"If I Could Make It, You Too Can Make It!"
Personal Pronouns in Political Discourse: A CDA of President Jonathan's Presidential Declaration Speech

Umar Bello[1]

[1] English Language Center, Jubail Industrial College, Jubail, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Umar Bello, English Language Center, Jubail Industrial College, Jubail 31961, P O BOX 10099, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: bello.umar@gmail.com

Abstracts

This paper attempts to use Critical Discourse Analysis to unravel the complex webs of political associations and identities that go into political speeches of Nigerian presidents using one as a model. Nigeria has always been plagued by leadership problems and a lack of critical appreciation of crises of interests that abound in our political sphere. This article aims to offer a linguistic evaluation of a given political discourse in Nigeria in the mode of close engagement with the constructions and context of the discourse. It shows how personal pronouns are used by President Jonathan in his presidential declaration of interest speech to construct various identities and to transpose sentiments and sympathies in order to probably promote a political agenda. The use of Fairclough's (1989) three-tier analytical framework, i.e., description, interpretation and explanation helps to reconstruct the import and real ideological thrust of the speech. The description level shows the linguistic associations, the interpretation level, the pragmatic and intertexual, while the explanation level shows how the socio-cultural practices in the Nigerian society are drawn upon to reflect in these two in a dialectical cycle. In essence, this study, in a systematic way, shows in general how ideologies in the status quo are (or can be) sustained and reproduced by discursively supplanting the consciousness of the people. The pronouns used in the speech end up creating identities that foster the president's political interest and sustain the state of affairs while at the same time mystifying the real class and power struggle at the political center.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, political piscourse, personal pronouns, ideology, intertexual(ity), presupposition

1. Introduction

1.1 Nigeria's Political Context

Goodluck Ebele Jonathan became the president of Nigeria after the former President, Umaru Yar'Adua, had died on the 5th of May, 2010. He was before then the Nigeria's vice president. Goodluck Jonathan was sworn in as Yar'adua's successor on the following day, becoming Nigeria's 14th Head of State to serve until the election in 2011. Before the election, the ruling party, the People's Democratic Party, organized an intra-party primary election to (s)elect their presidential candidate for the national election. This speech to be analyzed was delivered by the President at a party congress declaring his candidacy for the PDP presidential primaries on the 8th of September, 2010. The primary election took place afterwards on the 13th of January, 2011 involving party delegates. He won the intra-party election with a landslide and also went ahead and won the national election with overwhelming (albeit controversial) victory. President Jonathan is the first president to emerge from the south-south region of Nigeria which is the oil producing region of the country. His candidature challenges the assumption that power is the prerogative of the three major ethnic groups in Nigeria, namely: Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo who have largely constituted themselves as the power brokers in the political scene of the country. As such he came with an enormous goodwill as representing the minority from a region which is seen as the "cash cow" of the country. It is instructive to understand that the speech was conducted in an all-party affair as all the delegates that converged were members of the same party. This may have impacted on the way the speech was delivered because there was no any explicit reference to political enemies.

1.2 Review of Related Literature

A lot has been written regarding Nigeria's political discourse using various linguistic theories especially Speech Acts. Daramola (2008), for instance, analyses President Obasanjo's farewell speech to "unearth the linguistic and political underpinnings" therein using Speech Acts and other aspects of pragmatics. He concludes that assertives are mostly used to mobilize and convince Nigerians to support President Yar'adua. Ayeomoni and Akinkuolere (2012) also use Speech Acts to identify the features of Yar'adua's inaugural speech. Their research concludes that President Yar'adua uses very few directives and expressives in his speech preferring to use more of assertives instead. In another paper, Ayeomoni (2012) uses a different theoretical approach to analyze speeches of Nigeria's military heads of state. He particularly uses Systemic Functional Linguistics to look at the grapho-syntactic features of the speeches. He concludes that the speeches are mostly poorly constructed in punctuation and syntax due to the hasty and "swift style that they (the military) carry out their administrative duties". Abuya (2012), on his part, also looks at the Speech Act analysis of Goodluck's inaugural speech. The result of his research indicates that President Goodluck Jonathan uses sentences that perform comissive acts and which generally indicate the tendency of politicians to be grateful to the polity when they are successful at the polls. Kamalu and Agangan (2012) use a Critical Discourse Analysis approach to look at the overall textual representation of Goodluck's presidential declaration speech. The thrust of their paper is on the persuasive and rhetorical strategies used to yield acceptance. While they use CDA in their general ideological analysis, they have not actually used the model provided by Fairclough with clear-cut analytical windows and questions to be asked of texts as is intended to be provided in this paper. They (for example) maintain that Goodluck has used deligitimization strategies to "threaten undesirable groups such as criminals, miscreants, and corrupt individuals" This deligitimization (they identify) operates at the level of clear textual representations. What is rather not delineated in this analysis is the deligitimization of political enemies using strategies of presuppositions through cuing of members' resources which a segment of the Fairclough's analytical model takes care of. Deligitimization can be carried out not necessarily overtly but also covertly, through hints and cues that position and shape the addressees' cognition.

Critical Discourse Analysis appears to still be novel in the linguistic circles in Nigeria. Analysis using this paradigm, especially the model proposed by Fairclough (1998) appears to be very scanty. This model combines a three-pronged analysis that looks at not only the descriptive (textual) level of analysis but the interpretative (audience reception) and explanatory (socio-cultural influences) which involve various strata of analysis. Most of the analyses of political texts mentioned above do not look at the operation of ideology in the textual constructions they highlight. In Speech Act analysis, for example, the preference of one act over another may demonstrate an ideological preference. Such analyses also emphasize the positioning of the addresser and not that of the addressee and how the latter's mental resources may be used to presuppose ideological realities. Fairclough's CDA generally offers a close textual and contextual analysis that shall be explained in the methodology chapter.

