute to the meaning of the interaction (17).

Every speech act performs a function in speech. Speech act theory identifies three parts of an act; the locution, the illocution and the prelocution.

The Locutionary Act

A locutionary act is a sentence that possesses meaning. It is the general act of saying something. According to Alan Cruse, locutionary act is “the production of an utterance, with a particular intended structure, meaning, and reference” (167).

The Illocutionary Act

An illocutionary act represents the speaker's intent. It is the performance of an act. Illocutionary force is "the intended effect of a speech act, such as, a warning, a threat and a bet, e.g., the illocutionary force of *I resign!* Is the act of resignation?" (Fromkin, Rodman and Hyams, 581)

Cruse concurs:

An act performed by a speaker in saying something (with an appropriate intention and in an appropriate context), rather than by virtue of having produced a particular effect by saying something. For instance, if someone says *I order you to leave now* they have performed the act of ordering, simply by virtue of having uttered the words, whether or not the addressee acts in the desired way (168).

The Perlocutionary Act

This is the effect of the utterance on the listener. Perlocutionary act, according to Cruse is;

A speech act which depends on the production of a specific effect. For instance, for the verbal act of persuasion to have occurred, in Pete persuaded Liz to marry him, it is not enough for Pete to have uttered certain words – what is essential is that a previously reluctant addressee is caused to act in an appropriate way (168).

Perlocutionary acts seek to change minds. For instance, Amaka walks into an air-conditioned room, and says: could you open the window, Kosi (locutionary act). Her intent is to persuade Kosi to put off the air conditioner and open the windows (illocutionary force). If Kosi eventually opened the window, Amaka succeeded in persuading her (perlocutionary force).

Searle identified five illocutionary acts as: assertive, commissives, directives, expressive, and declaratives.

Assertives

Assertives describe states of affairs. They are used to confirm, affirm, believe and report. The speaker has to make sure that the statement is definitely true. Politicians make political truth claims using assertives. Examples:

- a) I am a woman.
- b) Africa is my continent.

Commissives

These have the effect of committing the speaker to some action in the future: *promise, undertake, offer, threaten* (Cruse 168). In commissives, the speaker is certainly committed to the course of action. Our politicians make use of commissives in making political promises. Examples:

- a) Every unemployed youth will receive a monthly stipend of five thousand naira, when I become the president.
- b) I shall build the second Niger Bridge, if you elect me as your governor.

Directives

These are aimed at getting someone to act in a certain way: *beg, implore, request, warn (to), recommend (to), and ask (to)* Cruse 168. The speaker works to get the hearer to take a certain course of action. Directives make political requests. Examples:

- a) Shut the door!
- b) Could you get me a cup of water?

Expressives

These express the speaker's feelings or attitude: *thank, congratulate, forgive* (Cruse 168).

Expressive are expressions of attitudes/feelings over a condition. Political apologies can be made using expressives. Blames can also be carried out. Examples:

- a) I am terribly sorry for your loss.
- b) Congratulations on the birth of your baby.

Declaratives

Declaratives “produce a change of some sort in the world: *resign, sack, appoint, name, christen, sentence (in court), bid (at auction)*” (Cruse 169). The speaker changes the status of a thing, a situation or a person. In political discourse, declaratives can be used to announce an election, proclaim a constitution or even declare a war against another country.

- a) You are fired.
- b) I name you Esther.

These speech acts can be identified by specific components of their illocutionary force. A speech act achieves its aim, if certain conditions are put in place, and certain criteria met. These conditions are called felicity conditions. Cruse posits, “For a particular illocutionary act to function normally, it is typically the case that certain contextual conditions need to be satisfied. These conditions are known as felicity conditions (Cruse 168).

Types of Felicity Conditions

- a) An essential condition: Here, the speaker believes that the addressees will act upon an utterance.

- b) A sincerity condition: A sincerity condition is when a speech act is being seriously performed.
- c) A preparatory condition: A speech act is being performed if the authority invested on the speaker and the circumstances of the speech act are in tandem. The power and status of a particular politician may persuade voters to vote for him/her. “In fact, the ‘positioning’ of the speaker as an authoritative narrator and messenger and as a decisive actor is crucial” (Chilton and Schaffner, 219).

A politician’s intent, purpose and actions can be unmasked using the felicity conditions. This can be achieved through the linguistic structure of the speaker’s sentences. “In the context of political discourse, felicity conditions are of interest because they provide a rubric under which to investigate what it is that constitutes such phenomena as ‘credibility’, ‘persuasion’, and the like (Chilton and Schaffner, 11).

Apart from these felicity conditions, the credibility of politicians’ speeches, and their intents and purposes can also be checkmated using the Cooperative Principle as proposed by Paul Grice.

It is assumed that human beings are cooperative in their talk exchange. Grice proposed certain rules of conversation termed Cooperative principle.

3.2 Research Methodology

3.2.1 Research Design

This study employs qualitative method to analyse and classify data in order to find out the distinctive linguistic features of their speeches.

It is a qualitative research as it concerns the analysis of data with reference to selected speeches or utterances. The selected speeches vary in length and number of utterances.

3.2.2 Population of the Study

Six political speeches by Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu will be sampled for this study.

They are:

- I am Prepared to Die, 20 April 1964 – Nelson Mandela
- Nelson Mandela’s Address at a Rally in Cape Town on his Release from Prison, 11 February 1990
- Nelson Mandela’s Address to the People of Cape Town, Grand Parade, on the Occasion of his Inauguration as State President, 10 May 1994
- Nnamdi Kanu’s Speech at 2015 World Igbo Convention in Los Angeles
- Nnamdi Kanu’s Speech at Boys’ Technical College, Aba, 27 August 2017
- Nnamdi Kanu’s Latest Speech in Ohafia, Abia State, 7 September 2017

These political speeches were deliberately chosen, because they contain instances of rhetorical devices and hate language. They are speeches from African political activists/president. Three speeches will be chosen out of many political speeches made by Nelson Mandela (South Africa), and the three from Nnamdi Kanu (Nigeria). The speeches from Nelson Mandela span between 1964 and 1994, while Nnamdi Kanu’s speeches were made between 2015 and 2017. This strikes a balance between the old and the new.

3.2.3 Method of Data Collection

The researcher makes use of documented speeches of Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu especially those that concerns politics. These speeches are harnessed from internet. The researches exploited this medium for accuracy and to meet global standard.

3.2.4 Method of Data Analysis

This research employs textual analysis in line with its theoretical framework. Analysis of data is carried out using the analytical framework associated with the persuasion theory and the Critical Discourse Analysis. At the end of the analysis the research questions would help provide the solution to the problem of the research.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter examines six political speeches of two political activists – Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu. Critical discourse analysis investigates certain structures and strategies in political texts and talks. It highlights forms of persuasion in discourse using rhetorical devices.

The researcher also makes use of the persuasive theory to analyse the teachings of these two great activists and see how far their speeches are able to provoke some actions in their audience through the use of rhetorical devices. The task of the analyst is to examine these speeches indicating their rhetorical devices and using persuasion and critical discourse analysis to do a textual analysis of these speeches. The researcher employs these rhetorical devices just to bring nearest, the picture of what they have in mind, to their audience, for clearer understanding.

4.1 Research Question One

How far did these politicians employ rhetorical devices in their political speeches?

Politicians always strive to persuade their audience. One of the prerequisites of a good speech is the employment of proper rhetorical devices to foreground their speeches and therefore, capture their target audience. Political speeches can be intentionally or unconsciously filled with rhetorical devices. The speaker's aim is usually to persuade the audience.

Analysis of Selected Speeches

Metaphor

- a. We note with pride that you are the conscience of white South Africa (Mandela, 228).

- b. You, the young lions have energized our entire struggle (Mandela, 239).
- c. I pay tribute to the endless heroism of youth; you, the young lions (Mandela, 236).
- d. IPOB military intelligence evacuated me from my compound when the army of the Zoo attacked me (Kanu, 83).
- e. The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me (Kanu, 99).
- f. On the 14th of September, 2017, the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me (Kanu, 96).
- g. Nigerian court is a Kangaroo court (Kanu, 102).
- h. We are going to crumble the Zoo; Nigeria is a Zoo (Kanu, 21).
- i. The names of those who were incarcerated on Robben Island is a roll call of resistance fighters' and democrats spanning over three centuries (Mandela, 316).

Metaphor makes a direct comparison of an object or person in a way that is different from its literary sense. In metaphorical expressions, reference is made to something while referring to something else that has a semblance of that thing. Metaphors make implicit comparisons of two things that have same characteristics. The underlined phrases in the above sentences points to these comparisons.

Mandela goes on to persuade and motivate the youths using so many metaphorical statements. The reference “You acted the conscience of white South Africa” depicts a graphic address to a black renegade against his own black course, perhaps for personal myopic selfishness. He gives power back to the youth by describing them as ‘young lions’ and the conscience of South Africa. He uses metaphor to shape their beliefs, value, behaviour and attitudes and this depicts persuasion. Metaphor influences our beliefs, attitudes and values because it uses language to

activate unconscious emotional associations and it influences the value that we place on ideas and beliefs on a scale of goodness and badness.

Kanu emphasises his non-allegiance (hatred for Nigeria) to Nigeria using metaphoric statements. He refers to Nigerian courts as kangaroo courts. He equally refers to the Nigerian soldiers that came to capture him as terrorists and compares Nigeria to a zoo. He adopts these rhetorical devices to shape and alter people's beliefs, attitudes and behaviour towards Nigeria. He persuades them to discard their positive opinions about Nigeria.

'The army of the zoo' attacking Kanu and the 'terrorists of the zoo' who came to kill Kanu on the 14th of September, 2017 depicts Kanu displaying his inequality and bias against Nigeria.

From his speeches, one can clearly observe these features of CDA depicting inequality and power abuse.

Anadiplosis

- a) It requires us all to work together to bring an end to division. An end to suspicion and build a nation, united in our diversity (Mandela, 339).
- b) They want change! And change is what they will get (Mandela, 341-342).
- c) That day, heaven authenticated our mandate. That our mandate to the children of this very earth that IPOB must restore Biafra (Kanu, 4).
- d) Some idiots who are not educated enough said that they are going to arrest me, and I ask them to come. Come, I am in Biafraland (Kanu, 11).
- e) I pay tribute to the endless heroism of youth; you, the young lions. You, the young lions, have energized our entire struggle (Mandela, 236).

Anadiplosis is a rhetorical device in which the last word of a clause or sentence starts the next clause or sentence. Anadiplosis is a form of repetition. The underlined expressions show the anadiplosis in these speeches.

In the first speech, under anadiplosis, Mandela emphasises or explains to his people that political division based on colour is entirely unacceptable especially as it gives rise to the domination of one colour group to another. He stressed that they must unite and fight or put an end to all forms of division and suspicion. He went further to stress that they should work together to build a nation, united in our diversity. He informs the audience that the group fights with boldness is needed in order to bring about institution of democracy in their country. He gives the impression that democracy can only be achieved through collective efforts and responsibility. The use of the deictic pronoun 'our' is to strengthen the sense of identifying with the people in order to demonstrate his love and concern for them. The speech influences the people to change their attitudes, beliefs, behaviours, values and mindset towards the white.

Mandela went further to say in the next speech that Africans want change. The speaker implicitly makes a request from the government. He emphasizes that his people, the South Africans, desire change. The use of the verb "want" further intensifies the request for the change. South Africans want change in all its ramifications. They want to be part of general population and not confined to living in their ghettos. They want to be paid a living wage. They want to own lands in places where they work. All these point to dominance, inequality and bias as stipulated by CDA. Using manipulation and domination as tools of influence and persuasion is considered social power abuse.

Kanu, in his speech, repeatedly said, '...heaven authenticated our mandate', employing the powerful effect of repetition embedded in anadiplosis to achieve certain persuasive goals. He inspires the people by stating the originality of the struggle for Biafra by saying that heaven

authenticated their mandate to restore Biafra through IPOB. He persuades the people by showing an emotional attachment to the struggle for the sovereign state of Biafra. Kanu tenaciously holds on to the belief that they are being marginalized.

These speeches touch on the emotion of the audience, and both CDA and persuasion is highly reflected. Kanu sees Buhari as an uneducated man who has nothing to offer to Nigerians and who keeps making things very difficult for Biafrans.

Nelson Mandela, in his last speech, says “I pay tribute to the endless heroism of youth, you, young lions ...” The repetitive use of “you” in the construct above really authenticated his doggedness for the fight for freedom. He likened the youths in South Africa to lions. He gives power back to the youth. He shapes their attitude and belief as he needed them to see themselves differently.

Simile

- a. When we look out across Table Bay, the horizon is dominated by Robben Island, whose infamy as a dungeon built to stifle the spirit of freedom is as old as colonialism in South Africa (Mandela 316).
- b. Africans want to be allowed out after eleven o’ clock at night and not to be confined to their rooms like little children (Mandela, 187).
- c. Over 100 years, Biafrans have endured the unholy marriage known as amalgamation since creation of Nigeria by the British Colonial Masters (Kanu 56).

Simile is a part of speech that explicitly compares two distinct things by employing two connecting words; like and as, in the above speeches, the simile is underlined in each one.

Mandela compares Robben Island as a dungeon that stifles the spirit of freedom to the age long colonialism in South Africa. This creates a visual effect of the situation at Robben Island in the minds of people thereby creating an emotional effect on them. His speeches motivate the audience and shape their attitude, belief, value and behaviour towards the white. He reflected on how he was confined to a small cell with hard labour at the brutal Robben Island Prison, it was the dungeon built to stifle the spirit of freedom. It was in this prison that he made his most famous speech... "It is an ideal for which I am prepared to die". This very speech evokes sympathy, pathos. Which is associated to persuasion theory used in the analysis?

Mandela went on to lament that Africans want to be allowed out after Eleven O' clock like the whites, Africans should not be confined to their rooms like little children. It shows inequality, ill treatment, discrimination against the black people. From the speeches of this activist one can clearly observe these features of CDA depicting inequality dominance and power abuse.

Nnamdi Kanu in the last extract compares the marriage of Biafrans to Nigeria as unholy. He stressed that over hundred years that Biafrans have been enduring that marriage to no avail. Forcing other parts of Nigeria to stay or live with Biafra is not functional as we are "NEVER" one. Every right thinking human being knows that the slogan "One Nigeria" is a ruse. Biafra is the holy one word distinct and internationally accepted republican value system. The amalgamation of Biafra and Nigeria was done by the British for their own selfish interest. These speeches go on to persuade the Igbos to join and support IPOB in their struggle for the restoration of Biafra.

Van Dijk maintains that, "Critical discourse analysis primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts" (24). From the speeches of those activists, one can clearly observe these features of CDA depicting inequality, dominance and power abuse as seen in those speeches.

Anaphora

- a) **I** do not, however, deny that **I** planned sabotage. **I** did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness, nor because **I** have any love for violence. **I** planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation, and oppression of my people by the Whites (Mandela 11-13).
- b) **I** deny that Umkhonto was responsible for a number of acts which clearly fell outside the policy of the organisation, and which have been charged in the indictment against us. **I** do not know what justification there was for these acts, but to demonstrate that they could not have been authorized by Umkhonto, **I** want to refer briefly to the roots and policy of the organisation (Mandela, 21-22).
- c) **I** have fought against white domination and **I** have fought against black domination. **I** have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which **I** hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which **I** am prepared to die (Mandela, (202-205).
- d) **I** greet you all in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all. **I** stand here before you not as a prophet but as a humble servant of you, the people (Mandela, 207).
- e) Before **I** go any further, **I** wish to make the point that **I** intend making only a few preliminary comments at this stage. **I** will make a more complete statement only after **I** have had the opportunity to consult with my comrades (246-247).
- f) **I** am a loyal and disciplined member of the African National Congress. **I** am therefore in full agreement with all of its objectives, strategies and tactics (259).

Anaphora is the rhetorical device of repeating a word or phrase in the beginning of several successive verses, clauses or sentences. The highlighted words show anaphora in the sentences.

