

Pronominal Choices in Mandela's Speech at The International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People: A Critical Discourse Analysis

(PhD.)

Nazar Abdulhafidh Ubeid

(PhD.)

Ali Qassim Ali

University of Basra/ College of Arts

Abstract:

The present study aims to offer a linguistic evaluation of Nelson Mandela's speech at The International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People on the 4th of December 1997 in Pretoria and its mode of engagement with the context of its discursive situation. The study follows Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) to investigate pronominal choices made by Mandela in his speech and to what extent such choices help in creating identity, power and solidarity. It discloses how President Mandela uses pronominal forms, as a rhetorical device, in his speech to construct various identities to convey his political and humanistic stance, and solidarity with the Palestinian people. It also investigates how those pronominals used by the speaker operate as linguistic indicators of inclusion and exclusion. This notion of clusivity is very much related to the way these pronouns express inclusionary and exclusionary reference to the actors presented in a discursive presentation of reality in a soci-political context. Therefore, the speaker is capable of establishing a representation of the self and placing the discursive actors either inside or outside the deictic centre in particular historical and socio-ideological circumstances. The use of Fairclough's (1989) three-tier analytical framework, i.e., description, interpretation and explanation help reconstruct the message and the ideological power of the speech. The study casts light on the relationship that Mandela (the addressor) establishes with the audience (the addressee), whom the speech is addressed to. The results show that pronominal choices made by Mandela in his speech helped him as creator of solidarity and as a persuasive strategy as well.

أختيار الضمائر في خطاب مانديلا في اليوم العالمي للتضامن مع الشعب الفلسطيني: دراسة تحليل نقدي للخطاب

الدكتور
علي قاسم علي

الدكتور
نزار عبد الحافظ عبيد

جامعة البصرة/ كلية الآداب

المخلص:

تهدف الدراسة الى تقديم تقييم لغوي لخطاب نيلسون مانديلا في اليوم العالمي للتضامن مع الشعب الفلسطيني الذي القاه في الرابع من كانون الاول عام ١٩٩٧ في بريتوريا ونمط علاقته مع سياق الموقف الخطابي. تعتمد الدراسة على التحليل النقدي للخطاب (CDA) لدراسة اختيارات مانديلا للضمائر في خطابه لمعرفة مدى مساهمه هذه الاختيارات في التعبير عن الهوية والسلطة والتضامن. تكشف الدراسة كيفية استخدام نيلسون مانديلا للضمائر بوصفها اداة خطابية لبناء هويات (او كيانات) خطابية وذلك للتعبير عن موقفه السياسي والانساني وتضامنه مع الشعب الفلسطيني. وتهدف كذلك الى البحث في مدى استخدامه لتلك الضمائر كمؤشرات لغوية عن الاندماج او الفصل. وهذا المفهوم يتعلق كثيرا بطريقة استخدام تلك الضمائر للتعبير عن دلالات الاندماج او الفصل للمتحدث والتي تظهر في تقديمه للحقائق في الخطاب ضمن السياق الاجتماعي والسياسي. فيمكن للمتحدث ان يؤسس تمثيلا للذات ويضع الاطراف موضوع الخطاب اما داخل او خارج المركز التأشيري للضمائر ومايتعلق بها في سياقات تاريخية وادولوجية اجتماعية. ان استخدام الاطار التحليلي ليفركلف (١٩٨٩) والمكون من ثلاث مديات (او مستويات): الوصف والتأويل والتفسير، يساعد في بناء رسالة وايدولوجيا الخطاب. وتسلط الدراسة الضوء على العلاقة بين مانديلا (المتحدث) ومستمعيه الذين يوجه اليهم خطابه. كما توضح النتائج ان اختيار مانديلا للضمائر في خطابه هذا قد ساعده في التعبير عن تضامنه وكذلك في انشاء استراتيجيات اقناع في نفس الوقت.