2. Theoretical Framework

This research paper will use CDA as its theoretical framework to analyze the speech made by Goodluck Jonathan at his party congress. This resolve is made in consideration of CDA's concern with the social context of a given text and the power dynamics that may be brought to bear. Texts are looked at here as products of a socially or politically determined context. Choices of linguistic elements are not made in a random or for the luxury of a range of alternatives but can be made to represent the world in a way disposed to one own's point of view or ideology. The analysis of a text also transcends textual analysis. It involves analyzing the processes of text production and interpretation and also the explanation of the social and cognitive conditions that give nuance to them. Choices of pronouns, for instance, do not merely pertain to deictic or anaphoric grammatical reference but to references that may relate to identities, group solidarity and the like with the sole aim of indirectly promoting and sustaining power. As Simpson (1993, p. 6) rightly observes "Language is not used in a contextless vacuum; rather, it is used in a host of discourse contexts which are impregnated with the ideology of social systems and institutions" The careful selection of linguistic items even becomes much more expedient in the world of politics that relates to the "socialization 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" (Chilton, 2006, p. 6).

So, CDA generally makes towards deconstructing the intricate manipulation of texts and thoughts that go into a given discourse. Wodak and Meyer (2001) see CDA as fundamentally about analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. Language is the domain of the ideology of the powerful elements in the society, and it is the "commonest form of

social behavior where we rely most on 'common sense' assumptions" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 2).

Our concern here is institutional political discourse, i.e., discourse as enacted in the political sphere. This discourse deals especially with the reproduction of political power, political abuse or domination. The connection between language and politics is highly strong as political action itself is carried out through language. Chilton (2004, p. 30) maintains that "only in and through language can one issue commands and threats, ask questions, make offers and promises—provided one has convinced their interlocutors that they have the requisite resources to make the speech act credible. And only through language tied into social and political institutions can one declare war, declare guilty or not guilty, prorogue parliaments or raise or lower taxes" Generally, political activity hardly exists without the use of language. In fact the 'doing' of politics is largely the 'doing' of language (Chilton, 2004).

The strategic essence of language in carrying out political action and in mobilizing people to certain goals makes it a very useful tool in the hands of politicians. This language or discourse encapsulates the vision, perception and world view of the people that create it and its intended perlocutionary effect is to have whatever views carried or lines of action taken expressly believed or acted upon. Lukes (2005, p. 28) asks:

> Is it not the supreme and most insidious exercise of power to prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they see it as natural and interchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained or beneficial?

Jones and Peccei (2004), on their part, maintain that to secure power, it makes some sense to convince people that what you want is also good for them. Through such encouragement to accept your views of their own accord, any ruler or leader can save money on armed forces and police officers who are instruments of coercion. But to achieve this, they further maintain, your ideology needs to be established or sustained to make the beliefs which you want people to hold appear to be 'common sense', or logical or simply inevitable. This will make it difficult for them to question your assumptions. Politicians use speech with this aim of "manufacturing consent" (Fairclough, 1989) and to lift their image while tarnishing the image of their opponents. Chilton (2004, p. 47) defines this as legitimization of self and the deligitimization of the other. Deligitimization, according to him,

> can manifest itself in acts of negative other presentation, acts of blaming, scapegoating, marginalizing, excluding, attacking the moral character of some individual or group, attacking the communicative cooperation of the other, attacking the rationality and sanity of the other. The extreme is to deny the humanness of the other. At the other end of the spectrum deligimization, usually oriented to the self, includes positive self-representation, manifesting itself in acts of self praise, self apology, self explanation, self justification, self identification as a source of authority, reason, vision and sanity where the self is either an individual or the group with which an individual identifies or wishes to identify

This view resonates with Van Dijk's (1997) ideological square which polarizes actors into in and out groups and how the former project their positive side but downplay their negative side; while they project the negative side of the latter and downplay their positive side.

Fundamental to the political sphere is the construction of identity, group membership and ways of talking about self, others, and the polarizing categories of us and them (Allen, 2007). Politicians' selection of personal pronouns helps them also to evoke multiple identities of themselves and others from a range of perspectives. Allen (2007, p. 3) believes that "it is in the politicians interest to present themselves as multi-faceted in order to appeal to a diverse audience, and a careful pronoun choice is one way of achieving this aim" The essence of analyzing pronouns in political discourse, as such, is that they help in reconstructing these various identities, associations, actors and ideological groupings.

Pronouns are analyzed only in their deictic or anaphoric work in traditional grammar which does not help in unraveling the associations they socially and politically engender. Pennycook (1993) argues that applied linguistics has often opted for a rather bland descriptivism which tends to assume the existence of an unproblematic world that is neatly referenced by words in a language (like pronouns) that are in fact very complex political words that raise difficulty about who is being represented. Fairclough maintains also that English pronouns have relational values, i.e., values that help to construct social relationships. These relationships can exclude or include with ideological ease. Wodak (2005) sees pronouns especially personal plurals as being able to be "used to induce interpreters to conceptualize group identity, coalitions, parties and the like, as insiders or as outsiders". Bramley (2001) also argues that pronouns are not merely a way of expressing person, number and gender as is suggested by traditional grammarians nor do they only do deictic or referential work, they must be thought of in terms of the context of interaction and identity work that they accomplish.

It is in this context that we find this analysis of personal pronouns crucial, i.e., the ability of the analysis to possibly map out pronominal representations carried out in view of political exigencies to serve political goals that may otherwise, under other theoretical constructs, remain opaque.

3. Methodology

The speech to be analyzed was made by Dr. Goodluck Jonathan at the Eagle Square, Abuja, on the 8th of September, 2010. It was obtained from the Vanguard Newspaper of the 18th of September, 2010, via their website http://www.vanguardngr.com/2010/09/100003/. The speech contains about 1831 word tokens and about 710 word types. The personal pronouns (both in the subject and object positions) obtained are tabulated below:

Table 1. Personal pronouns in GEJ's speech

Pronouns	I	Me	We	Us	You (subject and object)
Number	71	9	20	6	21

This corpus generated as data will then be analyzed using Fairclough's (1989) three-tier analytical framework, i.e., description, interpretation and explanation. These levels of analysis will be briefly explained here for the purpose of clarification.