From these speeches, “I” is anaphoric as it occurs at the beginning of each sentence. The speaker tries to present himself properly by the use of the deictic pronoun ‘I’ through which he describes himself as a good politician with a personal quality and one with a bachelor’s degree. Mandela artistically makes a repetition of the first person pronoun ‘I’ for emphatic purpose. Persuasively, these speeches deal with messages directed at surreptitiously changing the attitudes and mindset of listeners. Little wonder Burgoon, Hunsaker and Dawson define persuasion as “a conscious symbolic act intended to form, modify or strengthen the beliefs, opinions, values, attitudes and behaviour of another or ourselves” (177). Also, in analysing these speeches, critical discourse analysis is seriously reflected in that social inequality that is asymmetrical power relations is seen as Nelson Mandela lamented over sober assessments of the political situations that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation and oppression of his people by the whites. Tyranny, exploitation and oppression truly reflect social power abuse, dominance and inequality as shown by CDA. The speaker said he has no love for violence but he could not help himself other than trying to speak out what he feels will emotionally touch the whites. In all these speeches, Mandela informs the audience that he alone is responsible for what happened. The audience emotionally felt for him as these depict persuasion and CDA. ‘I’ depicts the speaker as being a good politician who is responsible for his actions. He took the action both as a leader of his people and as a person because of his personal experience in South Africa.

From the speeches of Nnamdi Kanu, he tries to represent himself properly by the use of the pronoun “I”, through which he describes himself as a good politician with a personal quality and one responsible for his actions. He uses his political talk to achieve dominance over his audience through social cognition. He equally uses his speeches to gain solidarity from his audience. His actions depict CDA as powerful speakers self-servingly control the minds of others in a way that is in the interest of the powerful. Kanu is seen as the supreme leader, so he exercises and reinforces that social power relation by influencing the people through hate speech. On a surface

level, Kanu's political discourse is persuasive in nature but his nature of persuasion stems from manipulation and domination. "Manipulation can equally be a form of (legitimate) persuasion" (Kamalu and Agangau, 38).

Finally, Nelson Mandela concludes by informing his people that they are now towards the latest movement for the freedom of South Africa. He is being inaugurated as president, which of course means that South Africa has indeed come into a new age. The use of "we" implies himself and the whole people of South Africa and also, the deictic pronoun "our" suggests that South Africa is their own. Mandela states that they are not rejoicing over a party conquest but for the whole of South Africa as a country. The speeches of Mandela persuasively influence his audience beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviour.

Rhetorical Questions

- a) What have been the fruits of moderation? (Mandela, 41).
- b) What were we, the leaders of our people, to do? Were we to give in to the show of force and the implied threat against future action, or were we to fight it and, if so, how? (Mandela, 87-88).
- c) Are we doing restructuring of Nigeria now? Are we doing Fiscal Federalism? Are we doing devolution? (Kanu, 16-18)
- d) After all, is it not why today we found ourselves in far flung lands like the USA and many more countries around the world? (45).

This is a rhetorical device mostly used in persuasive discourse. It poses questions they have no intention of answering. The questions are asked for effect; therefore, answers are not expected. Rhetorical questions achieve an emphasis stronger than a direct statement.

Nelson Mandela asked this question, “What have been the fruits of moderation?” not to evoke an actual reply but to achieve an emphasis as the audience knew that the whites are not being fair in their treatment of the blacks. It reflects restructuring in Nigeria, which has always been on the lips of our politicians, but when is the restructuring going to take place. This speech creates an emotional effect on the audience and shows Mandela’s attachment to the struggle and plight of the people.

In Mandela’s second speech, “What were we, the leaders of our people, to do? Were we... ..we were to fight it and, if so...? (Mandela, 87-88). Here, Mandela asks this pathetic question to arouse the emotion of his audience, they are helpless in the hands of the white, how will his people be free borders him so much as he fears threats but were they to fight it out, and if so, how will they fight the whites. As Mandela ponders on these questions, he emotionally changes his audience attitude, mindsets and beliefs towards the white. This speech depicts persuasion as well as CDA as it reflects power and inequality.

Kanu, in the next speech, asks, “Some people talk about restructuring; are we doing restructuring in Nigeria? Are we doing true federalism?” Kanu persuades his audience and makes them realize the minds of Nigerian people towards the Biafrans. He achieves discursive control over them by pillorying and casting aspersions on Nigerian(s).

In Kanu’s last speech, he makes a contrast between Biafra and Nigeria. The contrast helps Kanu achieve discursive control. After all, why are we then resident in America if things were working in Nigeria? He went further to prove to the audience that their moving to foreign lands is not their desire but just for them to find sources of livelihood, as the country they called their own cannot give them jobs or protect them as her citizens.

Hypophora

- a. What is Nnamdi Kanu doing here at the congress of all Igbo worldwide talking about the global effort to restore Biafra? My answer as always is a very simple one, “Izu ka nma na nneji” (Kanu, 35 – 36)
- b. But who are actually the Biafrans or put in another way; what is the footprint of Biafraland? Biafraland consists of the states in the present South East and South – South with the exception of Edo State but including Igbanke in Edo state, Biafraland also include Igala in Kogi state and Idoma in Benue State (Kanu, 52 - 54)
- c. But what has IPOB/RBL really achieved, you may ask? Through the works of IPOB/RBL within the past three years, we have achieved the following ... (Kanu, 67)

“It is the technique of asking a question than proceeding to answer it” (McGuigan 26). It is a rhetorical strategy in which the speaker poses a question to his/her audience but she/he proceeds to answer the question.

These speeches are in form of questions expected to yield answers by another person but the speaker went on to answer his questions so as to give these questions the right answers in a way to arouse the emotions of his audience. He persuades them into joining in the struggle for Biafra. He vehemently shows his struggle to restore Biafra. He stirs the spirit of brotherhood in the hearers. His speeches always geared towards marginalisation. “Izu ka nnma na nneoji”. He extensively influences his followers to change their beliefs, attitudes and behaviours towards the entire Nigeria land.

Alliteration

- a. “Your mass marches and other forms of struggle have served as a constant source of ...”

- b. In other places in this very town, people were campaigning and protesting for my release. In this very republic people were slaughtered to death.

Alliterations are identified by the repetition of same consonant sounds at the beginning of a sentence or phrase. Alliteration creates rhythmic effect. These consonant sounds are underlined for easy identification.

The repetition of these consonant sounds /s/, /p/, /t/, creates a rhythmic effect which attracts the attention of the audience.

The rhythmic pattern of these sound arouse the emotions of the people of South Africans. In the phrase above, Mandela means to say that the way the people move gives the political parties the strength to forge ahead. In this speech, Mandela evokes the spirit of his audience emotionally, showing the light to the direction they are heading.

Also, in Nnamdi Kanu's second speech, the repetition of those consonant sounds are rhythmic in nature, and this constantly reminded the Biafrans of the battle Kanu is fighting. The protests attracted lots of killings, most notably the Operation Python Dance. A lot of people vehemently protested for his release as he paid tribute to fellow Biafrans that were murdered by security agencies at the National High School. The killings must have ignited fear in the heart of Kanu's fellow compatriots, so he gave this speech to persuade them that their struggle for independence is actually a divine mandate from *Chukwu Okike Abiama*. Kanu gave them due courage that, though a lot of people have been killed, but this will not stop them from continuing in the fight to restore Biafra. Nnamdi Kanu is seen as a supreme leader, so he exercises and reinforces that social power relation by influencing the people's social beliefs and values, in line with Van Dijk's school of critical discourse analysis.

Repetition

- a) “I have fought against white domination and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society...”
- b) “I don’t care what they say in Abuja. I don’t care what they say in Lagos.” (Kanu, 8-9).

Repetition is a rhetorical device in which same word is often repeated in a clause, phrase or sentences for emphasis. The repeated word is underlined for easy identification.

The above is an evocative and emotional laden speech that has the efficacy and potency to sway any right thinking individual into an awakening for a progressive union that will save the black oppressed from the doldrums of perpetual subjugation. This undoubtedly is an incisive example, conveniently situated both in discourse analysis and persuasion theories.

Firstly, Mandela expressively clarifies the vision and purpose of his struggle and subsequently became emotional. Thus, the people get swayed by the persuasive power in the emotion-laden speech and rise for actions. Mandela sees the struggle as an ideal that he hopes to live for and achieve, even if it may require his life. He is ready to sacrifice himself as a martyr.

The expression above is a clear opposition of Mandela’s daunting position in his fight towards the emancipation of humanity (in this case, South Africans) from the pangs of imperial oppression and subjugation over the years. This oppression is borne out of the apartheid policy of the South African government that deliberately dislocates and decimates the black populace who own the land but have been made, in Ngugi’s words, ‘Muthoi’ – meaning strangers and tenants. Mandela’s fight for the freedom of the black South Africans is not against the white domination alone but also against their black cohorts who have found favour from the imperialists and thus, joins the oppressors to fight their people’s good course for freedom from domination and deprivation. Mandela avers that he cherishes the ideal for democracy and

ultimately, a free society, where all humans will live together in an accord with one another and enjoy equal opportunities.

In the second speech, “Today, we celebrate not the victory of a party...” Mandela makes a statement of fact. He emphasized that they are not rejoicing over a party conquest but the whole of South Africa as a country. The use of the pronouns ‘we’ is to enhance their institutional identity. All these speeches of Mandela are very emotional and they further motivate and persuade the audience.

Kanu employs the powerful effect of repetition in most of his speeches for emphasis and to show how bitter he is. He uses this rhetorical strategy to focus the mindset of his audience and to change their belief, value and attitude with what the secessionist group stands for.

Chiasmus

- a) “Today, we celebrate not the victory of a party but a victory for all the people of South Africa.” (Mandela, 306)
- b) “As our people rest in the grave, we’re not going to rest until Biafra is restored.” (Kanu, 7)

Chiasmus is a type of antithesis. It is a rhetorical device in which the second part of a sentence is pitched against the first part. The parts are usually reversed to have a play on words.

Mandela, in the first speech above, uses the pronoun ‘we’ to emphasis to his people that the victory is not just for the blacks alone, or for him, Mandela. He points to the audience that the victory is for everybody, both black and white. He motivated his audience to know his kind of person.

In the second speech above, Kanu appeals to the emotions of the audience that IPOB will not rest until Biafra becomes a reality. He reminds them that, though, a lot of people have been killed for

the sake of Biafra, but that will not make the IPOB to be discouraged, rather this should spur them the more to fight for the realisation of Biafran restoration. Kanu, in all his speeches, motivates the IPOB to continue fighting for the secession from Nigeria through the content of his messages.

Antithesis

a) “I stand here, before you, not as a prophet but as a humble servant to you, the people.”

(Mandela, 210)

Antithesis is a figure of speech in which style built upon contraries, using contrary in successive clauses. Mandela, in this speech, humbled himself. In this antithetical postulation, the speaker observes that he is not a “prophet” – a servant of God, with the capacity to decipher tomorrow but rather a mere mortal ‘servant’.

Hyperbole

a) On the 14th of September, 2017, the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me. They knew if I go to court, Nigeria will burn, and I was forced to leave. (Kanu, 96-97).

b) That Nigeria is perpetually in the doldrums politically, economically and socially is of no surprise to any discerning mind and keen follower of the miserable history of Nigeria. (Kanu, 44).

c) Thirty-nine Africans died in their disturbances. (Mandela, 98)

Hyperbole represents extreme exaggeration. It is used to create emphasis and create a mental picture in the audience’s mind. It evokes emotions. Hyperbole is a powerful rhetorical weapon, when used properly.

Kanu, in the first speech, employs hyperbole to bring the picture of what he has in mind to his audience. He really exaggerated that Nigeria will burn if he goes to Nigerian court. He says so just to change the attitudes and beliefs of the people at the convention concerning Nigeria. He uses this rhetorical device to emotionally manipulate the audience to share in his belief.

In the second speech, Kanu emphasises that “Nigeria is perpetually in doldrums politically...” In this speech, he really proves to his audience that the country called Nigeria is nothing to write home about in all its ramifications. He uses this rhetorical device to emotionally manipulate and persuade the audience to join in his struggle for freedom of Biafra from Nigeria. This speech reflects persuasion, as well as CDA. He uses this rhetorical device to foreground the minds of the people on the shared beliefs, values and motives of the group.

In the third speech, Mandela created a gory scene in the minds of his audience by inflating the number of deaths in a particular event that led to the death of a few black South Africans. He uses hyperbole to force the audience into coming to the understanding of his fight against apartheid.

Allusion

- a) “It was to this peninsula that the patriots, among them many princes and scholars of Indonesia, were dragged in chains. It was on the study plains of this peninsula that the first battles of epic wars of resistance were fought.” (Mandela 314-315)
- b) “They thought we are joking around. God gave us a simple message, and that message we must deliver. No one can stop us. That message is that the movement to restore Biafra is unstoppable.” (Kanu, 22-23)

Allusion is a device that makes implicit reference to a place, a person or an event. It helps to widen the reader's understanding. Although, allusions are usually laconic, they are loaded with pieces of information.

Nelson Mandela uses allusion to bring to the minds of his audience the kind of maltreatment they suffered; his people were dragged in chains. He uses it to create an emotional effect on the audience. This shows his emotional attachment to the struggle. This actually depicts persuasion theory, as well as a clear reflection of critical discourse analysis. He uses allusion to tell his people that they are starting on a clean slate.

Generally, all the speeches that have been analyzed in this research pose a question, "How far did these activists/politicians employ rhetorical devices in their political speeches?" One can clearly observe that a lot of rhetorical devices are employed in the speeches made by the two activists – Nelson Mandela and Nnamdi Kanu. They gave several speeches which are geared towards persuading, motivating and influencing people to join in their political struggles.

Again, from the speeches of these two great activists, features of CDA depicting inequality, dominance and power abuse are also seen in their speeches. All these rhetorical devices are geared towards a change in the beliefs, motives attitudes and behaviours of the target audience.

4.2 Research Question Two

To what extent do rhetorical devices in political speeches persuade and manipulate the audience to support politicians and their ideologies?

Persuasion theory focuses on the mental state of a person to bring about change whether positive or negative. The focus is usually on the audience and the content of the message while CDA also

uses rhetorical devices that persuade and manipulate the audience to support the politician's ideologies.

According to Charteris-Black,

Within all types of political system, from autocratic, through oligarchic to democratic; leaders have relied on the spoken word to convince others of the benefits that arise from their leadership--- The argument that I will develop is that the most important type of behaviour by which leaders mobilise their followers is their linguistic performance. In democratic frameworks it is primarily through language that leaders legitimise their leadership.” (1)

Although language is a viable persuasive device, it is not inherently persuasive. It employs certain rhetorical devices in order to become persuasive.

Charteris-Black concurs:

Rhetorical is the art of persuading others; therefore, rhetorical and persuasion are inseparable since any definition of rhetorical necessarily includes the idea of persuasion. The essential difference between the two is that Rhetorical Persuasion, Legitimacy and Leadership refers to the act of communication from the hearer's perspective while persuasion refers to both the speakers' intentions and successful outcomes. Hearers are only persuaded when the speaker's rhetorical is successful. In classical antiquity the definition of rhetorical was *ars bene dicendi*, the art of speaking well in public (Nash 1989). As Sauer (1997) notes, this definition requires a *comparative* judgement because it assumes that some people speak better than others do – this is evident from speech events such as debating competitions and parliamentary debates. The most rhetorically

successful speech performance is the most persuasive one as measured by followers' responses. Rhetorical may therefore fail if it is not persuasive (Charteris-Black, 9)

Politicians are very much aware of the power of rhetorical devices, so they tend to fully exploit that power in their speeches. The aim is usually to persuade; to change the minds of the populace and get them to think in a certain way. Charteris-Black maintains that:

Persuasion is an interactive communicative process in which a message sender aims to influence the beliefs, attitudes and behaviour of the message receiver (cf. Jowett and O'Donnell 1992: 21–6). It is important to distinguish the two roles in the communication process. In persuasion the active role of the sender is characterised by deliberate intentions: persuasion does not occur by chance but because of the sender's purposes (9).