1. Introduction:

Mandela had been a good friend to the Palestinian People and their leaders. He was a key and long-time supporter of the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Mandela and the Palestinians share the same ideology as freedom fighters and victims of apartheid. The Palestinians always remember his frequent messages of solidarity with them as a humanist, a freedom fighter, and president of South Africa or as an international figure. Mandela was an inspiration for Palestinians and all those who suffer injustice and resist occupiers. His message of solidarity from his 1997 speech in which he said "our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians," has been repeatedly invoked across Palestine. Mandela who also strongly criticised Israel's close ties with the former apartheid government in South Africa. Comparisons between the former regime in South Africa and the Israeli occupation of the [Palestinian territories](#) have become relatively commonplace not only among Palestinians and their supporters, but also among Israelis and the international community.

In 1977, the General Assembly called for the annual observance of 29 November as the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. This date was chosen for its meaning and significance to Palestinians as it was on that day in 1947, the UN General Assembly adopted what came to be known as the Partition Resolution which provided for the establishment in Palestine of a "Jewish State" and an "Arab State." Of the two States to be created under this resolution, only one, Israel, has so far come into being.

2. Theoretical Framework:

CDA is both a continuation of critical linguistics as well as a transdisciplinary field derived from linguistics, with interests in language as social practice. CDA looks at discourse on the basis of the assumption that meaning is achieved through various representational systems, and language is one of them. CDA understands meaning as to be embedded within social, historical, political, and ideological contexts. Hence, people use meaning in discursive processes to

accomplish or attempt to accomplish something. So it should be emphasized that all meanings are motivated and always being invented as people make their choices from the representational systems available to use them to create meanings. Therefore, discourse both constructs and represents the world. CDA provides a framework for bringing together critical social theories and theories of linguistics to give insights of the role of discourse in the construction and representation of the world. Consequently, CDA can provide a clear view of the way meaning constructs and is constructed by world view. It also supplies analytical and interpretive tools that help in understanding discourse within its context to change the world for the better (Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 1995 and 2000).

CDA provides helpful methods in various areas, especially in the field of the relationship between discursive text or talk and its social and cultural contexts and studies the concepts of power and ideology. CDA studies texts and events in various social practices, proposing a theory and a method to describe, interpret and explain language in socio-historical context. The areas which can be tackled by CDA are education, literacy, gender, racism, ideology, economics, advertisement, institutional and media language, and most importantly political discourse. In all these areas, CDA examines and sheds light on issues like power asymmetries, manipulation, structural inequalities and solidarity. It contributes to provide scholars with valuable theoretical and methodological apparatus to discuss issues related to racism, discrimination based on sex, control and institutional manipulation, violence, national identity, self-identity and gender identity, social exclusion. CDA currently refers to the interdisciplinary field adopted by scholars who take the text as the basic unit of speech and communication and who turn to the analysis of social relations of struggle and conflict (Wodak 2001: 2).

Human life is social and language is a social practice so the interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity of both is typical of (CDA). Such a network of relationships is clearly discussed by Chouliarak and Fairclough (1999: 16):

We see CDA as bringing a variety of theories into dialogue, especially social theories on the one hand and linguistic theories on the other, so that its theory is a shifting synthesis of other theories, though what it itself theorizes in particular is the mediation between the social and the linguistic –the ‘order of discourse,’ the social structuring of semiotic hybridity (interdiscursivity). The theoretical constructions of discourse which CDA tries to operationalize can come from various disciplines, and the concept of ‘operationalization’ entails working in a transdisciplinary way where the logic of one discipline (for example, sociology) can be ‘put to work’ in the development of another (for example, linguistics).

Political Discourse has gained a wide range of consideration in CDA, simply because all discourse may be looked upon as political (Shapiro, 1981). Issues of power, conflict, control, and solidarity are being worked out in political discourse. Apparently, the scope of political discourse includes all persons and institutions that operate in political environments to achieve political goals. Such achievement comes across language choice which manipulated for specific political goal. Wilson (2003) discusses the involvement of all linguistic levels in political discourse from lexis to pragmatics.