According to Fairclough (1989) a text can be analyzed at the descriptive level by interrogating the lexical, syntactical and textual structures of a text at three different values of analysis, i.e., the experiential, relational and expressive. The experiential value is a 'cue' to and 'trace' of the way in which a text producer or writer presents their experience of the natural or social world. The relational value, on the other hand, relates to the social relationships texts in discourses enact; while the expressive value deals with the text producer's evaluation of their reality and what social identities are intended to be projected. In our discussion, we will be concerned with the experiential and the relational values of analysis.

Texts are generally the end products of a descriptive analysis and the resource for the interpretative analysis. This is because values of textual features only become realized when they are set in social interaction. Texts are, in other words, produced and interpreted against the background of common-sense assumptions and intertextual chains which are part of members' resources-MR. Here the second stage *interpretation* is needed to deal with these discourse processes and their dependence on background assumptions.

Explanation is the third and final stage in Fairclough's three-tier analytical framework. According to Fairclough, the essence of this stage is to delineate discourse as part of a social process and practice. It attempts to show how discourses are determined by social structures, and what reproductive effects discourses can have on those structures generally, sustaining them or charting a new course for them. There is a dialectical interplay between text, discourse and social practice which shall be explained in the latter part of this paper.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 The Descriptive Level

4.1.1 'I' and 'Me'

Apart from the usual grammatical words like 'the' and 'to' the next most occurred word is 'I'. 'I' even occurs more than other grammatical words in the list. The occurrence of this word seventy one times in a speech of less than two thousand word tokens is not without major political significance that can hardly be accounted for by a consideration of grammatical representation. Bramley (2001) argues that 'I' is a term of self-reference and not a substitute for a noun or name as is the case with third person pronouns. Sacks (1992) cited in Bramley (2001) points out that 'I' is the way I refer to myself in talk not a substitute for my name. 'I' stands alone as marker of the speaker referring to himself/herself. Malone (1997) cited (ibid) also maintains that 'I' not only indexes the speaker, it anchors the talk in the moment by providing subjectivity and stating the speaker's position. It provides personal involvement and commitment. Beard (2000) also maintains that 'I' among others show a clear sense of personal involvement which is especially useful when good news is delivered. The following analysis will show how 'I' has been used with fluidity as the representation of different aspects of the persona. It oscillates from private to institutional identities. It has been used as the government, as an individual, and as an autobiographical representation, and all these realizations are made in positive light.

The first aspect of 'I' used by Goodluck Jonathan as the government mainly gives his major achievements. As we can see below, there is a clear narration of achievements of 'I' which constitutes the government.

I have served as President of Nigeria have opened my eyes to the vast potentials of this office as a potent instrument for the transformation of our country..I could end the long queues and price fluctuations in our petrol stations. …I discovered that by insisting that the right things be done, we could begin a turnaround in our power sector by involving the private sector in power generation and distribution improved…I have put in place new gas policies and very soon……In the last few months, I embarked on monumental projects in our road infrastructure to end the carnage on our federal highways. I began several projects to make our water resources available for drinking and farming. I targeted our educational system to return quality and competitiveness to them. I re-addressed our drive for self sufficiency in food production. I have taken bold steps to confront our security situation. …I set the stage for free and fair elections by constituting an electoral commission comprising of Nigerians with impeccable credentials for firmness and incorruptibility. I charged our anti corruption agencies to speed up the war against corruption, and respect no sacred cows in the process. In the management of the economy, I advocated a more transparent banking industry, price stability, low inflation, and aggregate increase in productivity as a way to drive us to a more prosperous economy. In International Relations, I advanced the respectability accorded our country by effective engagement in global fora.

His achievements are based on material actions as shown by the usage of material processes that show action, for example: *advance, set the stage, readdress, embark, target, put in place, confront, take bold steps* etc. The second stage of the 'I' used here relates to his history and humble upbringing. He moves from an institutional persona to a private one, to give a mini-narrative about his humble growing up. In the following text, there is an attempt to recollect his personal history and to imprint in the audience ordinariness and humility that may result in voter sympathy.

I was not born rich, and in my youth, I never imagined that I would be where I am today, but not once did I ever give up. Not once did I imagine that a child from Otuoke, a small village in the Niger Delta, will one day rise to the position of President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. I was raised by my mother and father with just enough money to meet our daily needs.

In my early days in school, I had no shoes, no school bags. I carried my books in my hands but never despaired; no car to take me to school but I never despaired. There were days I had only one meal but I never despaired. I walked miles and crossed rivers to school every day but I never despaired. Didn't have power, didn't have generators, studied with lanterns but I never despaired.

In spite of these, I finished secondary school, attended the University of Port Harcourt, and now hold a doctorate degree. Fellow Nigerians, if I could make it, you too can make it!..As I travel up and down our country, I see a nation blessed by God with rich agricultural and mineral resources and an enterprising people. I see millions of Nigerians whose potentials for greatness are constrained by the lack of basic infrastructure. I see Nigerians who can make a difference in the service of their country but are disadvantaged by the lack of opportunities.

The last part of the 'I' used in the speech represents the pledges that he has made to the polity in his quest to gain their confidence and win their votes.

I have come to say to all of you, that Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan is the man you need to put Nigeria right. I have come to launch a campaign of ideas, not one of calumny. I have come to preach love, not hate. I have come to break you away from divisive tendencies of the past which have slowed our drive to true nationhood. I have no enemies to fight. … I will be for the students, teachers and parents of Nigeria, a President who will advance quality and competitive education. Let everyone in this country hear that I shall strive to the best of my ability to attain self sufficiency in food production.