Aside inundating the listeners with rhetorical devices in his/her speech, a speaker's persona/character also comes into play in persuasion.

Repetition

a) *During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die (Mandela, 201-205).*

Mandela was a political activist, and he garnered international recognition due to his activism. He was captured in 1962 for inciting workers' strike and travelling out of the country without permission. Mandela delivered "I am prepared to Die" -in 1964- on the day of his trial at

Rivonia. Mandela's trial came at a time when apartheid was still rife in South Africa. At the time, Mandela was not so loved because he was against apartheid and tackled racism.

Mandela generously turned his plea into a political speech which he graciously laced with rhetorical devices. He was arraigned in a white man's court, so he sought communicative strategies that will enable him to get freed. The last paragraph of the speech is beautified with anaphora. He used it to emphasize how far he is willing to go for the liberation of both whites and blacks in South Africa. It also created an emotional effect on the hearers, because Mandela used this rhetorical device to show the length of his involvement in the struggle for equality in the country.

At the end of this three-hour political speech cum trial, Mandela was sentenced to life imprisonment. He was to get the death sentence but for the fact that his case had attracted the attention of international media. This means that he failed to persuade the judge in charge of his case. But he successfully persuaded the people; the blacks to change their beliefs and attitude towards apartheid and racism. Mandela's credibility and reputation as a freedom fighter also contributed to the efficacy of the content of his speech. Awol says,

The Rivonia Trial is a momentous legal event rightly recognized as 'the trial that changed South Africa'. One of the most momentous legal events of the twentieth century, the historical significance of the Rivonia Trial is recognized by UNESCO's Memory of the World Register.

Mandela saw the trial as a transformative opportunity that offered him visibility and a hearing, a space from which to spread stories of such significance and consequence that eventually they would change South Africa.

The root of the love and respect the people of South Africa have for Mandela can be traced to his speech at this trial. Mandela stood for a democratic and free nation; not minding whose ox was gored. His aim might not have been to persuade the judge or jury, but to persuade the people. If the latter was the case, then, he was able to persuade the people (audience) to align with his political ideologies.

Metaphor

- a) We note with pride that you have acted the conscience of white South Africa (Mandela, 228).
- b) You the young lions have energized our entire struggle. (Mandela, 237).

Here the reference “You” referring to South African students and seeing them as lions depicts a graphic address to black renegade against his own black course perhaps for personal myopic selfishness.

- c) The names of those who were incarcerated on Robben Island is a roll call of resistance fighters and democrats (Mandela, 316).

Mandela delivered this speech on the day he was inaugurated as the president of South Africa. He just became the first democratically - elected president. Mandela did not have much persuading to do, because he already won the election and his inauguration marked the end of apartheid in South Africa. Notwithstanding, knowing full well that the blacks and whites were sworn enemies, he says: “Today we celebrate not the victory of a party, but a victory for all the people of South Africa” (306). Mandela persuades everybody to embrace unity, reconciliation and togetherness; this is why his speech is filled with ‘we’ and ‘our’.

Seeing that Mandela was able to avert reprisal attacks, a civil war and end apartheid, he was able to persuade South Africans to embrace togetherness and not separation; stealthily. He did not have to put them under duress in order to achieve his aim.

- d) Nigerian court is a Kangaroo court. (Kanu, 102).
- e) IPOB Military intelligence evacuated me from my compound when the Army of the Zoo attacked me (Kanu, 83).
- f) The Army of the zoo killed my dog, Jack, and few other people in my compound (Kanu, 91).
- g) On the 14th of September 2017, the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me. (Kanu,96)
- h) The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me (Kanu, 99).

Antithesis

- a) I stand here before you not as a prophet but as a humble servant of you, the people (Mandela, 208).

The speaker observes that he is not a “prophet” a servant of God with the capacity to decipher tomorrow but rather a mere mortal-“servant” of the people with burden to cause emancipation

Anaphora

- a) I greet you all in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all. I stand here before you not as a prophet but as a humble servant of you, the people (Mandela, 207-208).
- b) We call on our people to seize this moment so that the progress towards democracy is rapid and uninterrupted. We have waited too long for our freedom. We can no longer wait (Mandela, 282-284).
- c) We started in Aba. We declared in 2015. We were at CKC in 2015 (Kanu, 13-14).
- d) Tell Buhari this is what I said. Tell Buhari that I am in Aba (Kanu, 13-14).
- e) I promised that I will be coming to Biafra and I came; I do not recognise the court of the zoo. I want the people of the Middle Belt to rise and join IPOB. (Kanu, 80-82)
- f) I want to send my solidarity to Governor Ayo Fayose and assure him that Biafra will stand by him in his hour of need; we will have a special place for him in Biafra. I thank all my sureties that stood by me, my unavailability was forced on me. (Kanu, 88-90).

- g) I am not a Nigerian. I already renounced Nigeria in 2015. I am a Biafran with British Nationality. I cannot be tried by a court I do not recognise. I do not recognise Nigeria. I can only come to the court with UN supervision (Kanu, 105-109).
- h) It was to this peninsula that the patriots, among them many princes and scholars, of Indonesia were dragged in chains. It was on the sandy plains of this peninsula that first battles of the epic wars of resistance were fought (Mandela, 312).

Anadiplosis

- a) I pay tribute to the endless heroism of youth, you, the young lions. You, the young lions, have energised our entire struggle (Mandela, 236-237).

Mandela delivered this speech at the Grand Parade on the 11th day of February in 1990. He just got out of the Victor Vester prison after twenty-seven years of incarceration. Mandela was incarcerated for daring to stand against apartheid. He delivered this speech to assure the people that his stance against apartheid had not changed, and that he is proposing a democratic and free society.

Mandela begins his speech by addressing the people as friends and comrades; he says: “Amandla! Amandla! i-Afrika, mayibuye!” (Translation: Power! Power! Africa it is ours!). My friends, comrades and fellow South Africans, I greet you all in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all (206). He is implicitly promising them a government that will not be biased by the colour of anyone’s skin; a government of inclusion. The purpose of Mandela’s speech was, first, to thank the people for their unalloyed support throughout his incarceration, and for believing that he could eradicate apartheid and deliver a free and democratic society.

Mandela’s case, at the time, had garnered international recognition. He, knowing full well that the fight might be too much for himself and ANC, used this speech as an avenue to surreptitiously induce a change in the belief, attitude and behaviour of the global audience -who

joined the audience via radio and television - to join them in the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. Mandela got a Nobel Peace Prize three years after (1993) he delivered this speech, and equally became the President of South Africa a year later (1994). When Mandela became the President of South Africa in 1994, apartheid was totally eradicated. It is safe to say that when Mandela regained his freedom, he persuaded the people (local and global audience) to join in the march against apartheid. And he succeeded, because the people supported his idea of a democratic and free society. In 1994, apartheid was successfully eradicated. Without infringing on their free will to choose, Mandela successfully got them to endorse his ideologies.

- a) It requires us all to work together to bring an end to division, an end to suspicion and build a nation united in our diversity (339).
- b) The South Africa we have struggled for, in which all our people, be they Africa, Coloured, Indian or White, regard themselves as citizens of one nation is at hand (308).
- c) We have fought for a democratic constitution since the 1880s (318).
- d) Ours has been a quest for a constitution freely adopted by the people of South Africa, reflecting their wishes and aspirations (319).
- e) The struggle for democracy has never been a matter pursued by one race, class, religious community or gender among South Africans (320).

Chiasmus

- a) Today we celebrate not the victory of a party, but a victory for all the people of South Africa (306)
- b) Because today they rest in the grave, we are not going to rest until Biafra is restored (7).

Alliteration

- a) In other places in this very town, people were campaigning and protesting for my release, in this very republic people were slaughtered to death.

Hypophora

- a) What is Nnamdi Kanu doing here at the congress of all Igbo worldwide talking about the global effort to restore Biafra? My answer as always is a very simple one, “izu ka mma na nne ji” (Kanu, 35-36).
- b) But who are actually the Biafrans or put in another way; what is the footprint of Biafraland? Biafraland consists of the states in the present South East and South-South with the exception of Edo State but including Igbanke in Edo State. Biafraland also include Igala in Kogi State and Idoma in Benue State. (Kanu, 52-53).
- c) But what has IPOB/RBL really achieved, you may ask? Through the works of IPOB/RBL within the past three years, we have achieved the following: ---. (Kanu,67-68)

Rhetorical Question

- a) Are we restructuring? Are we doing Fiscal Federalism? Are we doing devolution? (Kanu, 16-17).

Nnamdi Kanu, the leader of IPOB (Indigenous People of Biafra) was granted bail on the 25th of April, having served eighteen months in DSS custody. He delivered this speech at Boys' Technical College, Aba in August, 2017 while paying tribute to fellow Biafrans that were murdered by security agencies at National High School. The killings must have ignited fear in the heart of Kanu's fellow compatriots, so he gave this speech to persuade them that their struggle for the independent people of Biafra is actually a divine mandate from Chukwu Okike Abiama. That though people have been killed, they will not rest until Biafra is restored.

Kanu persuades his audience to boycott the then upcoming gubernatorial election in Anambra State. “After Anambra 2017, in 2019, there’ll be no elections in Biafra land. Signed and sealed” (29-30). He equally persuades and manipulates his physical and virtual audience into aligning with his political ideology, that is, the restoration of Biafra by IPOB.

According to Ogbonna:

IPOB who claimed there is no election going on in the state because the “polling booths and streets are totally deserted” also thanked the people of Anambra state for hearkening to its call for boycott. A statement by its spokesman, Emma Powerful, said the governorship election in the state witnessed a low turnout because the people heeded its warning. According to the statement, “IPOB wants to use this opportunity to congratulate Biafrans particularly the people of Anambra State for obeying the order of IPOB and our leader Mazi Nnamdi who has been abducted since 14th September, 2017 in today’s election. “The people of Anambra State have shown the whole world that they are the first sons of Biafraland and no doubt about that, there is no election in Anambra State, everywhere is empty both the polling booths and streets are totally deserted. “We want to tell the whole world that IPOB under the leadership of Mazi Nnamdi Kanu gave the order on Anambra State governorship election to prove to the civilised nations that we are no more interested in the system of government and her political strategies. The international community and other civilised nations should come for rescue of Biafrans in the Nigerian Islamic government”.

INEC also corroborated the report. It was reported that only twenty percent of registered voters took part in the election. Owoseye reports:

Less than a quarter of the total number of registered voters actually participated in the Anambra governorship election on Saturday. According to the Returning Officer of the election, Zana Akpagu, a total of 2,064,134 residents registered as eligible voters for the election with the Independent National Electoral Commission, INEC. Of this number, only 457, 511, about 22.16 per cent, actually came out on Election Day to be accredited. Regardless, not all the 457,511 accredited people actually cast their vote. The INEC figure shows that only 21.74 per cent of the registered voters (448,771) actually cast their votes. For example, Idemili North local Government Area which has the highest number of registered voters, 178,938, had only 25,254 (14.11 per cent) being accredited. Already, the Independent People of Biafra, IPOB, has claimed credit for the low voter turnout across the state. The secessionist group in a statement on Saturday said Anambra residents listened to his demand that they boycott the polls (par.1 web).

From these reports, the IPOB leader, Nnamdi Kanu, was able to persuade the people in his speech through certain communicative strategies – rhetorical devices – which he employed in his speech. He covertly changed their mind-set and attitude towards IPOB and Biafra without employing any kind of force. Kanu, obviously, was also able to get a lot of people, considering the number of people that boycotted the election, to support his political ideologies.

b) After all, is it not why today we found ourselves in far flung lands like the USA and many more countries around the world? (45).

Nnamdi Kanu delivered this speech at the 2015 Igbo World Congress that was held in Los Angeles, California, America. Indigenous People of Biafra – IPOB – were not quite popular as at the time. Kanu’s main purpose was to give the Igbo at the conference an exposé on IPOB. He sought persuasive goal that will enable him to stealthily influence the people’s mindset towards

IPOB and Biafra. This is why his speech is rich with contrasting statements about Nigeria and Biafra. He equally solicited their support in the struggle for the restoration of Biafra. In his words;

I am using this opportunity to call upon each member of WIC to join hands with other Biafrans and members of IPOB to work towards the restoration of our dear nation of Biafra. You can help in diverse ways such as funding, diplomatic connections, lobbying your congressmen and people of significant clout and influence, and sundry activities geared toward the singular goal of achieving sovereignty for the nation of Biafra. Your loved ones in Biafraland look up to you because we have it in our saying that “Onuru ube nwanne agbala oso.” BIAFRA restoration is here, all you have to do is put in your efforts and BIAFRA will come. Like many other well-meaning Biafrans of Igbo extraction around the world, I look forward to the day when World Igbo Congress will be held in any of our towns and villages in Biafraland. May Chukwu Okike Abiama bless all of you and bless the nation of BIAFRA (72-77).

Judging by the large number of IPOB followers globally, it is safe to say that Mazi Kanu, through that World Igbo Congress speech (which is replete with rhetorical devices) plus his arrest by the DSS on 14th October, 2015, was able to get fellow Biafrans to endorse his political ideologies.

Hyperbole

- a) That Nigeria is perpetually in the doldrums politically, economically, and socially is of no surprise to any discerning mind and keen followers of the miserable history of Nigeria (44).
- b) On the 14th of September 2017, the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me, they know if I go to court, Nigeria will burn and I was forced to leave (96).

IPOB had been proscribed as a terrorist organisation by the Nigerian government at the time of this speech. Mazi Nnamdi Kanu delivered this speech from Jerusalem where he has been on exile after Nigerian soldiers raided his father's house during the Operation Python Dance II that was unleashed on Igboland. This speech happened at a time when the Biafra Secret Service Soldiers that joined Biafra's military intelligence were massacred in their numbers. Prior to this speech, IPOB members wandered like sheep without a shepherd. They were no longer certain about the restoration of Biafra by IPOB. According to Abati,

Since your disappearance there has also been little talk about self-determination or Biafra among Igbo. The sound of the narrative is gradually changing. There is more talk these days about Igbo marginalization, and the need to appoint Igbo into offices. One prominent Northerner from Kaduna has since gone to Chatham House in the UK to say Igbo should not complain about marginalization when they didn't vote for President Buhari in 2015, and that it is foolish for any Nigerian to expect to reap where he or she did not sow. Nnamdi, you'd be surprised that appointment-seeking Igbos' will mobilize your people, including your followers, to vote massively for the same people who are currently hounding you, in 2019. You can be sure this will happen. In fact, some people are already boasting that the only way to have peace in Nigeria is to make an Igbo man President or Vice President in 2019. While you were shouting "Biafra or death", some people were eyeing the business and political side of things. Every proposed revolution often runs into its own contradictions (par. 12).

Many feared Kanu had been murdered by the Nigerian soldiers. So, Kanu delivered this speech to assure them of his safety. He equally persuaded them not to relent in their struggle for the restoration of Biafra. In his speech, he also urged the Middle Belt region of Nigeria to align with his political ideology and join the race for the restoration of Biafra.

Since the Middle Belt region of Nigeria are yet to join IPOB, one cannot say whether Kanu, through the rhetorical devices in his speech, was able to manipulate the people of that region to support his political ideologies. Notwithstanding, the South Easterners are still solidly behind Kanu in the race for the restoration of Biafra, even in the face of the proscription by the Nigerian government. The raid at Kanu's father's house has further strengthened their ideology about the segregation and hatred of the Igbo.

Generally, Mandela and Kanu are political activists, championing the cause of their people. Both of them were incarcerated by their governments for their political activism, and their incarceration worked out positive outcomes for them. As political activists, they understand the power of certain words and some communicative/persuasive strategies which are geared towards influencing people to change their attitudes, beliefs, behaviour, values, and mindset, and they usually employ these persuasive strategies. Besides their rhetoric-device-laden speeches, they also have their credibility and reputation working for them. Kanu might be hated by many in Nigeria, but Biafrans perceive him to be their supreme leader sent by God to deliver them from the marginalisation meted out on them by the Nigerian government.