In terms of using pronominals as a means of persuasion in political discourse, Håkansson (2012) investigates the pronominal choices made by George W. Bush and Barak Obama in their state of the union speeches. The results suggest that such choices of those presidents do not differ significantly. In addition, the results show that personal pronoun ‘I’ is used when the speaker wants to speak as an individual rather than as a representative of a group. The pronoun ‘you’ is used

both as generic pronoun as well as when the President addresses the congress, without speaking on their behalf. 'We' is used to invoke a sense of collectivity and to share responsibility. 'They' is used to separate self from other. In short, these results indicate that the referents of personal pronouns vary greatly depending on the context of the speech.

Bello (2013) studies President Jonathan's presidential declaration speech. He examines the use of personal pronouns in political discourse following Fairclough's (1989) three-tier analytical framework, i.e. description, interpretation and explanation. The results show that when politicians use pronouns, they tend to use them not only as person deixis or anaphoric references, but also in terms of political interests and associations. For instance, the use of the pronouns 'we' and 'us' reflects the so many dimensions for different political purposes.

Jarraya (2013) studies the use of personal pronouns in Tunisian President Ben Ali's last speech and what role these pronouns play in his attempt to persuade opposition figures and the public in Tunisia. The results show that deictic pronouns are used as strategic tools of power. The use of 'I', which expresses power, relies on explicit performative verbs.

Levinson (1983: 69) categorizes plural pronouns by encoding them as 'we' and 'they'. He makes a distinction between two types of first person plural pronouns, 'we'. One is called inclusive 'we', which includes the speaker and the addressee when the speaker is one person asking another about something they share or would both like to. The other is the exclusive 'we', which exclude the speaker from the reference. Accordingly, there are two main uses of the plural pronoun 'we': self-referring and other-referring.

The present research paper follows CDA as theoretical framework to analyze the speech delivered by Nelson Mandela at The International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People on 4 December 1997. Fairclough, (2001) and Wilson (1990) argue that politicians use person deixis to manipulate people, make alliances, attack, or express an

ideological basis. Moreover, Chilton (2004: 6) observes that “socialisation of humans involving the formation of coalitions, the signaling of group boundaries and all that these developments imply, including the emergence of what is called reciprocal altruism.” In fact, CDA concerns the social context of a given text. Text, here, is looked upon as products of a socially or politically determined context. The main concern here is the discourse community which Johnstone (2008: 133) defines as “a group of people who regularly talk to one another about a particular topic or in a particular situation.”

Power and solidarity are the two interrelated important social elements that are constructed and expressed in discourse (Johnstone, 2008: 129). Power and solidarity are main principles in any human relationships. They can be found in mutual orientation context as members of such social context share almost the same knowledge.

Power and solidarity are relationships, created by the usage of certain linguistic elements, between groups of people or speaker and recipients in discourse on different levels. The notions of power and solidarity are universal as addressers usually both try to get close to their audience and they use address forms to produce solidarity by approaching the audience. However, Power and solidarity manifest themselves in a variety of ways in pronominal usage.

Pronominal choice as one of the rhetorical devices is capable of covering a wide range of social contexts such as: politeness, respect, intimacy and solidarity. The analysis of rhetorical devices in political discourse is highly required to see how politicians speak, present ideas in a persuasive discourse, communicate their thoughts and impressions effectively.

Jones and Peccei (2004: 41) state that “language can be used to influence (rather than control) people’s political views by exploring in details the ways in which politicians can use language to their own advantage.” Using personal pronouns can be considered as one of

solidarity markers, politicians emphasize their key views, persuade audience to be sympathetic with their views, and make their speech more effective.

As to power, according to CDA, language by itself is not powerful but gains power through the choices made by powerful participants in the discursive context. Hence, there is no balance between relationships and the ability to create and shape meaning in discourse or affect the way it is interpreted. Wodak (2001) also argues that power is indicated not only by grammatical forms within a discursive event, but also by a participants' control of a social occasion which through analysis and interpretation, it is possible to uncover linguistic structures of power in discourse.