Let all the kidnappers, criminal elements, and miscreants that give us a bad name be ready for the fight that I shall give them. Let the international community hear that today I have offered myself to lead a country that will engage them in mutual respect and cooperation for the achievement of international peace and understanding. To help me in these tasks effectively, I will re-train, revamp, and motivate the civil service. My dear good people of Nigeria, I got here today by the power of God and the support of all Nigerians; all ethnic groups, North, South, East and West. I am here today because of your support and prayers. I want all of you to know that I am one of you and I will never let you down! I want you to know that I will keep hope alive; I want you to know that your time has come. I stand before you today, humbly seeking your support for me, Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan, to run for the office of the President of Nigeria with Architect Namadi Sambo as my running mate…….

I cannot end this speech without thanking you all for attending this occasion. Your huge attendance is a

loud testimony of your support for us. For this I am very grateful. I pray that the Almighty God abides with you and sees you safely back to your respective destinations…….Goodluck has come to transform Nigeria and I will never let you down.

In sum, the usage of 'I' in this speech clearly underscores three important issues: his achievements, his humble autobiography and his pledges.

In different parts of the 'I' rendition, there are also three constructions that appear very important in the speech:

"from the moment I was sworn in as president, I have come under intense pressure to make a declaration"

"as I travel up and down our country, I see millions of Nigerians whose potentials for greatness are constrained by lack of basic infrastructure"

"I see Nigerians who can make a difference a difference in the service of their country but are disadvantaged by the lack of opportunities"

The use of 'come' an intransitive verb that indicates an "intense pressure" coming on its own to meet him in the first sentence is politically suspect. There is clearly no clue as to the identity of those people who put him under pressure to contest. Such statement could be handy in giving the impression of a national or general acceptability. Such 'intense pressure' may either be nonexistent or only coming from his inner party members. In the second sentence, another tactical political statement is seen. "As I travel up and down our country, I see millions of Nigerians whose potentials for greatness are constrained by lack of basic infrastructure". This is a passive construction and the agent is "lack of basic infrastructure". The use of this abstraction as agent reifies or humanizes the agent. The "lack of basic infrastructure" is created by an actor whose mention may indict the status quo of which president Goodluck is part either as vice president of the preceded regime or the incumbent president. Likewise, in the third sentence, we have reification where "lack of opportunities" is indicted instead of the backgrounded actor which is the government. Those who create (or are responsible for) both the "lack of basic infrastructure" and the "lack of opportunities" are mystified. Fairclough (1989) maintains that agents can be realized as inanimate or abstract nouns or nominalizations that should make people be alert to possible ideologically motivated obfuscation of agency, causality and responsibility. In this case, we see an abstract notion being indicted for purely a human responsibility. Those three expressions, that is, "intense pressure", "lack of basic infrastructure" and "lack of opportunities" are all nominalizations. According to Toolan (2001) a nominalization is a conversion of a clausal process into a noun phrase, thus treating the entire process as an established 'thing'—which can then serve as a participant in another more inspectable process. It essentially denarrates a process. Downing and Locke (2006), in the same vein, see it as a grammatical metaphor that distances us from events, raising the representation of a situation from the iconic to a high level of abstraction. Politicians generally employ 'nominalizations' as they acquit them of the responsibility of saying who does what to whom and when.

'Me' (the object) is likewise used in positive contexts that construct a multi-faceted view of the president:

With the death of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, the mantle of leadership of our great nation fell on (1) me….. …..I therefore told Nigerians to give (2) me time to concentrate on my work, and that at the appropriate time, I would make a public statement on my political future after widespread consultations. .. I carried my books in my hands but never despaired; no car to take (3) me to school but I never despaired. ……My story is the story of a young Nigerian whose access to education opened up vast opportunities that enabled (4) me to attain my present position…My fellow Nigerians, this is what has brought (5) me to Eagle Square today. ….To help (6) me in these tasks effectively, I will re-train, revamp, and motivate the civil service…..I stand before you today, humbly seeking your support for (7) me….. My dear country men and women, give (8) me your support, give (9) me your votes and together we will fight to build a great nation of our dreams!

The first use of 'me' talks about the president in institutional view as a leader who has got into leadership by fate, using the verb 'fall' that shows nature as influencing events. Downing and Locke (2006) classify the process 'fall' as an involuntary intransitive process. Using such a verb clearly hides the actual politicking involved in power transition and appearing as if 'power' on its own comes to him rather than the other way round. Likewise, in the second sentence, he speaks in the institutional sense as a serious leader with set priorities who 'concentrates' on his work and does politics at the 'appropriate time'. In the third use of 'me', he relapses into a private persona giving a sympathetic narration of his poor upbringing. From the fourth to the ninth, the president presents himself in the institutional image of a political candidate seeking for support along with constructions that put this desire in positive lights.

4.1.2 'We' and 'Us'

Pennycook (1993) sees 'we' as always simultaneously inclusive and exclusive as a pronoun of solidarity and of rejection, of inclusion and exclusion. Any construction of a 'we' clearly presupposes the existence of a 'they' or 'you'. Thus, by inclusion, it, at the same time, excludes and assumes a parallel 'other' exists elsewhere. According to Fairclough (1989), when 'we' is used by a leader inclusively as part of the led, it assimilates the leader to 'the people' possibly as a humbling tactic. In this current speech, we can see how the various dimensions of the 'we' here are brought to full political effects in 20 occurrences.