According to Charteris-Black,

The classical tradition of rhetorical went beyond the orator's act of communication to his qualities of character, or *ethos*. A model orator was necessarily morally virtuous (*vir bonus*) and could only persuade if his behaviour met with social approval. So successful rhetorical entailed either an effective heuristic or *logos* (the content of a speech), *and* a speaker who was ethically beyond criticism. There is, then, an inherent tension between evaluation of *the linguistic choices* that form a text and evaluation of *the behaviour* of the speaker (9).

Mandela was able to persuade the people to join in the march against apartheid/white supremacy through his speeches that are usually laden with rhetorical devices. He did not achieve all these feats through violence. He never supported the blacks in their reprisal attacks. Mandela chose the way of peace, dialogue. He made sure his speeches were not bereft of rhetorical devices. According to Richburg,

Miraculously, Mandela found a way to thread the needle. He did it through words and simple gestures, and through the force of his own outsize personality. Each time the country seemed inescapably hurtling toward a violent cataclysm, Mandela almost single-handedly found a way to pull it back (par. 12).

Judging by the end of apartheid, Anambra State gubernatorial election boycott, popularisation of IPOB, and the people that lost their lives during Operation Python Dance due to their support for IPOB, it is clear that Mandela and Kanu are able to get their audience to support their political ideologies by persuading them with their political speeches that are filled with rhetorical devices.

Summarily, in all the analyses from the speeches contained in research question two, “To what extent does rhetorical devices in political speeches persuade and manipulate the audience support politicians in their ideologies. One can vividly observe that these speeches are greatly persuasive and to a large extent manipulate the audience to support these politicians in their political ideologies. The speeches touch the emotions of the audience and many of these speeches talk about dominance and inequality, seriously reflecting CDA.

4.3 Research Question Three

To what degree do these politicians achieve discursive control and dominance through the use of rhetorical devices and/or hate language in their speeches?

Discursive control, simply put, centres on achieving control through discourse. It is a discursive strategy. Discursive strategies point to those linguistic practices employed by speakers with the intent to accomplish certain goals in discourse, and discursive control looks at how discourse is used to achieve such social practices. Discourse deals with language use. Political discourse, as one of the types of discourse, is usually characterised by the need to influence people to endorse the politician's political ideologies. Political speeches are delivered to persuade the target audience, so politicians – or speech writers – usually employ certain communicative strategies that will achieve that goal. Politicians use language as a tool to achieve that aim.

According to Sharndama,

In other words, politicians can influence the way we think about the events happening around us and the words they choose are crucial part of the process. --. When the listeners perceive that their belief are understood and supported, the speaker create connections to the policy that they wish to communicate. When putting forward arguments a speaker has to communicate at an emotional level and take stand points that seem morally correct. Furthermore, the listener must perceive that the arguments are relevant for the issue (16).

Political discourse can be seen as one of the sources of dominance, discrimination; power and control which are made manifest through language.

Anaphora

- a) I don't care. I do not care what they say in Abuja. I don't give a damn what they say in Lagos (8-9).
- b) Tell Buhari this is what I said. Tell Buhari that I am in Aba (14).
- c) I will never go on exile. I assure you. I am not going anywhere (15).

- d) I promised that I will be coming to Biafra and I came, I do not recognise the court of the zoo. I want the people of the Middle Belt to rise and join IPOB (82).
- e) I am not a Nigerian. I already renounced Nigeria in 2015. I am a Biafran with British Nationality. I cannot be tried by a court I do not recognise. I do not recognise Nigeria. I can only come to the court with UN supervision (105-110).
- f) Biafrans don't run away from history, rather they make history. Biafrans are adventurous and are not afraid to venture into the unknown. But the same cannot be said of other merged nations in the country called Nigeria. Biafrans have been held down and their development arrested by virtue of merging them with other nations to form Nigeria (48-50).

Kanu delivered this speech on September 5 2015, a time when IPOB was not popular in Nigeria. IPOB was popularised by Kanu's arrest on 14 October 2015. He used this speech to persuade Nigerians in Diaspora, plus the global audience, to stand with Biafra. He promised that IPOB will see to the restoration of Biafra.

Kanu's speech can be categorised as hate speech. He uses it as a tool to incite hate against Nigeria(ns). He says:

Regrettably, the British colonial masters forcefully merged BIAFRA with the other two nations of AREWA and ODUDUWA to form what is known today as Nigeria. Implicit in their value system and its incompatibility with those from other merged nations lies the need for the immediate extrication and restoration of the nation of Biafra from the country called Nigeria to represent as it was ordained a pinnacle of hope for the black race the world over. That Nigeria is perpetually in the doldrums politically, economically, and socially is of no surprise to any discerning mind and keen followers of the miserable history of Nigeria (42-44).

For over 100 years Biafrans have endured the unholy marriage called amalgamation and creation of Nigeria by the British colonial masters. Biafrans at home and in the diaspora can no longer endure the subjugation of Biafra under Nigeria. As in most revolutions and emancipation struggles, patriotic citizens in diaspora are always in the lead for collective objective of achieving nationhood (56-58).

Kanu persuades his audience, virtual and physical, to work together to achieve the sovereign state of Biafra. He achieves discursive control over them by pillorying and casting aspersions on Nigeria(ns). Kanu employs hate speech as his discursive source of inequality and bias. He further maintains it by tracing the history of Nigeria down to its amalgamation. He uses his political talk to construct the identity of Biafra (ns). In the content of his message, Kanu makes a contrast between Biafra and Nigeria. This contrast helps Kanu highlight an asymmetrical power relation between the two groups. The contrast between Nigeria and Biafra helps Kanu achieve discursive control. After all, why are they resident in America, if things were working in Nigeria?

Metaphor

- a) The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me. (Kanu, 99).
- b) Some idiots who are not educated enough said that they are going to arrest me, and I ask them to come (Kanu, 11).
- c) Any attempt to move against IPOB, we will shoot the zoo (par. 4).

Mazi Kanu, the leader of the secessionist separatist group IPOB, delivered this speech at Boys' Technical College, Aba after some IPOB members were killed at National High School by security agencies. Prior to this speech, the federal government of Nigeria had called for a revocation of his bail for flouting his bail conditions. The Nigerian government had also put plans in place to have him re-arrested.

Kanu's speech, albeit rich in rhetorical devices, is hate speech. Hate speech, according to Alexander Brown, is defined as speech that is:

...insulting, degrading, defaming, negatively stereotyping or inciting hatred, discrimination or violence against people in virtue of their race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, for example; and that it makes a positive difference because such speech implicates issues of harm, dignity, security, healthy cultural dialogue, democracy, and legitimacy, to name just a handful of relevant issues (420).

Hate speech is usually intently delivered to attack and insult a group of people because of their race, religion, nationality, sex and many others. Kanu uses this speech to attack and show his discrimination and bias against Nigerians and the Nigerian Army, and, also, to incite hate against the government of President Muhammadu Buhari. He constantly calls Nigeria "the zoo" (80). Nnamdi Kanu's political discourse employs hate speech as a discursive strategy that will promote tribalism and hatred. He uses it to achieve discursive control over the audience. In this speech, Kanu reproduces and enacts social power abuse, dominance and inequality over Nigeria(ns). He represents Biafrans as superior humans, and Nigerians as inferior humans.

"IPOB Military intelligence evacuated me from my compound when the Army of the Zoo attacked me" (83).

"The Army of the zoo killed my dog Jack and few other people in my compound." (91)

"The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me" (99).

Hyperbole

a) That Nigeria is perpetually in the doldrums politically, economically, and socially is of no surprise to any discerning mind and keen followers of the miserable history of Nigeria (44).

b) On the 14th of September 2017, the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me, they know if I go to court Nigeria will burn and I was forced to leave. (96-97)

This speech is delivered by Kanu from Jerusalem, his place of exile is the aftermath of operation python dance and the disappearance of Kanu from Nigeria. Kanu, on one hand, persuades IPOB followers that the struggle to restore Biafra has not been abandoned. His exile was not intentional, but was forced on him. He influences them to change their attitudes and beliefs about him running away from the battle.

On the other hand, Kanu makes disparaging statements about Nigeria, Nigerian courts and the Nigerian Army. His speech incites hatred, discrimination and violence against certain groups of people due to their nationality. He refers to Nigerian courts as “kangaroo courts” (102) and “court of the zoo” (81). He calls the Nigerian Army “army of the zoo” (91) and “terrorists of the zoo” (96). Finally, he says “The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me. I will fight till the last day” (99-100). These statements make Kanu’s speech a hate speech. He uses it to attack Nigeria, Nigerian courts and the Nigerian Army. He equally uses it to gain solidarity from his audience.

He uses his political talk to achieve dominance over his audience through social cognition. With all these hatred-inciting statements about Nigeria, the Nigerian Army and Nigerian courts, IPOB converts will begin to view these institutions in a negative light. Kanu employs hate speech in displaying his power, dominance, inequality and bias over and against Nigerian. This gives him the ability to gain discursive control over his audience.

Kanu uses language (hate speech) to display power, control and dominance over IPOB. In IPOB, Kanu is seen as the supreme leader, so he exercises and reinforces that social power relation by influencing the people through hate speech. In line with Van Dijk’s school of Critical Discourse Analysis, Kanu uses hate speech as his discursive source of power, dominance, inequality and

bias with the intent to influence the audience's social beliefs and values. According to Kamalu and Agangan, Van Dijk's CDA;

...is concerned with studying and analyzing written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias, and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political and historical contexts. By so doing, it illuminates ways in which the dominant forces construct texts that favour their interest (37).

The social power relations and display of power are shrouded in the hate speech. The social and political dominion that Kanu exercises over IPOB members is reproduced in his hate-speech-laden political text. Suffice it to say that Nnamdi Kanu uses his status as the supreme leader of IPOB to attack the generally accepted norm of people's nationality in Nigeria. He employs these factors in constructing his political discourse. On a surface level, Kanu's political discourse is persuasive in nature. But his nature of persuasion stems from manipulation and domination. "Manipulation can equally be a form of (legitimate) persuasion" (Kamalu and Agangan 38). Van Dijk states that:

CDA studies the ways in which such influence and control of the mind is socially or morally illegitimate, e.g., when powerful speakers self-servingly control the minds of others in a way that is in the interest of the powerful. Since action is based on mental models of actors, models which in turn embody social knowledge and attitudes, influencing such models or the beliefs on which they are based may be an effective way to (indirectly) control the actions of other people (22).

Using manipulation and domination as tools of influence and persuasion is considered social power abuse. They are equally used by the speaker to achieve discursive control. This is CDA clearly shown. And emotionally, these speeches touched the audience to change their attitudes, beliefs and values.

4.4 Research Question Four

To what extent does hate language reflect social power abuse?

Social power is the extent of influence an organisation or a person has over its members or even society at large. Generally, social power is the ability to influence other people. A person or organisation that wields social power has a large amount of influence over people. Social power is usually located in politics and society at large. Unlike physical power, force is not used to get people to act the way they do.

Gershaw agrees:

Coercive power influences others through threats and punishment. Coercive power is frequently used, because it gets quick results and is relatively easy to use. Unfortunately, it has several important drawbacks. First, the low-power person dislikes the high-power person. If this is the only source of power, the low-power person will get out of the relationship as soon as possible. (Does anyone ever want to associate with a bully?) Second, the low-power person has to be constantly watched so they cannot avoid performing the demanded behaviour or get away from the high-power person. Third, if the power scales tip the other way, the former low-power people are likely to retaliate for the punishments they have received. In addition, if you rely almost exclusively on this power as a

parent, children obey a coercive parent only because of fear — not because they think they are doing the right thing (58).

However, people cannot be socially powerful without the consent and support of others. Most people have power because others give it to them, so people cannot be powerful without the endorsement of human beings. When one is armed with social power, one can bring about a change in the beliefs, attitudes, behaviour and values of someone because of their actions or expertise. This means that social power gives rise to social influence.

Because “power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely” (Dalberg, 21), in a social relationship, the person that wields the power might tend to abuse it. And social power abuse leads to dominance. Although the person that wields social power can create conformity without resistance, he is not expected to abuse that power.

Repetition

- a) I’m a Biafran and we are going to crumble the zoo. Some idiots who are not educated said that they’ll arrest me, and I ask them to come. I’m in Biafra land. If any of them leaves Biafra land alive know that this is not IPOB (Kanu, 10-12).
- b) The plans of our enemies are not going to be actualized. The enemies are planning, but we are formidable. “We are going to boycott Anambra state election. After Anambra 2017, in 2019, there’ll be no elections in Biafraland (26-29).

This speech is the aftermath of the massacre of the members of the secessionist separatist group IPOB. In his speech, Kanu continuously refers to Nigeria as ‘the zoo’. He equally influences his audience to change their beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviour towards their own country; Nigeria. After all, it is a zoo, and they will ‘crumble the zoo’. Kanu, as the supreme leader, wields social power over other members of the separatist group. This means that he has social

influence over them. By calling Nigeria a zoo, Kanu leads his people into believing that Nigeria lacks law and order, and that they can go about flouting the laws of the country/zoo.

With his social influence over them, Kanu persuades them to boycott the then oncoming Anambra Gubernatorial election and the 2019 presidential and gubernatorial elections in Nigeria. According to INEC's report, which has been quoted earlier, only twenty two percent of registered voters took part in the election. So, Kanu was able to influence IPOB members to boycott the election. Kanu's participation in the election report is palpable. He abused the power that was vested on him as the IPOB supreme leader by leading his members into not expressing their franchise. Also, Kanu uses hate speech to garner solidarity from IPOB members. Kanu usually constructs his political discourse to reflect the asymmetrical power relations between him and his audience, as he always manipulates and dominates them to do his wishes.

Kanu employs hate speech to show his discrimination, hatred and bias against Nigerians. His hate for Nigerians drives his discourse, and he constantly reproduces that hate in his political talks. He also uses hate speech to abuse the social power he wields in IPOB. He uses it to influence IPOB members to do things that are against their own nation.

“Every right-thinking human being knows that the slogan “One Nigeria” is a ruse. Nigeria was not a united country and will NEVER be a united country even in the foreseeable future. To refresh our memories, Nigeria is a country made up of three distinct nations with mutually exclusive and diametrically opposed and irreconcilable value systems. Among these nations, BIAFRA is the only one with a distinct and internationally accepted Republican value system predicated upon the twin philosophy of (1) “Egbe bere ugo bere” the principle of natural justice, fairness, equity and equality before the spiritual and temporal laws and (2) “Eziokwu bu ndu” which is the weaving of the irreducibility of truth into the day to day discourse of life, in essence a life of nobility predicated on honesty” (38-41).

“That Nigeria is perpetually in the doldrums politically, economically, and socially is of no surprise to any discerning mind and keen followers of the miserable history of Nigeria. After all, is it not why today we found ourselves in far flung lands like the USA and many more countries around the world?” (44).

The general aim of this speech is to persuade the Igbos at this conference to join and support IPOB in their struggle for the restoration of Biafra. His social power over them as the leader of the secessionist separatist group would have sufficed in influencing the audience to support IPOB in the restoration of Biafra. But Kanu goes on to display his discrimination against Nigeria in order to persuade his audience. He disparages Nigeria, yet he extols Biafra which is a part of Nigeria.

Kanu adopts hate speech to disparage Nigeria and then form a kind of social relationship with his audience against their perceived enemy, Nigeria. Hate speech, as a discursive strategy, enables Kanu to form the identity of Biafra; the nation to be identified with and loved. Ultimately, he employs hate speech in displaying his inequality and bias against Nigeria. Hate speech is illegal in Nigeria, so Kanu abuses his social power, and uses it to lead his members into indulging in illegal linguistic exercise.