The language use of the addresser forms and reflects different ideologies held by addressees. One participant may have power over others to a certain degree to control their behavior or reaction to the speech (text or talk). As suggested by Bull and Fetzer (2006) the conception of power and solidarity affects the use of names, titles, and deictic words including pronouns. On the surface, the referential domain of pronouns could be vague; this may lend them ability to be employed as persuasive tools as they do not carry their own meaning (function words), but gain it from their referents or the nouns which they are used instead.

Politicians usually aim at convincing their addresses by argument, mostly through power and solidarity to persuade them on an emotional (psychological) level or even manipulate them making use of the socio-political knowledge that the two parties share. However, politicians (as encoders) use multitude of rhetorical and stylistic devices that language could render to achieve the greatest impact. To express and highlight solidarity and communicate opinions persuasively, the addresser uses certain advance strategies in the form of expectations, recommendations, advices, and warnings. Such a process produces some kind of distancing in the form of positive 'self' and negative 'other'. This creates and shapes some sort of political polarization.

The importance of pronouns lies in their ability to encode important features of the context of the utterance. They become meaningful only when used in actual discourse. Pronominal choice encodes the social identity of participants or the social relationship between them. The meaning associated with pronominal usage is more dependent on the specific context of the discursal event and the roles and goals of the speaker. Pronominal selection shows different ways in which speakers present themselves with respect to other participants and groups involved in the discursal event. Hence pronominal choice is seen as coherent indication of the speaker's presentation of self (Kuo, 2002). It signals different ways in which speakers are presented and their involvement in the topic of the discourse. Such a linguistic choice can point at attitudes and stances with respect to topics and people involved in the discursal event. Speakers can express their own presence in discourse, the presence of others and the relationships they entertain with these participants by the mechanisms of pronominal reference.

Pronominals are words or expressions that are used to refer to identities (referents) that are already present or active in the mind of audience. Such referents are judged to be already and uniquely identifiable. Pronominals, in their different modifications, stand for identities that are sufficiently known without being named; hence, their antecedents, or nouns are therefore generally understood. This fact enables them of creating intimacy and indicating the stance of the speaker.

3. Procedure

The pronominal choices in the chosen speech are analyzed in terms of the concept of power and solidarity according to Fairclough's (1989) three-tier analytical model of CDA, to study the role of such linguistic selections and patterning in demonstrating the concepts of power solidarity within the socio-cultural context of the discursive event. The selected speech is downloaded from the following website:

<http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=3384>

4. Analysis and Results

The selected speech is in English, it has (1,173) words and appears in 18 paragraphs. Instances of pronominal reference in this speech are (84), that is (7.16%); these are distributed as shown in (Table 1) below. As it can be seen from Table 1, which illustrates the frequency of pronominals used by Mandela in the selected speech, 59 (70.23%) of them are instances of first person pronominals, 55 (65.47%) of these are from what can be called the 'we group' (with instances realized through the possessive 'our' 'us' or pronominals like 'we all', 'all of us', and 'us all'), and 4 (4.76%) are occurrences of 'I'. Second person pronominals appear only 2 times, that is (2.39%) only in the form of the pronoun 'you'. This table also shows that there are 23 (27.38%) occurrences of third person pronominals.

	Pronominals	Number	Percentage	Total	Percentage
1st	I	4	4.76	55	70.23
	We	24	28.57		
	We all	1	1.19		
	Our	20	23.80		
	Us	2	2.38		
	All of us	4	4.76		
	Us all	1	1.19		
	All	3	3.57		
2nd	You	2	2.38	2	2.39
3rd	They	2	2.38	23	27.38
	It	6	7.14		
	Other(s)	8	9.52		
	None	1	1.19		
	Themselves	1	1.19		
	These/Those	5	5.95		
				84	