> (1)… We confronted those moments and their challenges to national security with patriotism and care. (2). We toiled together to realize those dreams in order to justify the confidence Nigerians reposed in us. (3) Together we swore to execute a joint mandate and today I come before you to make a pronouncement based on that undertaking….. I discovered that by insisting that the right things be done, (4) we could begin a turnaround in our power sector by involving the private sector in power generation and distribution…I have put in place new gas policies and very soon, (5) we will be saying goodbye to gas flaring in our oil fields. Working with the National Assembly, (6) we rolled out a law that requires companies operating in the oil and gas sectors of our economy to utilize an appreciable percentage of their goods and services from local sources. (7) We saw to it that normalcy began to return to the Niger Delta by ensuring government's fidelity to its promises, and this has helped to stabilize our national revenue. ... In this regard, (8) we are pursuing the revision of our laws to be more responsive to international conventions and more punitive to criminals. …From the moment I was sworn in as President, I came under intense pressure to make a declaration concerning my political future, but declined to do so because it would have immediately distracted us from all the development initiatives (9) we have accomplished so far. …

> You are all my friends and (10) we share a common destiny. (11) We will fight for JUSTICE!. (12) We will fight for all Nigerians to have access to POWER!. (13) We will fight for qualitative and competitive EDUCATION!. (14) We will fight for HEALTH CARE REFORMS!. (15) We will fight to create jobs, for all Nigerians!. (16) We will fight corruption!. (17) We will fight to protect all Citizens!. (18) We will fight for your rights! My dear country men and women, give me your support, give me your votes and together (19) we will fight to build a great nation of our dreams!..When you return, tell all those at home that as (20) we celebrate our fifty years anniversary as a nation, Goodluck has come to transform Nigeria and I will never let you down.

The usage of 'we' here indicates the various representations and dimensions of the referents. From sentence 1 to 4, 'we' is represented as two people, i.e., the late Yar'adua and GEJ as president and vice president respectively. In 5, we have 'we' as referring to the overall Nigerians (inclusive of the president) who are affected by gas flaring. In what way the president constitutes part of those directly affected by this phenomenon remains unclear. In ten, we see another tactical usage of 'we' where he claims that 'we share a common destiny' another inclusively overall representation. In what way does the president share a common destiny with the ordinary people? Fairclough (1989), analyzing Margaret Thatcher's speech, also confronts a similar kind of representation. He queries MT's statement "now we do enjoy a standard of living which was undreamed of then…" as relationally significant for it puts all in the same boat with the prime minister in spite of the gross disparities in standards of leaving that exist. In the other representations of the 'we', there are pledges made with 'will'—a deontic modal that indicates strong commitment and promise. The 'we' used here represents the overall government as a partnership. In the various representations of the president with pronouns, there are referential ambiguities. At various points, the president is represented as 'I' with certain achievements and 'we' with others. 'I' mostly appears with achievements that are totally accomplished while 'we' with issues that are either promised or pledged in the campaign or about legislations where the executive has to liaise with the legislature.

The object 'us' has about six realizations as shown below:

> We toiled together to realize those dreams in order to justify the confidence Nigerians reposed in (1) us. Together we swore to execute a joint mandate and today I come before you to make a pronouncement based on that undertaking….Today, all our refineries are working, saving (2) us huge amounts of funds spent on importation of petroleum products. … I advocated a more transparent banking industry, price stability, low inflation, and aggregate increase in productivity as a way to drive (3) us to a more prosperous economy. …From the moment I was sworn as president, I came under intense pressure to make a declaration concerning my political future, I decline to do because it would have immediately distracted (4) us from the development initiatives we have accomplished so far…Let all the kidnappers, criminal elements, and miscreants that give (5) us a bad name be ready for the fight that I shall give them. …Your huge attendance is

a loud testimony of your support for (6) <u>us</u>.

In the first sentence, 'us' is used as an anaphoric reference to 'we' which represents a joint mandate between him and Yar'adua. 2 and 3 represent the overall Nigerians, inclusive of the president as recipients of their positive efforts to repair the economy. 4 reverts to his leadership position as a team work with his cabinet and their desire not to be 'distracted', while 5 is about all Nigerians including the president that are being given bad names by 'miscreants'. The final 'us' reverts again to the institutional team that is looking for electoral support. In the representations here, the president has identities that change from that of a leader to a citizen then to a leader who has come seeking for re-election.

4.1.3 'You'

'You' is used 21 times. In the use of 'you', we can see how it is used for both the people who attend the rally and those people at home, i.e., the overall Nigerians. Though 'you', in itself, has referential ambiguity as it can refer to a single or plural, near or far referent(s), it has been used here for referents that are mostly clear.

> Together we swore to execute a joint mandate and today I come before (1) <u>you</u> to make a pronouncement based on that undertaking…. As (2) <u>you</u> can see from the lower quantities of diesel that (3) <u>you</u> are buying today, power generation has significantly improved….Fellow Nigerians, if I could make it,(4) <u>you</u> too can make it!..I have come to say to all of (5) <u>you</u>, that Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan is the man (6) <u>you</u> need to put Nigeria right. …I have come to break (7) <u>you</u> away from divisive tendencies of the past which have slowed our drive to true nationhood….. (8) <u>You</u> are all my friends and we share a common destiny.…. I want all of (9) <u>you</u> to know that I am one of (10) <u>you</u> and I will never let (11) <u>you</u> down! I want (12) <u>you</u> to know that I will keep hope alive; I want (13) <u>you</u> to know that your time has come. I stand before (14) <u>you</u> today….I cannot end this speech without thanking (15) <u>you</u> all for attending this occasion…. I pray that the Almighty God abides with (16) <u>you</u> and sees (17) <u>you</u> safely back to your respective destinations. When (18) <u>you</u> return, tell all those at home that as we celebrate our fifty years anniversary as a nation, Goodluck has come to transform Nigeria and I will never let (19) <u>you</u> down…Thank (20) <u>you</u>. May God bless (21) <u>you</u>

The first use of 'you' refers to the people that converge at the square and this 'you' is put in a respectful position as witnesses to a 'pronouncement'. From 2 to 13, 'you' is used as the overall Nigerians in various representations, i.e., as witnesses of 'development' his government has brought about, to references to them showing his similarity with them and to references to them as witnesses of his promises. The other use of 'you' (from 14 to 21) is in reference to the people who converge at the rally. In general, there are negotiations, reassurances and persuasions going on using the linguistic and spatial proximity of 'you' here. As 'you' has the potential to give the notion of discoursal proximity and the notion of the addressee being in bond with the addresser, politicians love to use it to build 'affinity', what Fairclough (1989) refers to as "synthetic personalization". Fairclough (1989, p. 52) defines this as a "compensatory tendency to give the impression of treating each of the people 'handled' en masse as an individual". The sentence, "you are all my friends", here tries to establish such a friendly classless bond. This bond moves higher where he claims that: ".. I want you to know that your time has come..." In this case, the political interest of the president is transposed as the interest of the people. His 'time' or 'quest' is constructed as that of the people. Such transposition of interests where the politician makes you see their interests as yours is part of the characteristics of political language (Beard, 2000).