In these speeches, the repetitive use of the personal pronoun, ‘I’ is to take full responsibilities for his actions as a worthy leader. He also uses it to show authority, thereby, creating a positive image of himself. Also, the use of the pronoun ‘we’ is to make himself inclusive in the struggle. These are for emphasis. These speeches emotionally influence their audience and change their worldview about Nigeria and CDA is clearly reflected in those speeches.

Excerpts from Nnamdi Kanu's World Broadcast

- a) "IPOB Military intelligent evacuated me from my compound when the Army of the Zoo attacked me, I am in Israel and the efficiency of MOSAD will be replicated in Biafra, we shall hunt everyone down to avenge the death of IPOB members (83-84).
- b) "The Army of the Zoo killed my dog Jack and few other people in my compound, I am sorry for what my sureties are passing through but I want to assure them that they will have a special place in Biafra. I shall not be honouring the Court (91-92).
- c) "The notion that I jumped bail is a fallacy in Law, I did not jump bail, on the 14th of September 2017 the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me, they know if I go to court Nigeria will burn and I was forced to leave, I did not jump bail (94-98).
- d) "The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me. I will fight till the last day. Binta Nyanko court fail to ask @HQNigerianArmy why they invaded my home. Nigerian court is a Kangaroo court. I did not jump bail, I left because the court fail to protect (99-104).

This speech is replete with hatred inciting and discriminatory statements about Nigeria and some of its institutions. Kanu says Nigeria is a zoo and denounces his Nigerian citizenship. Due to his social power in IPOB, other members will equally be influenced into changing their values, attitudes, and behaviour towards Nigeria. They are equally influenced to denounce their Nigerian citizenship.

By calling Nigerian courts, Court of the Zoo, and vehemently proclaiming that he will not honour the court, Kanu influences other IPOB members to disobey the courts in Nigeria. And this can lead to a subpoena. In the same speech, Kanu calls the Nigerian Army the army of the zoo. This is why when the DSS operatives invaded Kanu's father's house during operation python dance 2, IPOB military intelligence bravely attacked the soldiers and got massacred in their numbers. They had been influenced by Kanu's hate speech against Nigerian military, so

they believed they would overcome the army of the zoo. On the flip side, Kanu escaped and did not attack ‘the army of the zoo’ knowing their military prowess. On the other hand, the people he influenced negatively met their Waterloo.

Kanu abuses his social power in IPOB. He uses it to dominate the people into obedience. He does this by adopting social cognition to make IPOB members process the information he feeds them the way he wants them to. Because religion is rife in Nigeria, Kanu influences his members to believe that the restoration of Biafra is a divine mandate which Chukwu Okike Abiama gave him directly. This made IPOB members crown him their supreme leader, thereby investing so much social power on him which he abuses consistently. This also shows the asymmetrical power relation between the leader and his members. Because IPOB members have been influenced to believe that Kanu’s mandate is from Chukwu Okike Abiama, they take everything he says hook, line and sinker.

4.5 Summary

Language is a powerful weapon in getting political thoughts and ideologies of most political activist, hence through the analysis, the languages of Nelson Mandela is studied through the selected speeches in order to get to his thoughts, Nelson Mandela was able to persuade the people to join in the march against apartheid/white supremacy through his speeches that are usually laden with rhetorical devices. He did not achieve all these feats through violence. He never supported the blacks in their reprisal attacks. He chose the way of peace, dialogue. He made sure his speeches were not bereft of rhetorical devices. Mandela begins his speech by addressing the people as friends and comrades, Mandela’s case, at the time, he garnered international recognition. He, knowing full well that the fight might be too much for himself and

ANC, used this speech as an avenue to surreptitiously induce a change in the belief, attitude and behaviour of the global audience.

Kanu was able to persuade the people in his speech through certain communicative strategies – rhetorical devices – which he constantly employed in his speeches. Being a secessionist separatist leader, he tries to emancipate his people – Biafrans – using hate speeches, instead of using only rhetorical and emotive languages, just as Mandela did. He covertly changed their mindset and attitude towards IPOB and Biafra without employing any kind of force. Hate speech will delay this freedom.

Generally, Mandela and Kanu are political activists, championing the cause of their people. Both of them were incarcerated by their governments for their political activism and their incarceration worked out positive outcomes for them.

Apart from their rhetorical – device laden speeches, they also have their credibility and reputation working for them. Mandela chose the way of peace and dialogue. Kanu on the other side might be hated by many in Nigeria, but Biafrans perceive him to be their supreme leader sent by God to deliver them from the marginalization meted out on them by the Nigerian Government.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, CONCLUSION

5.1 Discussion of Findings

Language is primarily used for communication. Language possesses persuasive tendencies. Words are usually structured to have certain effects on their hearers or readers. Human beings do things with words. Words persuade; among other things. Some words have been termed power words because of the psychological response they elicit from their hearers or readers.

Politicians do not just string words together to inform their audience. Language plays a pivotal role in politics. Politics and language are inseparable. Political text and talk are always replete with rhetorical devices. Their main aim is to persuade and effect a change in the belief, attitude, behaviour, values and motives of the listener or reader. Therefore, they influence with words. Political speeches are usually geared towards persuading, motivating and influencing people to join the politician's political struggles, so political speeches are filled with rhetorical devices like metaphor, anaphora, anadiplosis, antithesis, alliteration, simile, and many others which are persuasive goals used to persuade and influence the audience. Political discourse is usually structured with rhetorical devices to surreptitiously alter the beliefs, values, motives, attitudes, and behaviour of the target audience. These politicians also make use of the first-person pronoun 'I', to show themselves worthy of the cause, and third person pronoun 'we' to show inclusion and participation in the struggles of their people. Political activists understand that there are certain persuasive strategies that influence people to change their attitudes, beliefs, behaviour, values and mind-set, and they copiously employ these persuasive strategies in their discourse. They do not apply violence. They make sure that their political talks are not bereft of rhetorical devices. They use rhetorical devices to get their audience to support their political ideologies.

Although a political speech is replete with rhetorical devices, it can also contain hate speech. Hate speech can be employed by a politician as a discursive strategy to promote tribalism and hatred. It can be adopted to achieve discursive control over the audience. It can also be used to enact social power abuse, bias, dominance and inequality. Hate speech can achieve dominance over an audience using social cognition. A politician can employ hate speech to implicitly display power, control and dominance over its members. On the other hand, a politician can equally persuade its audience using hate speech.

Social power abuse can be enacted in a political speech. The politician can use manipulation and dominance as tools of influence and persuasion. These tools of persuasion and influence can be employed by a speaker to achieve discursive control over its target audience.

5.2 Recommendations

A politician whose aim is to persuade and influence an audience ought to copiously employ rhetorical devices in his/her political speeches. These linguistic strategies should be consciously employed as persuasive strategies that will go a long way in helping a politician achieve his/her political goals and aspirations. A politician should extensively harness the discursive and persuasive strategies that are inherent in language. These persuasive goals should be accessed in such a way that they will assist the politician in achieving his political goals.

Politicians should desist from using hate speech. Although hate speech can assist in forming the identity of a political group, it is illegal in most parts of the world like Nigeria. Political discourse should focus on persuading the target audience to join the political struggle. It should not re-direct its focus on the other party; thereby inciting hatred and making disparaging statements about the other group of people. Political speeches, albeit persuasive, can also aim to

educate the audience on its aims and aspirations, especially if the separatist group has not been popularised. Casting aspersions on another group of people can lead to hatred and political wars, because hate speech serves as a threat to the opposition group who in turn can decide to act on the threats.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

This research focused on six political speeches by two political activists; Nelson Mandela of South Africa and Mazi Nnamdi Kanu of Nigeria/Biafra. A related study may be carried out using other political speeches by some other political activists in Africa.

The researcher focused on the employment of rhetorical devices and hate speeches in the political discourse of these political activists and also the hidden discursive strategies they were able to achieve using the two strategies. Another research can be carried out using political manifestoes, presidential debates, vice presidential debates and inauguration speeches of presidents and governors in Africa.

5.4 Conclusion

Language possesses persuasive strategies which can be used to persuade an audience. Rhetorical devices are examples of such persuasive strategies. When a political speech contains rhetorical devices, these devices persuade the audience extensively by influencing them to change their values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. It is pertinent that a political speech should not be bereft of rhetorical devices which are agents that can lead a politician to the promise land.

When a political speech contains hate speech, it drives the audience in the wrong direction, even if the speech contains rhetorical devices. Hate speech drives an audience to enact inequality and bias in their hearts against another group of people. It also drives an audience to do things that are inimical to the laws of the nation.

Works Cited

- Abati, Reuben. "A Letter to Nnamdi Kanu by Reuben Abati". www.saharareporters.com. Accessed 25 Dec. 2018.
- Abrams, M. H. *Glossary of Literary Terms*. Holt, Rinehart and Wilson. New York. 1981.
- Aduraola, Remi and Chris Ojukwu. "Language of Political Campaigns and Politics in Nigeria". *Canadian Social Science*. 9.3, 2013, pp 104-116.
- Akinwotu, Alaba. "Rhetorical in Selected Speeches of Obafemi Awolowo and Moshood Abiola". *Ihafa: A Journal of African Studies*. 8.2, 2016, pp 36-58.
- Akinwotu, Samuel Alaba. *A Speech Act Analysis of the Acceptance of Nomination Speeches of Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Chief M.K.O. Abiola*. English Linguistics Research, 2013.
- Allo, Awol. *Nelson Mandela's "I am Prepared to Die" Speech Fifty Years on*. www.opendemocracy.net Accessed 3 Dec. 2018.
- Alo, Moses. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Prominent African Leaders". *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*. 10.1, 2012, pp 87-100.
- Aristotle. *Aristotle's Politics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
- Black, Elizabeth. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U.P., 2006.
- Bostrom, Robert. *Persuasion*. Engle-Wood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1983.
- Brown, Alexander. "What is Hate Speech? Part 1: The Myth of Hate". *Law and Philosophy*. Vol. 36, 2017, pp. 419-468
- Burgoon, Michael, Frank Humsaker and Edwin Dawson. *Human Communication*. 3rd ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994.

- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palmgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Chetia, Barnali. "Rhetorical Devices in English Advertisements in India: A Descriptive Study". *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*. 3.11, 2015, pp 980-984.
- Chilton, Paul. "Challenges in the Study of Language and Politics: Challenges for JLP". *Journal of Language and Politics*. 6.3, 2007, pp 297-301.
- . *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Chilton, Paul and Christina Schaffner. "Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse". *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner (eds). Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002, pp 1-44.
- . and ---. "Discourse and Politics". *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Teun van Dijk (ed). London: Sage, 1997, pp 206-230.
- Christopher, Anne. "Rhetorical Strategies in Advertising: The Rise and Fall Pattern". *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. 2.8, 2013, pp 773-781.
- Cicero. *Selected Works*. Trans. M. Grant. Hammsworth: Penguin, 1971.
- Cruse, Alan. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Crystal, David. *The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. London: Blackwell, 1992.
- Dalberg, John. *Acton-Creighton Correspondence*. Cambridge University Library, Department of Manuscripts and University Archives, 1887. *Online Library of Liberty*,

<https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/acton-acton-creighton-correspondence>. Accessed 31 Dec. 2018.

Dessalles, Jean-Louis. *Why We Talk: The Evolutionary Origins of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dwivedi, Amitabh. Mandelian Rhetoric: An Analysis of Nelson Mandela' s Political Speeches. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*. 3, 2015, pp 61-69. 10.13189/lis.2015.030205.

Enyi, Amaechi. "Rhetorical Diplomacy: A Study of Nigeria's President Muhammadu Buhari's Speech to the 70th Session of the United Nations General Assembly-September, 2015". *British Journal of English Linguistics*. 4. 2, 2016, pp 38-52.

Ezejideaku, Emma and Esther Ugwu. "The Rhetorical & Propaganda of Political Campaigns in Nigeria". *Journal of the Linguistics Association of Nigeria*. 10, 2007, pp 9-26.

Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. "Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies 2: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Teun van Dijk (ed). London: Sage, 1997, pp 258-284.

Fasold, Ralph. *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Gershaw, David. "Social Power and Its Abuse". *A Life on Line*, <http://virgil.azwestern.edu/~dag/lol/SocialPower.html>. Accessed 30 Dec. 2018.

Godwin, Ameh. "Hate Speech Offenders to Die by Hanging – Nigeria's Senate's New Bill", 2018. <https://dailypost.ng/2018/03/01/hate-speech-offenders-die-hanging-nigeria-senates-new-bill/>. Accessed 9 Oct. 2018.

Grice, Paul. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989.

- Hazel, Harry. *The Power of Persuasion*. 2nd ed. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt, 1998. .
<https://www.thoughtco.com>procatalepsis>
- Ike-Nwafor, Nkechi. *Critical Discourse Analysis of Selected Political Campaign Speeches of Gubernatorial Candidates in South-Western Nigeria 2007-2014*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Nigeria, 2015.
- Indede, Florence. "The Pragmatics of Kiswahili Literary Political Discourse". *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 2009, pp 107-115.
- Johnstone, Barbara. *Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell, 2008.
- Joseph, John. *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Kamalu, Ikenna and Iniworikabo, Patience. "Metaphors in Selected Political Speeches of Nigerian Democratic Presidents". *California Linguistic Notes*, 2016, pp 71-84.
- Kamalu, Ikenna and Agangan, Richard. *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's Declaration of Interest in the PDP Presidential Primaries*. www.researchgate.net. Accessed 29 Dec. 2018.
- Korhonen, Saku. *The Rhetorical of Blame and Bluster: An Analysis of how Donald Trump Uses Language to Advance his Political Goals*. Unpublished B.A. Thesis. University of Oulu. 2017.
- Kulo, Lena. *Linguistic Features in Political Speeches: How Language can be Used to Impose Certain Moral or Ethical Values on People*. Unpublished B.A. Thesis. Lulea University of Technology, 2009.
- Lakoff, Robin. *Talking Power: The Politics of Language in our Lives*. USA: Basic Books, 1990.
- Lyons, John. *New Horizons in Linguistics 1*. London: Penguin, 1970.

Mandela, Nelson. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. USA Back Bay Book/Little, Brown and Company Hachette Book Group, 1994. .

_____. "Inauguration Speech". *Selected Speeches, Statements and Writing of Nelson Mandela*. 9th May, 1994. Retrieved 18th Mar., 2018.

<http://www.anc.org.z/ancdocs/history.mandela/1994/inaugpta.html>.

May, Stephen. "Language Policy and Minority Rights". *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, Thomas Ricento (ed.). London: Wiley, 2005. Pp 255-272.

McGaan, Lee. *Introduction to Persuasion*. www.department.monm.edu Accessed 2 Apr., 2018.

McGuigan, Brenda. *Rhetorical Devices: A Handbook and Activities for Student Writers*. USA: Prestwick House, 2007.

McQuarrie, Edward and David Mick. "Figures of Rhetorical in Advertising Language". *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1996, pp 424-438.

Nordquist, Richard. *Glossary of Grammatical & Rhetorical Terms*. Cromwell Press, England. 2006.

Nwachukwu, Agbada. *The Value of Literature in the Learning of the Use of English in Communicative Competence*. Ogbazi et al John Jacobs, Enugu, 2003.

O'Keefe, Daniel. *Persuasion: Theory and Research*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2002.

Ogbonna, Anthony. *Anambra Election: IPOB Says Low Turnout Sign Voters Obeyed Boycott Order*. www.vanguardngr.com. Accessed 25 Dec., 2018.

Ojukwu, Chika. *Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Nelson Mandela*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. University of Nigeria, 2016.

