

Discursive ideologies in campaign speeches of Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema in the 2019 South African presidential election

Ibitayo O. Oso¹
[ORCID 0000-0001-6572-2213](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6572-2213)
 University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
teewhyoso@gmail.com

Ivie R. Oviawe²
 University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria
realivie14@gmail.com

Abstract

This work analyses the discursive ideologies embedded in campaign speeches of Cyril Ramaphosa of the African National Congress (ANC) and Julius Malema of the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) in the period before May 8, 2019, the South African general elections. The study is an attempt to uncover the hidden ideologies the candidates subtly employ to sway voters in their favour. The study employed Critical Discourse Analysis to analyse the campaign messages. The data for the study comprised the campaign exchanges of the two candidates retrieved from www.youtube.com. This study shows that the two presidential contenders, through their campaign speeches, employed different ideologies through which they hoped to sway the electorate in their favour. The incumbent, Cyril Ramaphosa, projects the ideology of renewal and the elements of 'us' versus 'them' in his campaign speeches. Julius Malema, on the other hand, being a young leader, sells the ideologies of economic liberation, 'us' versus 'them' and 'young' versus 'old', depicting that only the youth can lead South Africa to the promised land. The study submits that political discourse is laden with specific ideologies which are intended to convince the voters to vote for them. It is therefore important that the public be well informed so that they can rationally uncover and identify these ideologies and either accept or reject them.

Keywords: discursive, ideology, campaign, South African presidential elections

Introduction

South Africa's road to democracy was a bumpy one. There have been unique issues that plagued the country before the eventual settling for democracy, making it one of the African countries that became democratic in the nineties. The issues that have been crucial in South Africa centered on the Apartheid policy that empowered the white minority over the black populace. During Apartheid, the National Party instituted segregation across South Africa to entrench white supremacy. They also separated South Africans from each other on the basis of colour. Non-white South Africans were moved out of the white urban areas. The government also offered non-whites inferior education decreasing their access to high-level jobs (Linford 2011).

-
1. Ibitayo Oso PhD is a lecturer in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Ibadan Distance Learning Centre, Nigeria.
 2. Ivie Oviawe is a postgraduate student in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Ibadan.

Apartheid lasted five decades until democracy was eventually negotiated. The hope of the average South African, particularly the blacks, was that the ugly trend that the previous years had set would be reversed. Therefore, hopes were high that democracy meant the dawning of a new era with high aspirations for a better life.

On April 27, 1994, South Africans voted in the first fully democratic elections. The African National Congress (ANC) won 62.7% of the vote, holding 252 seats in the 400 seat national assembly. The National Party (NP) won 20.4% of the vote with 82 seats and the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) won 10.5% of the vote with 43 seats. Due to the fact that South Africa operates the parliamentary system of democracy/government, the ANC, being the majority party in the National Assembly, chose Nelson Mandela as president. Since then, the ANC has consistently dominated the political space in South Africa.

There are almost always opposition to the ruling party, voters who believe that the ruling party does not have the will or ability to do things right. There are people who have been opposing the ANC saying that they have not lived up to the expectations of the South African people. This research seeks to identify and bring to the fore the discursive ideologies in the campaign speeches of Cyril Ramaphosa of the ANC and Julius Malema of the EFF in the 2019 South African elections. This will be achieved by exploring the ideologies that both Ramaphosa and Malema exploited to sway the electorate in their favour. This particular election is of interest because of its many intrigues. On the one hand, the ANC after the ousting of Jacob Zuma, who many thought was a corrupt leader, was struggling with its tarnished image. On the other hand, the EFF, a relatively new party, was seeking to oust a party that had been around for decades. Both parties made use of ideologies and other discursive patterns to convince South Africans to vote for them. The study will show how the 'old' versus 'young' ideology plays out in the campaign towards the South African elections. Cyril Ramaphosa of the ANC as at the time of the elections was sixty-six years old while Julius Malema was thirty-eight years old. While Ramaphosa leveraged on age and experience, Malema presented himself as young and vibrant. Therefore, it is important for this study to carry out critical discourse analysis of the two candidates' speeches based on their peculiarities. This work is significant because it contributes to the body of work on the language of political discourse in South Africa and, by extension, Africa.

The concept of politics

Politics is an activity and an activity through which people make, preserve and amend the general rules under which they live. Politics is an exciting phenomenon because people often disagree about how they should live. Who should get what? How should power and other resources be distributed? They also disagree about how matters should be resolved. How to collectively make decisions? Who should have a say? How much influence should a person have? Politics, according to Aristotle, is the 'master science'. It is mainly an activity through which human beings attempt to improve their lives and create a good society. Politics is, above all, a social activity. Pfeffer (1992:23) sees politics as the process, the action and the behaviour through which potential power is utilised and realised.

Chilton (2004:3) views politics as a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert their power and those who seek to resist it. Furthermore, it is viewed as cooperation, as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty and the like. Politics is a communal action involving people who accept a general membership or at least acknowledge a shared fate. Politics is concerned with power, the power to make decisions, to control resources and to control people and their values.