Table 1: Distribution of Pronominal forms in Nelson Mandela's speech

It is clear that first person pronominals are used most frequently than other types in the selected speech. Among these, the 'we group' takes the highest frequency of occurrence. The analysis shows that these pronominals are used collectively to range in reference from referring to Mandela and his supporters before victory, including his group or political party and later his government and people of South Africa, to himself, the Palestinians and all humanists and supporters. This also includes his other audience (addressees) as well. Such a pronominal usage indicates that Mandela attempts to involve all existing participants in to share his ideas and to demonstrate solidarity as a supporter to the Palestinians in their conflict with the Zionist Israelis to gain freedom and justice. This is also supported by instances of single first personal pronoun which appear only in the first part of the speech, almost in the first (14) paragraphs. Their function ranges from establishing the identity of the speaker to shaping his stance in regard to the issue as a victorious freedom fighter, a now president of South Africa and his cabinet and an international humanist. This is a professional manipulative political usage of what Fairclough (2001: 149) pointed to as a slippery 'we'. Blackwell (2007: 18) also emphasizes the same point stating that "'we' is the most slippery pronoun of all." Such pronominal usage here indicates the various representations and dimensions of the referents. Such a tactical usage establishes a multidimensional network of relations between Mandela and the addressees. Besides, the use of these pronominals also plays a role as representatives of the perspective that both addresser and the audience share which is the same common attitude concerning the topic discussed. Such pronominal choice indicates that the present information is commonly shared by both sides (addresser and addressee), and it also shows how the host (Mandela) hopes to share the same perspective with his guest the audience and all participants whom he thinks that his message will reach.

Mandela sets the basis of intimacy with his audience by starting his speech with direct address via names, titles or generic addressing then moves to the use of pronominal forms. This could clearly indicate the speaker's intimacy with the addressees especially the Palestinians who are in fact his guests since the gathering is held in Pretoria, South Africa. It is also an appeal to "ideological commonsense" (Fairclough, 1989: 88) which is suggested at the beginning by Mandela's opening salutation:

*Mr. Chairman;
Mr. Suleyman al-Najab,
Special Emissary of President Yasser Arafat;
Members of the diplomatic corps;
Distinguished Guests,*

Then Mandela moves to use 'I' which recurs only 4 times most of them in the first part of his speech. This is captured in the following extract which is the third paragraph in the speech:

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the organisers of the event, particularly the United Nations Information Centre and the UNISA Centre for Arabic and Islamic Studies for this magnificent act of compassion, to keep the flames of solidarity, justice and freedom burning.

However, Mandela's 'I' dissolves quickly into 'we' group pronominals to show his eagerness to move from the position of authority to that of common man. This continuum of 'I – you – we' in the selected speech indicates Mandela's efforts to persuade the audience of his ideological position. This also enables him to declare his stance and solidarity with the Palestinian people and their rights.

The use of first person plural pronominals, as it is also argued by Pennycook (1994b: 176) implies both authority and communality; such cases can be seen clearly in political speeches. Mandela, by the use of

these pronominals, expresses solidarity with his audience. For persuasive and manipulative purposes, he inclines to manipulate such personal pronominals when he addresses his audience. Politicians give attention to such a use to create that sense of solidarity with their audience to ascribe to their shared experiences and beliefs.

Mandela's use of 'we group' pronominals as involvement strategy integrates his beliefs into the addressed community and also projects his values on them. This also reminds the addressees all of the past support and solidarity they share and ensures its continuation in future.

As shown in (Table 1) 'we' got the the highest frequency among all the pronominals used in this speech, 24 time which rates (28.57%). 'We' also conveys the speaker's wish to have an intimate relationship and solidarity with the referent by taking their side. Mandela produces solidarity by approaching audience with the use the first person plural pronoun, which represents the identification of the speakers with the audience. This is the inclusive use of these pronominals. As Fairclough (2001:12), acknowledges this inclusive 'we' can make people feel "dragooned into partnership": "this use of 'we' and its group first person pronominals can be manipulative; it can claim a spurious solidarity, for instance when a politician uses it to convince people that she is 'one of them'". This is explicated below:

We are proud as a government, and as the overwhelming majority of South Africans to be part of an international consensus taking root that the time has come to resolve the problems of Palestine.