- Orimogunje, Ajewole and Christiana Oluremi. "A Stylo-Rhetorical Analysis of Obafemi Awolowo's 'It is not Life that Matters'". *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 2016, pp 216-228.
- Owoseye, Ayodamola. *Only 22 Percent Voters Partook in Anambra Election – INEC*. www.premiumtimesng.com. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Papanikolatos, Nafsika. "Hate Speech: (re) producing the Opposition between the National <<self>> and the <<others>>". Lenkova, Mariana (ed). '*Hate Speech*' in the Balkans. Vienna: The International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, 1998, pp 10-28.
- Perloff, Richard. *The Dynamics of Persuasion*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1993.
- . *The Dynamics of Persuasion: Communication and Attitudes in the Twenty First Century*. 4th ed. London: Routledge, 2010. .
- Reich, Keith. *Figuring Jesus: The Power of Rhetorical Figures of Speech in the Gospel of Luke*. Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Rezaei, Sohrab and Niloofar Nourali. "Language and Power: The Use of Persuasive Techniques in Iran and U.S Presidents Speeches". *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 7.6 (2016), pp 1203-1209.
- Richburg, Keith. *Appreciation: Nelson Mandela averted what many expected — an all-out civil war*. www.washingtonpost.com. Accessed 21 Dec., 2018.
- Salem, Ahmed. "Elusiveness in Political Discourse: How to Apologise the American Way". *Role of Media in Nation Building: Botanical Discourse, Contact Languages and Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2016, pp 80-92.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2006.

Simpson, Robert. "Dignity, Harm, and Hate Speech". *Law and Philosophy* 32.6 (2013). Pp 701-728.

Smith, Greg. *Persuasion Theory*. www.markedbyteachers.com Accessed 3 Apr., 2018. .

The Bible. *New International Version*, Zondervan, 2011.

Tom, Gail and AnMarie Eves. "The Use of Rhetorical Devices in Advertising". *Journal of Advertising Research*. 39.4 (1999), pp 39-43.

Tsesis, A. *Destructive Messages: How Hate Speech Paves the Way for Harmful Social Movements*. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Tuan, Luu. "Rhetorical Structures in the Language of Vietnamese Advertisements". *Asian Social Science*. 6.11 (2010) pp 175-182.

Van Dijk, Teun. "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse & Society*. 4.2 (1993) pp 249-283.

... "Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Japanese Discourse*. 1 (1995) pp 17-27.

... "Critical Discourse Analysis". *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi Hamilton (ed). Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. Pp 352-371.

... "Political Discourse and Political Cognition". *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner (ed). Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. Pp 203-237.

- ... “What is Political Discourse Analysis”. *Political Linguistics*. Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997. Pp 11-52.
- Waldron, Jeremy. *The Harm in Hate Speech*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2012. .
- Weaver, Tim. *Never Coming Back*. Viking, 2014.
- Weber, Anne. *Manual on Hate Speech*. France: Council of Europe Publishing, 2009.
- Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon Yates. *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage, 2001.
- Wilson, John. “Political Discourse”. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi Hamilton (ed). Blackwell Publishing, 2003. Pp 398-415.
- Wodak, Ruth. “The Discourse-Historical Approach”. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 2001. Pp 63-94.
- Wolfson, Nicholas. *Hate Speech, Sex Speech, Free Speech*. London: Library of Congress, 1997.
- Wooffitt, Robin. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 2005.
- Zheng, Tongtao. *Characteristics of Australian Political Language Rhetoric: Tactics of Gaining Public Support and Shirking Responsibility*. www.immi.se. Accessed 5 Mar., 2018.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Speeches of Nelson Mandela “I am Prepared to Die”

1. I am the First Accused.
2. I hold a Bachelor’s Degree in Arts and practised as an attorney in Johannesburg for a number of years in partnership with Oliver Tambo.
3. I am a convicted prisoner serving five years for leaving the country without a permit and for inciting people to go on strike at the end of May, 1961.
4. At the outset, I want to say that the suggestion made by the State in Its opening that the struggle in south Africa is under the influence of foreigners or communists is wholly incorrect.
5. I have done whatever I did, both as an individual and as a leader of my people, because of my experience in South Africa and my own proudly felt African background, and not because of what any outsider might have said.
6. In my youth in the Transkei I listened to the elders of my tribe telling stories of the old days.
7. Amongst the tales they related to me were those of wars fought by our ancestors in defense of the fatherland.
8. The names of Dingane and Bambata, Hinsta and Makana, Squngthi and Dalasile, Moshoeshoe and Sekhukhuni, were praised as the glory of the entire African nation.
9. I hoped then that life might offer me the opportunity to serve my people and make my own humble contribution to their freedom struggle.
10. This is what has motivated me in all that I have done in relation to the charges made against me in this case.

11. I do not, however, deny that I planned sabotage.
12. I did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness, nor because I have any love violence.
13. I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had risen after many years of tyranny, exploitation, and oppression of my people by the whites.
14. I admit immediately that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkhonto we Sizwe, and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August 1962.
15. In the statement which I am about to make I shall correct certain false impressions which have been created by State witnesses.
16. Amongst other things, I will demonstrate that certain of the acts referred to in the evidence were not and could not have been committed by Umkhonto.
17. I will also deal with the relationship between the African National Congress and Umkhonto, and with the part which I personally have played in the affairs of both organizations.
18. I shall deal also with the part played by the Communist Party.
19. In order to explain these matters properly, I will have to explain what Umkhonto set out to achieve; what methods it prescribed for the achievement of these objects and why these methods were chosen.
20. I will also have to explain how I became involved in the activities of these organizations.
21. I deny that Umkhonto was responsible for number of acts which clearly fell outside the policy of the organization, and which have been charged in the indictment against us.
22. I do not know what justification there was for these acts, but to demonstrate that they could not been authorized by Umkhonto, I want to refer briefly to the roots and policy of the organization.

23. I have already mentioned that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkhonto.
24. I, and the others who started the organization, did so for two reasons.
25. Firstly, we believed that as a result of Government policy, violence by the African people had become inevitable, and that unless responsible leadership was given to canalize and control the feelings of our people, there would be outbreaks of terrorism which would produce an intensity of bitterness and hostility between the various races of this country which is not produced even by war.
26. Secondly, we felt that without violence there would be no way open to the African people to succeed in their struggle against the principle of white supremacy.
27. All lawful modes of expressing opposition to this principle had been closed by legislation, and we were placed in a position in which we had either to accept a permanent state of inferiority, or to defy the Government.
28. We chose to defy the law. We had to recuperate our strength and muster our forces for another and more powerful offensive against the enemy.
29. We first broke the law in a way which avoided any recourse to violence; when this form was legislated against, and then the government resorted to a show of force to crush opposition to its policies, only then did we decide to answer violence with violence.
30. But the violence which we chose to adopt was not terrorism.
31. We who formed Umkhonto were all members of the African National Congress, and had behind us the ANC tradition of non-violence and negotiation as a means of solving political disputes.
32. We believe that South Africa belongs to all the people who live in it, and not to one group, be it black or white.
33. We did not want an interracial war, and tried to avoid it to the last minute.

34. If the Court is in doubt about this, it will be seen that the whole history of our organization bears out what I have said, and what I will subsequently say, when describe the tactics which Umkhonto decided to adopt.
35. I want, therefore, to say something about the African National Congress.
36. The African National Congress was formed in 1912 to defend the rights of the Africa: people which had been seriously curtailed by the South Africa Act, and which were then being threatened by the Native Land Act.
37. For thirty-seven years - that is until 1949 - it adhered strictly to a constitutions struggle.
38. It put forward demands and resolutions; it sent delegations to the Government in the belief that African grievances could be settled through peaceful discussion and the Africans could advance gradually to full political rights.
39. But White Governments remained unmoved, and the rights of Africans became les instead of becoming greater.
40. In the words of my leader, Chief Lutuli, who became President of the ANC in 1952 and who was later awarded the Nobel Peace Prize: "who will deny that thirty years my life have been spent knocking in vain, patiently, moderately, and modestly a: closed and barred door?
41. What have been the fruits of moderation?
42. The past thirty years have seen the greatest number of laws restricting our rights progress, until today we have reached a stage where we have almost no rights at all".
43. Even after 1949, the ANC remained determined to avoid violence.
44. At this time, however, there was a change from the strictly constitutional means: protest which had been employed in the past.
45. The change was embodied in a decision which was taken to protest against apart: legislation by peaceful, but unlawful, demonstrations against certain laws.

46. Pursuant to this policy the ANC launched the Defiance Campaign, in which I v. placed in charge of volunteers.
47. This campaign was based on the principles of passive resistance.
48. More than 8,500 people defied apartheid laws and went to jail.
49. Yet there was not a single instance of violence in the course of this campaign on that part of any defier.
50. I and nineteen colleagues were convicted for the role which we played in organizing the campaign, but our sentences were suspended mainly because the Judge found that discipline and non-violence had been stressed throughout.
51. This was the time when the volunteer section of the ANC was established, and when the word 'Amadelakufa' was first used: this was the time when the volunteers we asked to take a pledge to uphold certain principles.
52. Evidence dealing with volunteers and their pledges has been introduced into this case, but completely out of context.
53. The volunteers were not, and are not, the soldiers of a black army pledged to fight a civil war against the whites.
54. They were, and are dedicated workers who are prepared to lead campaigns initiated by the ANC to distribute leaflets, to organize strikes, or do whatever the particular campaign required.
55. They are called volunteers because they volunteer to face the penalties of imprisonment and whipping which are now prescribed by the legislature for such acts.
56. During the Defiance Campaign, the Public Safety Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act were passed.
57. These Statutes provided harsher penalties for offences committed, by way of protests against laws.

58. Despite this, the protest continued and the ANC adhered to its policy of non-violence.
59. In 1956, 156 leading members of the Congress Alliance, including myself, were arrested on a charge of high' treason and charges under the Suppression of Communism Act.
60. The non-violent policy of the ANC was put in issue by the State, but when the Court gave judgment some five years later, it found that the ANC did not have a policy of violence.
61. We were acquitted on all counts, which included a count that the ANC sought to set up a communist state in place of the existing regime.
62. The Government has always sought to label all its opponents as communists.
63. This allegation has been repeated in the present case, but as I will show, the ANC is not, and never has been, a communist organization.
64. In 1960 there was the shooting at Sharpeville, which resulted in the proclamation of a state of emergency and the declaration of the ANC as an unlawful organic
65. My colleagues and I, after careful consideration, decided that we would not obey this decree.
66. The African people were not part of the Government and did not make the laws by which they were governed.
67. We believed in the words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that 'the will of the people shall be the basis of authority of the Government', and for us to the banning was equivalent to accepting the silencing of the Africans for all time.
68. The ANC refused to dissolve, but instead went underground.
69. We believed it was our duty to preserve this organization which had been built up with almost fifty years of unremitting toil.

70. I have no doubt that no self-respecting White political organization would disband itself if declared illegal by a government in which it had no say.
71. In 1960 the Government held a referendum which led to the establishment of the aim Republic.
72. Africans, who constituted approximately 70 per cent of the population of South Africa, were not entitled to vote, and were not even consulted about the proposed constitutional change.
73. All of us were apprehensive of our future under the proposed White Republic, and a resolution was taken to hold an All-in African Conference to call for a National Convention, and to organize mass demonstrations on the eve of the unwanted Republic, if the Government failed to call the Convention.
74. The conference was attended by Africans of various political persuasions.
75. I was the Secretary of the conference and undertook to be responsible for organizing the national stay-at-home which was subsequently called to coincide with the declaration of the Republic.
76. As all strikes by Africans are illegal, the person organizing such a strike must avoid arrest.
77. I was chosen to be this person, and consequently I had to leave my home and family and my practice and go into hiding to avoid arrest.
78. The stay-at-home, in accordance with ANC policy, was to be a peaceful demonstration.
79. Careful instructions were given to organizers and members to avoid any recourse to violence.
80. The Government's answer was to introduce new and harsher laws, to mobilize its armed forces, and to send Saracens, armed vehicles, and soldiers into the townships in a massive show of force designed to intimidate the people.

81. This was an indication that the Government had decided to rule by force alone, and this decision was a milestone on the road to Umkhonto.
82. Some of this may appear irrelevant to this trial.
83. In fact, I believe none of it is irrelevant because it will, I hope, enable the Court to appreciate the attitude eventually adopted by the various persons and bodies concerned in the National Liberation Movement.
84. When I went to jail in 1962, the dominant idea was that loss of life should be avoided.
85. I now know that this was still so in 1963.
86. I must return to June 1961.
87. What were we, the leaders of our people, to do?
88. Were we to give in to the show of force and the implied threat against future action, or were we to fight it and, if so, how?
89. We had no doubt that we had to continue the fight.
90. Anything else would have been abject surrender.
91. Our problem was not whether to fight, but was how to continue the fight.
92. We of the ANC had always stood for a non-racial democracy, and we shrank from any action which might drive the races further apart than they already were.
93. But the hard facts were that fifty years of non-violence had brought the African people nothing but more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights.
94. It may not be easy for this Court to understand, but it is a fact that for a long time his people had been talking of violence - of the day when they would fight the White man and win back their country - and we, the leaders of the ANC, had nevertheless prevailed upon them to avoid violence and to pursue peaceful methods.

95. When some of us discussed this in May and June of 1961, it could not be denied that our policy to achieve a non-racial State by non-violence had achieved nothing and that our followers were beginning to lose confidence in this policy and were developing disturbing ideas of terrorism.
96. It must not be forgotten that by this time violence had, in fact, become a feature of the South African political scene.
97. There had been violence in 1957 when the women of Zeerust were ordered to carry passes; there was violence in 1958 with the enforcement of cattle culling in Sekhukhuniland; there was violence in 1959 when the people of Cato Manor protested against pass raids; there was violence in 1960 when the Government attempted to impose Bantu Authorities in Pondoland.
98. Thirty-nine Africans died in these disturbances.
99. In 1961 there had been riots in Warm baths, and all this time the Transkei had been a seething mass of unrest.
100. Each disturbance pointed clearly to the inevitable growth among Africans of the belief that violence was the only way out - it showed that a Government which uses force to maintain its rule teaches the oppressed to use force to oppose it.
101. Already small groups had arisen in the urban areas and were spontaneously making plans for violent forms of political struggle.
102. There now arose a danger that these groups would adopt terrorism against Africans, as well as Whites, if not properly directed.
103. Particularly disturbing was the type of violence engendered in places such as Zeerust, Sekhukhuniland, and Pondoland amongst Africans.
104. It was increasingly taking the form, not of struggle against the Government though this is what prompted it - but of civil strife amongst themselves, conducted in

such a way that it could not hope to achieve anything other than a loss of life and bitterness.

105. At the beginning of June 1961, after a long and anxious assessment of the South African situation, I, and some colleagues, came to the conclusion that as violence in this country was inevitable; it would be unrealistic and wrong for African leaders to continue preaching peace and non-violence at a time when the Government met our peaceful demands with force.
106. This conclusion was not easily arrived at.
107. Yet most Africans, even in this group, are impoverished by low incomes and high cost of living.
108. The highest-paid and the most prosperous section of urban African life is in Johannesburg.
109. Yet their actual position is desperate.
110. The latest figures were given on 25 March 1964 by Mr. Carr, Manager of the Johannesburg Non-European Affairs Department.
111. The-poverty datum line for the average African family in Johannesburg (according to Mr. Carr's department) is R42.84 per month.
112. He showed that the average monthly wage is R32.24 and that 46 per cent of all African families in Johannesburg do not earn enough to keep them going.
113. Poverty goes hand in hand with malnutrition and disease.
114. The incidence of malnutrition and deficiency diseases is very high amongst Africans.
115. Tuberculosis, pellagra, kwashiorkor, gastro-enteritis, and scurvy bring death destruction of health.
116. The incidence of infant mortality is one of the highest in the world.

117. According to the Medical Officer of Health for Pretoria, tuberculosis kills forty people a day (almost all Africans), and in 1961 there were 58,491 new cases reported.
118. These diseases do not only destroy the vital organs of the body, but they result in retarded mental conditions and lack of initiative, and reduce powers of concentration.
119. The secondary results of such conditions affect the whole community and the standard of work performed by African labourers.
120. The complaint of Africans, however, is not only that they are poor and the whites are rich, but that the laws which are made by the whites are designed to preserve this situation.
121. There are two ways to break out of poverty.
122. The first is by formal education, and the second is by the worker acquiring a greater skill at his work and thus higher wages.
123. As far as Africans are concerned, both these avenues of advancement are deliberately curtailed by legislation.
124. The present Government has always sought to hamper Africans in their search for education.
125. One of their early acts, after coming into power, was to stop subsidies for African school feeding.
126. Many African children who attended schools depended on this supplement to their diet.
127. This was a cruel act.
128. There is compulsory education for all white children at virtually no cost to their parents, be they rich or poor.
129. Similar facilities are not provided for the African children, though there are some who receive such assistance.
130. African children, however, generally have to pay more for their schooling than whites.