4.2 Interpretation

Generally interpretations are generated through a combination of what is in the text and what is in the interpreter in terms of their mental or cognitive resource of recall or what is termed "members' resources" (Fairclough, 1989) Fairclough maintains that there are six dimensions of what constitutes the processes of interpretation. These processes are: situational context, intertextual context, surface utterances, meaning of utterances, local coherence and text structure and point. The most important part for our analysis of pronouns here are the situational and intertextual contexts. The situational context pertains to the immediate context under which a discourse takes place. In this situation there are three important questions that need to be asked of a text, namely:

What is going on (activity, topic and purpose)?

Who is involved?

In what relations?

What is the role of language in what's going on?

Such questions would generally help in understanding the general identities constructed in the pronoun analysis. The event is actually a political declaration of interest to contest for the presidential candidature of the Peoples

Democratic Party (PDP). It is an intraparty affair that gathers members of the same political party. The people involved in the event are members of the same party called 'delegates'. These delegates have been chosen by their local party constituencies to represent them in the selection of who the party should (s)elect as its presidential flag bearer. So the immediate audience are highly important because they are the voters in this intraparty election. The relationship thus between the producer of the text and the immediate audience is that of a seeker of votes addressing givers of votes. This role certainly has influenced the careful choice of pronouns and texts to use in getting his political ambition achieved. The role of language here is highly important because it is used for the purpose of political campaign and advertisement. Here both the speaker and the listener are influenced by the context in the production and interpretation of the overall message to be delivered. They both know the reasons why they are there by dint of their selection as delegates for a purpose and by the party mechanism set in place to facilitate such an event.

At the situational context, there is an interpretation that is influenced by an obvious physical context that we have enumerated but at the intertexual/presupposition level the situation is different. Many issues can be presupposed using linguistic cues. These presuppositions can be ideologically predetermined and not necessarily shared. Fairclough (1989) maintains that presuppositions do not belong to texts; they are an aspect of text producer's intertexual context. Though they are not properties of texts, they can be cued by certain textual properties. The essence of using them is that they have the potential to pass what is purely ideological as epistemic or truthfully objective. In my analysis of pronouns, I have realized that no explicit mention is made of political opponents but there are many cases where they are presupposed.

According to Richardson (2007), a presupposition is a taken-for-granted, implicit claim embedded within explicit meaning of a text or utterance. In the following text, such presupposed notions could be seen:

> I have come to say to all of you, that Goodluck Ebele Azikiwe Jonathan is the man you need to put Nigeria right. I have come to launch a campaign of ideas, not one of calumny. I have come to preach love, not hate. I have come to break you away from divisive tendencies of the past which have slowed our drive to true nationhood. I have no enemies to fight. You are all my friends and we share a common destiny.

The use of 'the' in the expression "Goodluck Ebele Azikwe Jonathan is the man you need to put Nigeria right" presupposes that there are others vying for the same post and he stands as the best. Also, the use of 'coming to launch a campaign of ideas, not of hate' presupposes the existence of a campaign of hate preached elsewhere possibly by his political opponents. The use of "coming to preach love not hate" likewise presupposes that some people preach hate. And finally, the use of "coming to break you away from the divisive tendencies of the past" presupposes a continuum of divisive tendencies by an undisclosed 'they' which he has come to change or break. "The divisive tendencies" is passed as truth situation while in the real sense it captures his own ideological interpretation of Nigeria's past. Whether the past was made divisive or not by the leaders then remains a proposition meant to be seen as a fact, or as a true state of affairs. "Divisive tendencies" is also a nominalization which has clearly frozen the agency and circumstances of the action captured, i.e., not giving details on the identities and actions portrayed there.

Though certain presuppositions are Intertexual, i.e., drawn from other previous or like texts, they can be used for an immediate context to serve an immediate ideological need. The use of 'the man…' can be a campaign soundbite generally used in campaign rhetoric but its usage in this particular context also particularizes the truth situation expected to be recalled or believed. According to Chilton (2004), speakers or text producers have the option of using presuppositions strategically to a avoid challenge or rejection with the twin advantages of evading social threats and the cognitive adjustment of the hearers memory to take a proposition as true representation of the world.

4.3 Explanation

This is the stage that relates to the analysis of the socio-cultural milieu within which a discursive practice takes place and how it may affect it and vice-versa. Fairclough (1989) believes that when aspects of members' resources are drawn upon as interpretative procedures in the production and interpretation of texts, they are thus reproduced. According to him, reproduction links the stages of interpretation to explanation. The basic objective of the explanation stage is to project discourse as part of a societal process or practice and what reproductive effects discourses can impact on those structures in their sustenance or in their change. The reproduction of discursive structures helps a lot in maintaining the socio cultural practice or charting a new course for it. Fairclough maintains that there are about three questions that can be asked of a particular discourse under investigation, namely:

1. Social determinants: what power relations at situational, institutional and societal levels help shape the discourse?

2. Ideologies: what elements of members' resources drawn upon have ideological character?

3. Effects: how is this discourse positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional and societal levels? Are these struggles covert or overt? Is the discourse normative or creative? Does it contribute to the sustenance of existing power relations or in their transformation?