As early as February 1995, our government formalised its relations with the State of Palestine when we established full diplomatic relations. We are proud of the modest technical assistance that our government is offering Palestine in such areas as Disaster Management, women's empowerment and

assistance to handicapped children. But the various discussions with our counterparts in Palestine are an indication that we can do more.

But we know too well that our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians.....

By using 'we' and its variants of pronominals and all other instances of first person pronominals, Mandela tries to make a manipulative use of them in his speech based on the ambiguous nature of their referential function. In fact, this ambiguity is resulted from the mixed use of inclusive 'we' and the exclusive 'we'. Mandela uses the inclusive 'we' successfully to emphasize his shared beliefs and opinions with his audience, thereby creates solidarity with them. On the other hand, he uses the exclusive 'we' when he talks as the president of South Africa and their experience before gaining freedom. This exclusive 'we' seems quite like a royal 'we' which emphasizes the fact that they had succeeded as freedom fighters and could be followed as a living model by the Palestinians and others. However, this 'we' which seems to be used exclusively, in fact, implies that kind of common ideologies and opinions shared by the South Africans and the Palestinians which renders the opportunity of possible reciprocal ideological exchanged between the two parties:

We need to do more as government, as the ANC and other parties, as South Africans of all religious and political persuasions to spur on the peace process. All of us should be as vocal in condemning violence and the violation of human rights in this part of the world as we do with regard to other areas. We need to send a strong message to all concerned that an attempt by anyone to isolate partners in negotiations from their own mass base; and attempt to co-opt them is bound to hurt the peace process as a whole.

As Fairclough (2001:157) states, the use of such pronominal forms expresses solidarity especially 'we' which is clearly manipulated for "speaking on behalf of 'the people'" or some specified groups who share certain ideology. This is done by using pronouns exclusively or inclusively to demonstrate solidarity and involvement which can be included in the term 'stance'. Consequently, with this use of pronouns, the political language in Mandela's speeches achieves a high level of success and helps him to communicate his thoughts and his purposes. By such an intimacy created between Mandela and the audience, he showed sympathy and solidarity, and made audience remember important and significant information:

When in 1977, the United Nations passed the resolution inaugurating the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people, it was asserting the recognition that injustice and gross human rights violations were being perpetrated in Palestine.

Mandel's use of 'we' group pronominals plays an important role in increasing the intimacy between him and the audience. This language use helps to create a feeling that he and the audience are in the same team, and that they share the same plight. He employed the 'We group' pronominals to call for a shared sense of recognition of the experience. Moreover, the use of these pronominals helps to show the solidarity in his speech. With the tactics of such a use, he brings himself to the audience's position in order to express his highly valuable experience that made his speech more informal and reliable. Furthermore, the audience also felt that they themselves and [him] have the same feeling and experience. He tries to attract his audience's attention and stimulate their action by creating intimacy, solidarity through the frequent use of these pronominals, and also creating a feeling of inclusion and togetherness.

Moreover, Pennycook (1994b: 176) uses the term “problematic we” and emphasizes its function ofclusivity and some other pragmatic and context bound roles in any discursive event. The use of of ‘we’ implies also the concept ofclusivity in relation to some other pronouns:

... let me start with that problematic ‘we’. ‘We’ is always simultaneously inclusive and exclusive, a pronoun of solidarity and of rejection, of inclusion and exclusion. On the one hand it defines a ‘we’, and on the other it defines a ‘you’ or a ‘they’... it is also frequently a covert assumption about shared communality. Thus, whether in political speeches..., academic writing..., or many other forms of language use, there is an instant claiming of authority and communality in the use of ‘we’.

Pennebaker (2011:70) also looks at pronominals of the ‘we group’ as “tricky”. He believes that these “we-words” are related to showing solidarity but at the same wide in their range of usage and the relation they indicate between the speaker and his audience. Hence, they provide the speaker with rhetoric opportunity to encode, if manipulate them professionally, a complex network of relations with the issue and recipients.