131. According to figures quoted by the South African Institute of Race Relations in the 1963 journal, approximately 40 per cent of African children in the age group between seven to fourteen do not attend school.
132. For those who do attend school, the standards are vastly different from those afforded to white children.
133. In 1960-61 the per capita Government spending on African students at State-aided schools was estimated at R12.46.
134. In the same years, the per capita spending on white children in the Cape Province (which are the only figures available to me) was R144.57.
135. Although there are no figures available to me, it can be stated, without doubt, that the white children on whom R144.57 per head was being spent all came from wealthier homes than African children on whom R12.46 per head was being spent.
136. The quality of education is also differently. According to the Bantu Educational Journal, only 5,660 African children in the whole of South Africa passed their Junior Certificate in 1962, and in that year only passed matric.
137. This is presumably consistent with the policy of Bantu education about which the present Prime Minister said, during the debate on the Bantu Education Bill in 1953.
138. When I have control of Native education, I will reform it so that Natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them.
139. People who believe in equality are not desirable teachers for Natives.
140. When my Department controls Native education, it will know for what class of higher education a Native is fitted, and whether he will have a chance in life to use his knowledge.
141. The other main obstacle to the economic advancement of the African is the industrial colour-bar under which all the better jobs of industry are reserved for Whites only.

142. Moreover, Africans who do obtain employment in the unskilled and semi-skilled occupations which are open to them are not allowed to form trade unions which have recognition under the Industrial Conciliation Act.
143. This means that strikes of African workers are illegal, and that they are denied the right of collective bargaining which is permitted to the better-paid White workers.
144. The discrimination in the policy of successive South African Governments towards African workers is demonstrated by the so-called 'civilized labour policy' under which sheltered, unskilled Government jobs are found for those white workers who cannot make the grade in industry, at wages which far exceed the earnings of the average African employee in industry.
145. The Government often answers its critics by saying that Africans in South Africa are economically better off than the inhabitants of the other countries in Africa.
146. I do not know whether this statement is true and doubt whether any comparison can be made without having regard to the cost-of-living index in such countries.
147. But even if it is true, as far as the African people are concerned it is irrelevant.
148. Our complaint is not that we are poor by comparison with people in other countries, but that we are poor by comparison with the white people in our own country, and that we are prevented by legislation from altering this imbalance.
149. The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy.
150. White supremacy implies black inferiority.
151. The other main obstacle to the economic advancement of the African is the industrial colour-bar under which all the better jobs of industry are reserved for Whites only.

152. Moreover, Africans who do obtain employment in the unskilled and semi-skilled occupations which are open to them are not allowed to form trade unions which have recognition under the Industrial Conciliation Act.
153. This means that strikes of African workers are illegal, and that they are denied the right of collective bargaining which is permitted to the better-paid White workers.
154. The discrimination in the policy of successive South African Governments towards African workers is demonstrated by the so-called 'civilized labour policy' under which sheltered, unskilled Government jobs are found for those white workers who cannot make the grade in industry, at wages which far exceed the earnings of the average African employee in industry.
155. The Government often answers its critics by saying that Africans in South Africa are economically better off than the inhabitants of the other countries in Africa.
156. I do not know whether this statement is true and doubt whether any comparison can be made without having regard to the cost-of-living index in such countries.
157. But even if it is true, as far as the African people are concerned it is irrelevant.
158. Our complaint is not that we are poor by comparison with people in other countries, but that we are poor by comparison with the white people in our own country, and that we are prevented by legislation from altering this imbalance.
159. The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy.
160. White supremacy implies black inferiority.
161. Legislation designed to preserve white supremacy entrenches this notion.
162. Menial tasks in South Africa are invariably performed by Africans.
163. When anything has to be carried or cleaned the white man will look around for an African to do it for him, whether the African is employed by him or not.

164. Because of this sort of attitude, whites tend to regard Africans as a separate breed.
165. They do not look upon them as people with families of their own; they do not realize that they have emotions - that they fall in love like white people do; that they want to be with their wives and children like white people want to be with their; that they want to earn enough money to support their families properly, to feed and clothe them and send them to school.
166. And what 'house-boy' or 'garden-boy' or labourer can ever hope to do this?
167. Pass laws, which to the Africans are among the most hated bits of legislation in South Africa, render any African liable to police surveillance at any time.
168. I doubt whether there is a single African male in South Africa who has not at some stage had a brush with the police over his pass.
169. Hundreds and thousands of Africans are thrown into jail each year under pass law
170. Even worse than this is the fact that pass laws keep husband and wife apart and lead to the breakdown of family life.
171. Poverty and the breakdown of family life have secondary effects.
172. Children wander about the streets of the townships because they have no schools to go to, or no money to enable them to go to school, or no parents at home to see that they go to school, because both parents (if there be two) have to work to keep family alive.
173. This leads to a breakdown in moral standards, to an alarming rise in illegitimacy, and to growing violence which erupts not only politically, but everywhere.
174. Life in the townships is dangerous.
175. There is not a day that goes by without somebody being stabbed or assaulted.
176. And violence is carried out of the townships in the white living areas.
177. People are afraid to walk alone in the streets after dark.

178. Housebreakings and robberies are increasing, despite the fact that the death sentence can now be imposed for such offences.
179. Death sentences cannot cure the festering sore.
180. Africans want to be paid a living wage.
181. Africans want to perform work which they are capable of doing, and not work which the Government declares them to be capable.
182. Africans want to be allowed to live where they obtain work, and not be endorsed out of an area because they were not born there.
183. Africans want to be allowed to own land in places where they work, and not to be obliged to live in rented houses which they can never call their own.
184. Africans want to be part of the general population, and not confined to living in their own ghettos.
185. African men want to have their wives and children to live with them where they work, and not be forced into an unnatural existence in men's hostels.
186. African women want to be with their men folk and not be left permanently widowed in the Reserves.
187. Africans want to be allowed out after eleven o'clock at night and not to be confined to their rooms like little children.
188. Africans want to be allowed to travel in their own country and to seek work they want to and not where the Labour Bureau tells them to.
189. Africans want a just share in the whole of South Africa; they want security stake in society. Above all, we want equal political rights, because without them our disabilities will be permanent.
190. I know this sounds revolutionary to the whites in this country, because the majority of voters will be Africans.

191. This makes the white man fear democracy.
192. But this fear cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the only solution which guarantee racial harmony and freedom for all.
193. It is not true that the enfranchisement of all will result in racial domination.
194. Political division, based on colour, is entirely artificial and, when it disappears, so will the domination of one colour group by another.
195. The ANC has spent half a century fighting against racialism.
196. When it triumphs, it will not change that policy.
197. This then is what the ANC is fighting.
198. Their struggle is a truly national one.
199. It is a struggle of the African people, inspired by their own suffering and their own experience.
200. It is a struggle for the right to live.
201. During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people.
202. I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination.
203. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities.
204. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve.
205. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

NELSON MANDELA'S ADDRESS TO RALLY IN CAPE TOWN (RELEASE FROM PRISON 11 FEBRUARY, 1990)

206. Friends, comrades and fellow South Africans.
207. I greet you all in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all.
208. I stand here before you not as a prophet but as a humble servant of you, the people
209. You're tireless and heroic sacrifices have made it possible for me to be here today.

210. I therefore place the remaining years of my life in your hands.
211. On this day of my release, I extend my sincere and warmest gratitude to the millions of my compatriots and those in every corner of the globe who have campaigned tirelessly for my release.
212. I send special greetings to the people of Cape Town, this city which has home for three decades.
213. Your mass marches and other forms of struggle have served as a constant strength to all political prisoners.
214. I salute the African National Congress
215. It has fulfilled our every expectation in its role as leader of the great freedom.
216. I salute our President, Comrade Oliver Tambo, for leading the ANC even under most difficult circumstances.
217. I salute the rank and file members of the ANC.
218. You have sacrificed life and limb in the pursuit of the noble cause of our struggle.
219. I salute combatants of Umkhonto we Sizwe, like Solomon Mahlangu and A Kriel who have paid the ultimate price for the freedom of all South Africans.
220. I salute the South African Communist Party for its sterling contribution to the struggle for democracy.
221. You have survived 40 years of unrelenting persecution.
222. The memory of great communists like Moses Kotane, Yusuf Dadoo, Bram and Moses Mabhida will be cherished for generations to come.
223. I salute General Secretary Joe Slovo one of our finest patriots.
224. We are heartened by the fact that the alliance between ourselves and the Party is as strong as it always was.

225. I salute the United Democratic Front, the National Education Crisis Commit
226. South African Youth Congress, the Transvaal and Natal Indian Congress COSATU and the many other formations of the Mass Democratic Movement.
227. I also salute the Black Sash and the National Union of South African Students.
228. We note with pride that you have acted as the conscience of white South Africa
229. Even during the darkest days in the history of our struggle you held the flag up high.
230. The large-scale mass mobilisation of the past few years is one of the keys which led to the opening of the final chapter of our struggle.
231. I extend my greetings to the working class of our country.
232. Your organised strength is the pride of our movement.
233. You remain the most dependable force in the struggle to end exploitation oppression.
234. I pay tribute to the many religious communities who carried the campaign for forward when the organisations for our people were silenced.
235. I greet the traditional leaders of our country - many of you continue to walk in the footsteps of great heroes like Hintsa and Sekhukune.
236. I pay tribute to the endless heroism of youth, you, the young lions,
237. You, the young lions, have energised our entire struggle.
238. I pay tribute to the mothers and wives and sisters of our nation.
239. You are the rock-hard foundation of our struggle.
240. Apartheid has inflicted more pain on you than on anyone else.
241. On this occasion, we thank the world community for their great contribution to the anti-apartheid struggle.
242. Without your support our struggle would not have reached this advanced stage.
243. The sacrifice of the frontline states will be remembered by South Africans forever.

244. My salutations would be incomplete without expressing my deep appreciation for the strength given to me during my long and lonely years in prison by my beloved wife and family.
245. I am convinced that your pain and suffering was far greater than my own.
246. Before I go any further, I wish to make the point that I intend making only a few preliminary comments at this stage.
247. I will make a more complete statement only after I have had the opportunity to consult with my comrades.
248. Today the majority of South Africans, black and white, recognise that apartheid has no future.
249. It has to be ended by our own decisive mass action in order to build peace and security.
250. The mass campaign of defiance and other actions of our organisation and people can only culminate in the establishment of democracy.
251. The destruction caused by apartheid on our sub-continent is in- calculable.
252. The fabric of family life of millions of my people has been shattered.
253. Millions are homeless and unemployed.
254. Our economy lies in ruins and our people are embroiled in political strife.
255. Our resort to the armed struggle in 1960 with the formation of the military wing of the ANC, Umkhonto we Sizwe, was a purely defensive action against the violence ofapartheid.
256. The factors which necessitated the armed struggle still exist today.
257. We have no option but to continue.
258. We express the hope that a climate conducive to a negotiated settlement will be created soon so that there may no longer be the need for the armed struggle.

259. I am a loyal and disciplined member of the African National Congress
260. I am therefore in full agreement with all of its objectives, strategies and tactics.
261. The need to unite the people of our country is as important a task now as it always has been.
262. No individual leader is able to take on this enormous task on his own.
263. It is our task as leaders to place our views before our organisation and to allow the democratic structures to decide.
264. On the question of democratic practice, I feel duty bound to make the point that a leader of the movement is a person who has been democratically elected at a national conference. This is a principle which must be upheld without any exceptions.
265. Today, I wish to report to you that my talks with the government have been aimed at normalizing the political situation in the country.
266. We have not as yet begun discussing the basic demands of the struggle.
267. I wish to stress that I myself have at no time entered into negotiations about the future of our country except to insist on a meeting between the ANC and the government.
268. Mr. De Klerk has gone further than any other Nationalist president in taking real steps to normalise the situation.
269. However, there are further steps as outlined in the Harare Declaration that have to be met before negotiations on the basic demands of our people can begin.
270. I reiterate our call for, inter alia, the immediate ending of the State of Emergency and the freeing of all, and not only some, political prisoners.
271. Only such a normalised situation, which allows for free political activity, can allow us to consult our people in order to obtain a mandate.
272. The people need to be consulted on who will negotiate and on the content of such negotiations.

273. Negotiations cannot take place above the heads or behind the backs of our people.
274. It is our belief that the future of our country can only be determined by a body which is democratically elected on a non-racial basis.
275. Negotiations on the dismantling of apartheid will have to address the overwhelming demand of our people for a democratic, non-racial and unitary South Africa.
276. There must be an end to white monopoly on political power and a fundamental restructuring of our political and economic systems to ensure that the inequalities apartheid are addressed and our society thoroughly democratised.
277. It must be added that Mr. De Klerk himself is a man of integrity who is acutely aware of the dangers of a public figure not honouring his undertaking.
278. But as an organisation we base our policy and strategy on the harsh reality we are faced with.
279. And this reality is that we are still suffering under the policy of the Nationalist government.
280. Our struggle has reached a decisive moment.
281. We call on our people to seize this moment so that the process towards democracy is rapid and uninterrupted.
282. We have waited too long for our freedom.
283. We can no longer wait.
284. Now is the time to intensify the struggle on all fronts.
285. To relax our efforts now would be a mistake which generations to come will not be able to forgive.
286. The sight of freedom looming on the horizon should encourage us to redouble our efforts.
287. It is only through disciplined mass action that our victory can be assured.

288. We call on our white compatriots to join us in the shaping of a new South Africa.
289. The freedom movement is a political home for you too.
290. We call on the international community to continue the campaign to isolate the apartheid regime.
291. To lift sanctions now would be to run the risk of aborting the process towards the complete eradication of apartheid.
292. Our march to freedom is irreversible.
293. We must not allow fear to stand in our way.
294. Universal suffrage on a common voter's role in a united democratic and non-racial
295. South Africa is the only way to peace and racial harmony.
296. In conclusion I wish to quote my own words during my trial in 1964.
297. They are true today as they were then: 'I have fought against white domination and I have fought against black domination,
298. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities.
299. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve.
300. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

**ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF CAPE TOWN GRAND. PARADE, ON THE
OCCASION OF HIS INAUGURATION AS STATE PRESIDENT - Cape Town, 9 May
1994**

301. Mr. Master of Ceremonies,
302. Your Excellencies,
303. Members of the Diplomatic Corps,
304. My Fellow South Africans Today we are entering a new era for our country and its people.

305. Today we celebrate not victory of a party, but a victory for all the people of South Africa.
306. Our Country has arrived at a decision.
307. Among all the parties that contested the election, the overwhelming majority of South Africans have mandated the Africa National Congress to lead our Country into the future.
308. The South Africa we have struggled for, in which all our people, be they Africa, Coloured, Indian or White, regard themselves as citizens of one nation is at hand.
309. Perhaps it was history that ordained that it be here, at the Cape of Good Hope that we should lay the foundation stone of our new nation.
310. For it was this Cape, over three centuries ago, that there began the fateful convergence of the people of Africa, Europe and Asia on these shores.
311. It was to this peninsula that the patriots, among them many princes and scholars of Indonesia were dragged in chains.
312. It was on the sandy plains of this peninsula that first battles of the epic wars of resistance were fought.
313. When we look out across Table Bay, the horizon is dominated by Robben Island, whose infamy as a dungeon built to stifle the spirit of freedom is as old as colonialism in South Africa.
314. For three centuries that island was seen as a place to which outcasts can be banished.
315. The names of those who were incarcerated on Robben Island is a roll call of resistance fighters and democrats spanning over three centuries.
316. If indeed this is a Cape of Good Hope, that hope owes much to the spirit of that legion of fighters and others of their calibre.
317. We have fought for a democratic constitution since the 1880s.