The questions above are very relevant in this speech. The president has drawn upon many issues from the socio cultural and political settings of the country to help in projecting a good image of himself and achieving his political goals. These issues have helped in shaping the discourse and giving it an orientation that serves a political purpose.

4.3.1 Social Determinants

1. Appeal to religious sentiments

2. Appeal to class sentiments

4.3.1.1 Appeal to Religious Sentiments

In delivering his speech the president has drawn upon the essence of religion in the Nigerian society by invoking God and by constructing himself in the image of a Messiah. Religion is very crucial in the political terrain of Nigeria. Any issue that comes wrapped in religion is considered genuine by Nigerians. Barnard (2002) sees the political sphere of Nigeria as highly influenced by religion and that political leaders use religion as a means to mobilize the people around. So, Goodluck Jonathan invokes God and makes allusion to prayers chiefly as a campaign strategy in about nine instances: "a nation blessed by God", " god given potentials, unhindered by tribe or religion", " I got here today by the power of God", " I need your support and prayers', "I pray that Almighty God abides with you.." "May God bless you all" "and may God bless the Federal Republic of Nigeria", "and prayers with my family" In some of these expressions, he tries to show that his candidature is divinely ordained just like the biblical Messiah. Kamalu and Agangan (2011) see him as presenting himself in the form of a political messiah in possession of a "magic wand' to fix all Nigeria's problems. He shows this messianic role by painting the past gloomy and juxtaposing himself with expressions that usher him in as revolutionary who has come to forge a positive course for the country. Statements like: "let the word go out from this Eagle Square that Jonathan as president in 2011 will herald a new era of transformation of our country", "I have come to break you away from divisive tendencies of the past which have slowed down our drive to true nationhood" all help to indicate the role of a Messiah. In this, he draws from an intertexual chain and the habit of Nigerians politicians who always tend to show how different they are from their predecessors especially if they (the predecessors) have not performed well. The construction of a religious messiah helps in reflecting the subsisting religious sentiments and also in appealing to them.

4.3.1.2 Appeal to Class Sentiments

He also has copiously used expressions and pronominals that identify with the downtrodden lot. The use of these expressions helps in not only exploiting the African communal kinship system but in appealing to class sentiments. He tries to show that he does not only identify with the poor in his speech but that he is one of them by giving an emotional biographical account of his humble and poor upbringing.

> I was not born rich, and in my youth, I never imagined that I would be where I am today, but not once did I ever give up. Not once did I imagine that a child from Otuoke, a small village in the Niger Delta, will one day rise to the position of President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. I was raised by my mother and father with just enough money to meet our daily needs.

> In my early days in school, I had no shoes, no school bags. I carried my books in my hands but never despaired; no car to take me to school but I never despaired. There were days I had only one meal but I never despaired. I walked miles and crossed rivers to school every day but I never despaired. Didn't have power, didn't have generators, studied with lanterns but I never despaired. In spite of these, I finished secondary school, attended the University of Port Harcourt, and now hold a doctorate degree.

This humble biography and other expressions like "I am one of you and will never let you down!", "you are all my friends" and the use of inclusive pronouns like "we" all further help to draw similarities between the president and the ordinary people. This humble emphasis is a part of campaign tactics by political leaders (Beard, 2002). Fairclough (1989, p. 195) also believes that "surface markers of social inequality have disappeared *enmasse* from many institutions, of which politics is only one". The general solidarity of political leaders with the public acts as a

strategy of containment. "It represents a concession to the strength of the working class and its allies on the one hand, but constitutes a veil of equality beneath which the real inequalities of capitalist society carry on, on the other" This veil of equality screens the wide gulf of inequality and political oppression that take place and it is chiefly meant to displace radical consciousness.

4.3.2 Ideology

We can clearly see the ideological thrust of the speaker especially in areas where facts are presupposed. The subtle construction of past regimes as negative and his simultaneous construction of his own potential leadership as a break from the past constitute reasons for one to be elected are his ideological opinions. In essence his drawing up of a bogeyman for the problems of Nigeria and his positive self presentation are ideological. The political realities of the past are contestable and so are his endorsed eligibility criteria which he both passes as the way things are, or should be. A neat demarcation between the president and Nigeria's political past can hardly be established as he has participated at various levels of governance in the country, ranging from a deputy governor to governor to vice president and then finally to the president.

4.3.3 Effects

The general effect at least if this will be gauged in the peculiar Nigerian context is that it has served its purpose. He has gone to win the election at both the primary and general elections to emerge the president. But the real struggles remain essentially covert. The whole speech has drawn upon superficial realities but it has mystified the murky realities of class and political struggles and democratic subversion. The rhetoric 'if I could make it, you too can make it' and the emotional biography of a young man who has struggled through life to his current position has largely idealized the complex power manipulation that goes at the center of affairs. President Goodluck's emergence as the president has followed Nigeria's prebendal, clientele leadership that pertains to 'godfatherism'. According to Albert (2005), Nigerian godfathers consist of rich men whose contributions to campaign funds and influence on electoral manipulation (like rigging) help a candidate to win an election. He further maintains that the godfathers act like 'political gate-keepers' who dictate who participate in politics and under what condition. The candidate who attains political position on their part repays the godfather through a reward system that allows the latter access to government resources and other concessions. The former president, RTD Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo single-handedly selected Yar'adua and Goodluck Jonathan to serve a joint mandate which became successful through electoral manipulation. Writing on 'Criminal Politics' for the Human Rights Watch, Lackey and Rawlence (2007) maintains that the 2003 and 2007 elections were "brazenly rigged" and the latter polls that saw Goodluck emerge as the vice president and later president were "among the worst international observers had ever witnessed". Tenuche (2009, p. 1) corroborates Lackey and Rawlence's views (2007) by saying that "The April 2007 elections have been discredited both nationally and internationally as anything but free and fair. Specifically, Max Van Den Berg of the European Union (EU) observer team said he was bitterly disappointed by the elections and that the union had released it 'toughest ever statement about an election'. The EU concluded that 'any administration founded on this fraud cannot have legitimacy' "It is then evident that the actual struggles and power play at the center of Nigerian politics have decidedly been made opaque.