In addition, Mandela tries to put himself and his audience as a one whole by such a manipulation of pronominals in his speech. He also attempts to show whom that he supports the rights of the Palestinians and regards their issue as an international one on which world peace and justice highly depend.

However, even the low frequency of third person pronominals 23 times with a rate of (27.38%) (Table 2) below, is manipulated by Mandela to refer not to those who are opponent to his beliefs as usual, but to those who share them but absent:

...the efforts of the multitude of Israeli and Palestinian citizens of goodwill who are marching together, campaigning together, for

an end to prevarication. These soldiers of peace are indeed sending a message to us all, that the day is not far off, when Palestinian and Jewish children will enjoy the gay abandon of children of God in a peaceful and prosperous region.

These soldiers of peace recognise that the world we live in is rising above the trappings of religious and racial hatred and conflict. They recognise that the spurning of agreements reached in good faith... They know from their own experience that, it is in a situation such as this, that extremists on all sides thrive, fed by the blood lust of centuries gone by.

These mostly refer to a political agent with whom the speaker does clearly identify himself, they are Palestinians, Israelis and others from the international community who share the same beliefs with Mandela and most of his audience. This indicates that he is supporting them and part of the wide community whom he shows solidarity with.

First person pronouns	Second Person Pronouns	Third Person Pronouns	Total
59	2	23	84
70.23%	2.39%	27.38	

Table 2: The Distribution of First, Second and Third Person Pronominals in Nelson Mandela's speech

This allows us to say that Mandela is not speaking as an individual but his words point to a principle: that he has come to represent. His group is presented as being engaged in a continuous effort to build a new social reality in the region and therefore has acquired political legitimacy through its own presence in the area of the conflict.

In this sense we can say that the speech is highly solidary, because, although Mandela is physically pronouncing the speech, and is also presumably its author, he never points at himself as the source of it, but indicates that he is the integral representative of a social group:

We have assembled once again as South Africans, our Palestinian guests and as humanists to express our solidarity with the people of Palestine.

We are proud as a government, and as the overwhelming majority of South Africans to be part of an international consensus taking root that the time has come to resolve the problems of Palestine.

We are proud as humanists, that the international consensus on the need for the implementation of the Oslo Agreements is finding expression in the efforts of the multitude of Israeli and Palestinian citizens of goodwill who are marching together, campaigning together, for an end to prevarication.

Besides, the very low frequency of second-person pronouns (Table 2) also indicates that there is no explicit appeal to specific groups as addressees of the speech. That is, because there is no direct appeal to addressees, we have to assume that ratified recipients and addressees coincide in this case and that in fact the primary goal of the speech is to define and represent the role of a particular group and not to appeal to other forces. From this near absence of specific second-person reference and from the apparent goals of the speaker, it is possible to infer that the speech is addressed to all groups represented in the audience: intellectuals and representatives of the different political and non-political organizations.

5. Conclusions

The analysis of Mandela's speech discloses that understanding the role played by personal pronominals, which functionally belong to the domain of interpersonal relations, does not simply done only by looking at what they replace but also to know their other functions with certain soci-cultural implications which will influence their use. They are

spatio-temporal indicators of discourse which do not cover grammatical categories only but play a significant role in the identification of the participants within the communicative act. However, these function words are neither descriptive only nor mere deictic indicators of their referents. In addition, they go beyond being just supporting grammatical categories such as gender, person or number. Undoubtedly, they are endowed with the ability to cover extralinguistic categories like politeness, respect, intimacy and solidarity. This proves that they are, in various occurrences in a text can move beyond their noun-pronoun substitutional function or other syntactic processes such as pronominalization. Henceforth, pronominals play a key role in the construction of 'self' and 'other' or what is known as 'stance'. They are not, as is suggested by traditional grammarians, merely a way of expressing person, number and gender nor do they only do referential and deictic work.