318. Ours has been a quest for a constitution freely adopted by the people of South Africa, reflecting their wishes and their aspirations.
319. The struggle for democracy has never been a matter pursued by one race, class, religious community or gender among South Africans.
320. In honouring those who fought to see this day arrive, we honour the best sons and daughters of all our people.
321. We can count amongst them Africans, Coloureds, Whites, Indians, Muslims, Christians, Hindus, Jews - all of them united by a common vision of a better life for the people of this country.
322. It was that vision that inspired us in 1923 when we adopted the first ever Bill of Rights in this country.
323. That same vision spurred us to put forward the African Claims in 1946
324. It is also the founding principle of the freedom charter we adopted as policy in 1955, which in its very first lines, places before South Africa an inclusive basis for citizenship.
325. In 1980s the African National Congress was still setting the pace, being the first major political formation in South Africa to commit itself firmly to a bill of Right. Which we published in November.
326. These milestones give concrete expression to what South Africa can become.
327. They speak of a constitutional, democratic, political order in which, regardless of colour, gender, religion, political opinion or sexual orientation, the law will provide for the equal protection of all citizens.
328. They project a democracy in which the government, whom ever that government may be, will be bound by a higher set of rules, embodies in a constitution, and will not be able govern the country as it pleases.

329. Democracy is based on the majority principle.
330. This is especially true in a country such as ours where the vast majority have been systematically denied their rights.
331. At the same time, democracy also requires that the rights of political and other minorities be safeguarded.
332. In the political order we have established there will regular, open and free elections, at all levels of government - central, provincial and municipal.
333. There shall also be a social order which respects completely the culture, language and religious rights of all sections of our society and the fundamental rights of the individual.
334. The task at hand on will not be easy.
335. But you have mandated us to change Sources at from a country in which the majority lived with little hope, to one in which they can live and work with dignity, with a sense of self-esteem and confidence in the future.
336. The cornerstone of building a better life of opportunity, freedom and prosperity is the Reconstruction and Development Programme.
337. This needs unity of purpose. It needs in action.
338. It requires us all to work together to bring an end to division, an end to suspicion and build nation united in our diversity.
339. The people of South Africa have spoken in these elections.
340. They want change!
341. And change is what they will get.
342. Our plan is to create jobs, promote peace and reconciliation, and to guarantee freedom for all South Africa.
343. We will tackle the widespread poverty so pervasive among the majority of our people.

344. By encouraging investors and the democratic state to support job creating project; which manufacturing will play a central role we will try to change our country from net exporter of raw materials to one that exports finished products through beneficiation.
345. The government will devise policies that encourage and reward productive enterprise among the disadvantaged communities - African, Coloured and Indian.
346. By easing credit conditions, we can assist them to make inroads into the productivity and manufacturing spheres and breakout of the small-scale distribution to which they are presently confined.
347. To raise our country and its people from the morass of racism and apartheid will require determination and effort.
348. As a government, the ANC will create a legal framework that will assist, rather than impede, the awesome task of reconstruction and development of our battered society.
349. While we are and shall remain fully committed to the spirit of a government of national unity, we are determined to initiate and bring about the change that our mandate from the people demands.
350. We place our vision of a new constitutional order for South Africa on the table not as conquerors, prescribing to the conquered.
351. We speak as fellow citizens to heal the wounds of the past with the intent of constructing a new order based on justice for all.
352. This is the challenge that faces all South Africans today, and it is one to which I am certain we will all rise.

Nnamdi Kanu's Speech at BTC Aba

1. Where we are, is Biafra Land.
2. Aba is the spiritual capital of Biafra land.

3. We started in Aba in 2015 at CKC (Christ the King Catholic Cathedral).
4. On the 78th day, heaven authenticated our move that IPOB will restore Biafra and that's what we've come to do.
5. We died in Aba; at National High School.
6. They shot and killed us in other places in Biafra land when they were protesting for my release.
7. As our people rest in the grave, we'll never rest until Biafra is restored.
8. I don't care what they say in Abuja.
9. I don't care what they say in Lagos.
10. I'm a Biafran and we are going to crumble the zoo.
11. Some idiots who are not educated said that they'll arrest me, and I ask them to come.
12. I'm in Biafra land. If any of them leaves Biafra land alive know that this is not IPOB.
13. Tell them that's what I said.
14. Tell Buhari that I'm in Aba and any person who comes to arrest Nnamdi Kanu in Biafra land will die here.
15. I'll never go on exile I assure you.
16. Some people talk about restructuring, are we doing restructuring of Nigeria now?
17. Are we doing fiscal federalism?
18. Are we doing devolution?
19. What we want is Biafra!
20. Forget all the nonsense they write about us.
21. We are not slowing down, no man born of a woman can stop us and we are going to crumble this Zoo. Nigeria is a Zoo.
22. They thought we are joking and God gave us a simple message that no one can stop us.

23. The movement to restore Biafra is unstoppable.
24. The message of heaven is what I bring to you.
25. Don't be afraid.
26. The plans of our enemies are not going to be actualized.
27. The enemies are planning, but we are formidable.
28. We are going to boycott Anambra state election.
29. After Anambra 2017, in 2019, there'll be no elections in Biafra land.
30. Signed and sealed.
31. My message is that there'll not be election in Biafra land ever again until they give us date for referendum.

Nnamdi Kanu's Speech at the World Igbo Congress on September 06, 2015

[Being part of an address by Mazi Nnamdi Kanu, Leader of Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB), at the Plenary Session of World Igbo Congress (WIC) in Los Angeles--California, on September 6th, 2015]

32. With great humility and submission to the will of the Most High Chukwu Okike Abiama puru ime ihe nile, I stand before you today here in Los Angeles California, in the presence of the children of light, the custodians of our traditions in faraway lands, the bringers of hope and saviour of the Black race the World Igbo Congress.
33. I acknowledge the presence of each and every one of you, especially the members of the high table, distinguished ladies and gentlemen here gathered and those listening around the world.
34. I say "ndewo nu umu Chineke" to all of you.
35. It is my guess that the question on the lips of every delegate here today is perhaps 'what is Nnamdi Kanu doing here at the congress of all Igbos worldwide talking about the global effort to restore Biafra'?

36. My answer as always is a very simple one, 'izu ka nma na nne ji'.
37. There will be no Biafra without the support of World Igbo Congress in particular and the Igbos in the USA in general.
38. Every right-thinking human being knows that the slogan "One Nigeria" is a ruse.
39. Nigeria was not a united country and will NEVER be a united country even in the foreseeable future.
40. To refresh our memories, Nigeria is a country made up of three distinct nations with mutually exclusive and diametrically opposed and irreconcilable value systems.
41. Among these nations, BIAFRA is the only one with a distinct and internationally accepted Republican value system predicated upon the twin philosophy of (1) "Egbe bere ugo bere" the principle of natural justice, fairness, equity and equality before the spiritual and temporal laws and (2) "Eziokwu bu ndu" which is the weaving of the irreducibility of truth into the day to day discourse of life, in essence a life of nobility predicated on honesty.
42. Furthermore, and ingrained in the DNA of every Biafran, is the axiomatic expression that "Chi bu Eze" or God is King. Regrettably, the British colonial masters forcefully merged BIAFRA with the other two nations of AREWA and ODUDUWA to form what is known today as Nigeria.
43. Implicit in our value system and its incompatibility with those from other merged nations lies the need for the immediate extrication and restoration of the nation of Biafra from the country called Nigeria to represent as it was ordained a pinnacle of hope for the black race the world over.
44. That Nigeria is perpetually in the doldrums politically, economically, and socially is of no surprise to any discerning mind and keen followers of the miserable history of Nigeria.

45. After all, is it not why today we found ourselves in far flung lands like the USA and many more countries around the world?
46. The frustrating part of this history is the fact that Biafrans have been at the receiving end of the sorry state of affairs in Nigeria even though they possess the manpower and resources to sustain themselves and flourish as an independent nation.
47. Biafrans are known for their industrious and enterprising lifestyle propelled by sheer hard work and the “can do” spirit.
48. Biafrans don’t run away from history, rather they make history.
49. Biafrans are adventurous and are not afraid to venture into the unknown.
50. But the same cannot be said of other merged nations in the country called Nigeria.
51. Biafrans have been held down and their development arrested by virtue of merging them with other nations to form Nigeria.
52. One of the questions going through the minds of many could be; but who are actually the Biafrans or put in another way; what is the footprint of Biafraland?
53. Biafraland consists of the states in the present South East and South-South with the exception of Edo state but including Igbanke in Edo state.
54. Biafraland also include Igala in Kogi state and Idoma land in Benue state.
55. In all these areas we have the traditional four-market days and their women tie two-piece wrappers and have names and words that are interchangeable irrespective of the state.
56. For over 100 years Biafrans have endured the unholy marriage called amalgamation and creation of Nigeria by the British colonial masters.
57. Biafrans at home and in the diaspora can no longer endure the subjugation of Biafra under Nigeria.

58. As in most revolutions and emancipation struggles, patriotic citizens in diaspora are always in the lead for collective objective of achieving nationhood.
59. A very good example is the case of the State of Israel in which the Jews in America funded and supported the independence of the nation of Israel.
60. We share a common ancestry with our Jewish brothers and should follow similar strategy in achieving the nation of Biafra.
61. In this regard, WIC is expected to play a critical role in the quest for the restoration of the nation of BIAFRA.
62. As some of you may have known, there is an ongoing effort to galvanize Biafrans globally to work together to achieve the collective objective of restoration of the nation of Biafra.
63. This effort is spearheaded by the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) with Radio Biafra London (RBL) as the media arm.
64. The operational headquarters of IPOB is in Vitoria-Spain, outside of Nigeria for obvious reasons.
65. IPOB is registered and recognized by various countries all over the world.
66. Coincidentally, the USA headquarters of IPOB is here in Los Angeles—California.
67. But what has IPOB/RBL achieved, you may ask?
68. Through the works of IPOB/RBL within the past three years, we have achieved the following:
 - i. Radio Biafra is today the only African institution in the history of the world to be ranked No.1 in an independent survey against other (media) organizations from around the world. That Radio Biafra is today more popular than BBC Radio is clear testimony to what we can accomplish as a race when we put our minds to it.

- ii. Designation of Boko Haram as F.T.O. (Foreign Terrorist Organization) by the Department of States of the USA. We have the proof to make this claim.
- iii. IPOB gained recognition as national liberation movement in over 88 countries where we are registered and carry out our meetings and rallies unhindered.
- iv. Initiated and continued annual 30th of May Biafra Heroes Remembrance Day. The 2015 edition at Aba recorded over 3 million attendees without a single adverse incident recorded.
- v. Forced the Nigerian Government to halt the continuous aerial bombardment of Cross Rivers and Akwa Ibom under the guise of fighting kidnappers' havens. We alerted the world that Nigeria used the banned NAPALM bombs on Biafrans for three consecutive days of June 17th—19th.
- vi. We have raised the consciousness of our people on the Rights and the legality of their quest for their nation of Biafra based on the UNDRIP which Nigeria is a signatory to:
- vii. Debunked and dismantled all the lies and innuendoes dished out by Yoruba and Northern media concerning Biafrans, which in some cases are geared towards dividing the various sections/areas of Biafraland.
- viii. We have formed an effective opposition to the tyrannical rule of the current president of Nigeria and checkmated him in trying to take Biafrans for a ride.
- ix. Nigerian Police now know that you can no longer kill a Biafran and get away with it. Through the activities of IPOB in Igweocha (Port Harcourt) the officer responsible for the shooting of an unarmed bus driver has been dismissed from the Nigerian Police pending trial. You will agree with me that this has never happened before.
- x. Through our work/efforts, we got Microsoft to recognize the word Biafra.

- x. We have brought Biafra restoration into global discourse such that media juggernauts such as CNN, BBC, VOA, RFI, etc., who hitherto stayed away from discussing Biafra are now forced to talk about Biafra.
 - xii. We are also registered with the ECOSOC department of United Nations as INDIGENOUS PEOPLE OF BIAFRA, where we made it clear that no organization is representing us but we are Biafrans and representing ourselves.
69. In my humble submission, I do strongly believe that WIC can get involved and help achieve more.
70. The Igbo speaking Biafrans are known for their resourcefulness and resoluteness when they make up their minds to embark on a mission.
71. The Igbos from all I know about them, do collectively abhor evil, they love hard work, helped one another, and tenaciously believed that “nwanne di na mba.”
72. I am using this opportunity to call upon each member of WIC to join hands with other Biafrans and members of IPOB to work towards the restoration of our dear nation of Biafra.
73. You can help in diverse ways such as funding, diplomatic connections, lobbying your congressmen and people of significant clout and influence, and sundry activities geared toward the singular goal of achieving sovereignty for the nation of Biafra.
74. Your loved ones in Biafraland look up to you because we have it in our saying that “Onuru ube nwanne agbala oso.”
75. BIAFRA restoration is here, all you have to do is put in your efforts and BIAFRA will come.
76. Like many other well-meaning Biafrans of Igbo extraction around the world, I look forward to the day when World Igbo Congress will be held in any of our towns and villages in Biafraland.

77. May Chukwu Okike Abiama bless all of you and bless the nation of BIAFRA
78. Mazi Nnamdi Kanu
79. Leader of the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB).

Nnamdi Kanu's World Broadcast

80. I promised that I will be coming to Biafra and I came.
81. I do not recognise the court of the Zoo.
82. I want the people of the Middle Belt to rise and join IPOB.
83. IPOB Military intelligent evacuated me from my compound when the Army of the Zoo attacked me.
84. I am in Israel and the efficiency of MOSAD will be replicated in Biafra, we shall hunt everyone down to avenge the death of IPOB members.
85. The Governor of Abia State directed the assault on my Father who is a Monarch.
86. I thank @realDonaldTrump and the government of Israel who stood by IPOB in our time of need.
87. I thank Prof. Ben Nwabueze who stood by me.
88. I want to send my solidarity to @GovAyoFayose and assure him that Biafra will stand by him in this hour of need.
89. We will have a special place for him in Biafra.
90. I thank all my sureties that stood by me, my unavailability was forced on me.
91. The Army of the Zoo killed my dog Jack and few other people in my compound.
92. I am sorry for what my sureties are passing through but I want to assure them that they will have a special place in Biafra.
93. I shall not be honouring the Court.
94. The notion that I jumped bail is a fallacy in Law.
95. I did not jump bail.

96. On the 14th of September, 2017, the terrorists of the Zoo came to kill me.
97. They know if I go to court Nigeria will burn and I was forced to leave.
98. I did not jump bail.
99. The Zoo called Nigeria cannot jail me.
100. I will fight till the last day.
101. Binta Nyanko court failed to ask @HQNigerianArmy why they invaded my home.
102. Nigerian court is a Kangaroo court.
103. I did not jump bail.
104. I left because the court failed to protect.
105. I am not a Nigerian.
106. I already renounced Nigeria in 2015.
107. I am a Biafran with British Nationality.
108. I cannot be tried by a court I do not recognise.
109. I do not recognise Nigeria.
110. I can only come to the court with UN supervision.
111. IPOB will liberate Biafra and we will not take part in any election until we get a referendum and this is not negotiable.
112. We will achieve this by every necessary means.
113. We thank Israel for all the contributions they made to IPOB.
114. I owe my survival to the State of Israel.
115. I decree that there is no longer South East or South-South Nigeria, it shall be known as Biafra.
116. Without referendum, nothing will happen in Nigeria.
117. IPOB will not participate in any election and that position will never change.

118. IPOB is the largest mass movement in the whole world; we will not stop until Biafra is fully restored.
119. Chukwu Okike Abiama has assured me that Biafra shall come; all collaborators will feel the full weight of the anger of the Biafran people.
120. I am coming back to Biafra land soon and I will bring hell with me, the way it has never been seen before.