5. Summary and Significance of Findings

Generally, this paper has attempted to show the efficacy of a systematic analysis of text as provided by Fairclough (1989). At the descriptive level, it has tried to show that when politicians use pronouns, they are not using them merely as person deixes or simply as anaphoric references, but in terms of positioning of self and others within the purview of political interests and associations. It has tried also to show that the interests represented are the most germane interests to political success and national acceptance in the Nigerian context as produced and reproduced in elitist political discourse. Pronouns used to index self, like 'I' and 'me', simply show alignments with positive realities of achievements, humility and personal integrity all as commodities to be used in exchange for political acceptance. The use of 'we' and 'us' creates multi-faceted dimensions and groupings all serving different political purposes. The 'we' used involving all other Nigerians attempts to show all referents as sharing a common destiny for the purpose of earning trust. Likewise, 'you' is meant to create what Fairclough (1989) refers to as "synthetic personalization" that is, to create that air of personal closeness and bond with the addressee with the sole aim of earning their confidence and friendship.

At the interpretation level, it has tried to show that certain ideological realities are presupposed then passed as true state of affairs. Many issues like the use of 'the' and the nominalizations I mentioned elsewhere in this paper are meant to build a frame that distances the addresser from an undisclosed 'they' and that assumes his perception of reality as the truth. There is also the use of categorical modalities with assertions to accord them

factual status. Such assertions like "I want all of you to know that I am one you", "I am here today because of your support and prayers" etcetera come with relational processes that show 'states' instead of 'actions'. Modals with epistemic tentativeness have clearly not been used in most of these declarations. The use of categorical modalities, according to Fairclough (1989, p. 129) "supports a view of the world as transparent—as if it signals its own meaning to any observer, without the need for interpretation and representation"

Finally, at the explanation level, it has attempted to show what socio cultural practices are drawn upon to gain legitimacy in the speech. I have identified two important elements, that is, class appeal and appeal to religion. Pronouns like 'we' that place the leader and the led all in the same boat is a tactic that is meant to underscore the socio-cultural practices of 'belongness' and 'communal classlessness' as found in African traditional setting. Also, the social alignment with the masses meant to be seen as the truth through the use of categorical modalities as shown above indicates that actual class realities are meant to be hidden. Moreover, in Critical Discourse Analysis what is said is as important as what is not said. Behind the scene politicking that takes place and the associations engendered therein have not been shown. The realities of political struggle involving godfatherism, clientele politics, electoral rigging etcetera have essentially been hushed and replaced by superficial realities of classlessness and synthetic camaraderie. Socio-cultural practices are reflected in the discourse and the discourse in turn influences the socio-cultural practices. Through this dialectics, the realities of power stabilize and the real class struggle of interests remains essentially covert.

References

Abuya, E. J. (2012). A Pragma-stylistic Analysis of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan Inaugural Speech. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *5*(11). http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p8

Albert, I. O. (2013). Political Godfatherism in Nigerian Politics. *African Sociological Review*, *9*(2), 79-105. Retrieved August 26, 2013, from http://www.scribd.com/doc/132137016/Political-Godfatherism-in-Nigeria>

Allen, W. (2007). Australian Political Discourse: Pronominal Choice in Campaign Speeches. *Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, *2*. Retrieved December 7, 2013, from http://sharepdf.net/view/88633/australian-political-discourse-pronominal-choice-in-campaign-speeches

Ayemoni, M. O. (2012). Grapho-Syntactic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Some Nigerian Heads of State. *Journal for African Culture and Society*, *21*, 319-339.

Ayemoni, O. M., & Akinkuolere, O. S. (2012). A Pragmatic Analysis of Victory and Inaugural Speeches of President Umaru Yar'adua. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(3), 461-468.

Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.

Bernard, T. (n.d.). The Role of Religion in African Conflicts: The Cases of Nigeria and Sudan. *Academia.edu - Share research*. Retrieved August 18, 2013, from http://www.academia.edu/715044/THE_ROLE_OF_RELIGION_IN_AFRICAN_CONFLICTS_THE_CASES_OF_NIGERIA_AND_SUDAN

Bramley, N. R. (2001). *Pronouns of Politics: The Use of Pronouns in The Construction of 'Self' and 'Other' in Political Interviews*. Thesis: Australian National University.

Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Daramola, A. (2008). A Child of Neccessity: An Analysis of Political Discourse in Nigeria. *International Pragmatics Association*, *18*(3), 355-380.

Dijk, T. A. (1997). The Study of Discourse. *Discourse as Structure and Process* (vol. 1). London: SAGE.

Downing, A., & Locke, P. (2006). *English Grammar: A University Course* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Kamalu, I., & Agangan, R. (2011). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Goodluck Jonathan's Declaration of Interest in the PDP Presidential Primaries. *Language, Discourse and Society*, *1*, 32-54.

Lackey, C., & Rawlence, B. (2007). *Criminal Politics Violence, "Godfathers" and Corruption in Nigeria*. New York, NY: Human Rights Watch.

Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical View* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pennycook, A. (1994). The Politics of Pronouns. *ELT Journal*, *48*(2), 173-178. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/48.2.173

Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology, and Point of View*. London: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203312612

Tenuche, M. S. (2009). The Language of Politics and Political Behaviours; Rhetoric of President Olusegun Obasanjo and the 2007 General Elections in Nigeria. *Journal of public administration and policy research*, *1*, 47-54.

Toolan, M. J. (2001). *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Wodak, R. (2005). *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.