This investigation reveals that pronominals are used to construct Mandela's multiple 'selves' and 'others' and that as they occur in sequence, the changing 'selves' of politicians and different 'others' are created. The construction of these multiple 'selves' and 'others' is a version of reality that politicians construct discursively and is not an objective representation of facts. This analysis of pronouns in the selected speech also reveals striking and hitherto unresearched uses of pronouns, which can be used to show affiliation or create distance between people where it would not traditionally be expected. Mandela actively exploits the flexibility of pronominal reference to construct the different identities of themselves and 'other' and use them to create different alignments to, and boundaries between, their multiple 'selves' and 'others'. Thus, pronouns are pivotal in the construction of reality – a reality that is created and understood in the discourse of the moment.

As a result, the analysis, through looking at pronominal choices of speakers, sheds light on the way these speakers presents themselves in

relation to the discoursal context and contribute to the overall understanding of objectives and significance of discourse. This leads to understanding the relationship between texts and uses of language.

When the pronominal choice in a certain discoursal event is analyzed within the socio-ideological context in which it is embedded, it becomes possible to determine almost objectively different kinds of conditions of discourse production. Not only that, it can be also helpful to describe the relationships established between the speaker and his addressees. However, pronominal choice can give indications on whom the real addressees of the text are and to what extent they are involved in the topic of the discoursal event.

Such different dimensions of involvement are important to characterize the stance of the speaker within a discoursal context. In political discourse, analyzing pronominal choice can present insights into these stances and positions of participants in the discousal event.

Bibliography

- Bello, Umar (2013) "If I Could Make It, You Too Can Make It!" Personal Pronouns in Political Discourse: A CDA of President Jonathan's Presidential Declaration Speech, in International Journal of English Linguistics; Vol. 3, No. 6, 84-96.
- Blackwell, Susan Anne (January 2007) "Power and Solidarity Revisited: The Acquisition and Use of Personal Pronouns in Modern English and Dutch." Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of English, School of Humanities, The University of Birmingham.
- Bull, Peter. & Fetzer, Anita. (2006) "Who are we and who are you? The strategic use of forms of address in political interviews." Text & Talk: 26-1, p3-37.
- Chilton, P. A. (2004) Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie & Fairclough, Norman (1999). Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language. London, UK: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) "Discourse, Social Theory, and Social Research: The discourse of welfare reform." Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4(2): 163-95.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Language and Power. (2nd Edition) London: Longman.
- Häkansson, Jessica (2012) "The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches A comparative study of the pronominal choices of two

- American presidents.” Available at:
<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:lnu:diva-19502>
- Jarraya, Soufien (2013) “Persuasion in Political Discourse: Tunisian President Ben Ali's Last Speech as a Case Study.” Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Syracuse University.
- Johnstone, Barbara (2008) Discourse Analysis. New York: Blackwell
- Jones, Jason and Peccei, J. Stilwell (2004) “What is Language and what does it do? Language and Politics.” In Linda Thomas, et al. Language society and power. pp 35-53.
- Kuo, Sai-Hua “From solidarity to antagonism: The uses of the second-person singular pronoun in Chinese political discourse”. Text 22(1) (2002), pp. 29–55
- Levinson, Stephen (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mandela, Nelson (1997) “Address by President Nelson Mandela at the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, 4 December 1997, Pretoria.” Available at:
<http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=3384>
- Pennebaker, James W. (2011) The Secret Life of Pronouns: What our words say about us. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
- Pennycook, Alastair (1994) “The politics of pronouns.” ELT Journal Volume 48/2 April, PP. 13-178
- Shapiro, M. J. (1981) Language and Political Understanding. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Thomas, Linda, Ishtla Singh and Jean Stilwell Peccei (2004) Language, Society and Power: An Introduction. London: Routledge.
- Wilson, J. (2003) “Political Discourse” in Deborah et al, PP. 398-415
- Wodak, R. (2001) “What CDA is About? A Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments.” in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.). 1-13.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.) (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.