Politics is defined in different ways: as the exercise of power, the science of government, the making of collective decisions, allocation of resources, and so on. Politics is the making,

preserving and amending of general social rules. Okeke (2007:4) describes politics as a civilised agency and a way of ruling in a divided society without violence.

The role of language in politics

Language is a very powerful tool in politics. Language and politics are intertwined. In politics, language is a strong device for communication as it carries many different shades of meaning (Aduradola and Ojukwu 2013:105). Politics is concerned with power; the power to make decisions, to control other people's behaviour and to control their values. Politics is fundamentally concerned with power and authority, how to obtain and use it, how to make decisions and control resources within a particular jurisdiction, how to control and manipulate the perceptions, behaviour and values of those who are governed, among other things. To be able to do all these, politicians rely on language. Thus, politics is inherently dependent on language, hence the notion that "language is (an instrument of) power. The intricate relationship between the governed and those who govern them are enacted and mediated through language" (Chilton and Schaffner 1997:206). It is surely the case that politics cannot be conducted without language, and it is probably the case that the use of language in the constitution of social groups leads to what we call politics in a broad sense. Charteris-Black (2005:4) states that, "within all types of political system, from autocratic, through oligarchic to democratic; leaders have relied on the spoken word to convince others of the benefits that arise from their leadership".

The study of language extends beyond the domains of literature and linguistics. Pelinka (2007:129) claims that "language must be seen (and analysed) as a political phenomenon" and that politics must be conceived and studied as a discursive phenomenon.

Language is instrumental in political activities; politicians and those seeking political power use language not only to communicate their policies and ideologies, but also to create certain perceptions in order to influence the voters with a view to gaining advantage over their opponents. Szanto (1978:7) describes the language of politics as a "lexicon of conflict and drama, of ridicules and reproach, pleading and persuasion, colour and bite permeated. A language designed to valour men, destroy some and change the mind of others". Language and politics are intimately linked at a fundamental level. Politics is pre-dominantly constituted in language; hence, political activity does not exist without the use of language.

In a bid to identify the role of language in politics, Chilton (1998:12) defines language as the "universal capacity of human in all societies to communicate", while politics is the "art of governance". This means that language is a tool to interact or transact in various situations and in different organisations conventionally recognised as a political environment.

In politics, language is also used as a manipulative tool, to persuade and convince the voters. Politicians often use language to create a social ideology that their supporters and voters can easily key into and would want to be associated with. The strategy that involves a group of people to make other groups do what it intends to be done is referred to as a linguistic strategy. Linguistic strategy involves manipulative application of language. Onuigbo (2013:9) affirms that "language is not just a tool for communication but can be manipulated to be instrument of offence and defense". The term "linguistic manipulation" is the conscious use of one's language in a devious way to control others (Rozina and Karapetjana 2009). Pragmatically, linguistic manipulation is based on the use of indirect speech acts, which are focused on perlocutionary effects of "what is said?" Thus, in politics, linguistic manipulation plays an important role as an instrument in such a way that the manipulative intents of politicians are made obvious. Linguistic manipulation is considered to be an influential instrument of political rhetoric, because political discourse is primarily focused on influencing the people and persuading them to take specified political actions or make important political decisions. Atkinson (1984) asserts that linguistic manipulation is a distinctive feature of political rhetoric and the idea is based on persuading

people; for instance, linguistic manipulation would persuade people to take political action, persuade them to support a party or an individual.

Language plays a significant role in politics because it is an instrument by means of which the manipulative intents of politicians become apparent. Thus, the language used in politics employs an extensive range of rhetorical devices such as selective pronouns, metaphor, metonymy, allusion, hyperbole, etc. to convince the electorate in contemporary societies. Politicians engage in discourse and arguments, public statement, speeches and manifestos during elections. Thus, language is an indispensable tool for political construction and reconstruction.

Research questions

This research seeks to address the following questions:

1. What are the ideologies embedded in Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema's campaign speeches?
2. What are the motivations behind the ideologies employed by Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema?

Theoretical perspectives

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a theory that has been established as one of the fields of research in discourse studies. CDA focuses on public speech (talk or text) such as political speeches, advertisements, and official documents. Critical Discourse Analysis can be used for describing, interpreting, analysing and critiquing social life reflected in discourse. The aim of CDA is to examine the relationship between language, ideology and power. Moreover, its purpose is to discover the assessment and exploitation of language dominance through text. Fairclough (1995) stated that language is connected to social realities and brings about social change. He submitted that government involves the manipulation and use of language in significant ways and is particularly concerned with the links between language, ideology and power relations within society.

The focus here is on ideology, a term which has been linked to several definitions by scholars. Van Dijk (1998b) sees ideology as special forms of social cognition shared by social groups from the basis of the social representations and practices of group members including their discourse, which also serves the means of ideological production, reproduction and challenge. In the work of Fairclough and Wodak (1997), whose work provided a comprehensive work for this study on the principles within which CDA operates, one of the principles states that ideologies are produced and reflected in the use of discourse. That is, ideologies are often produced through discourse.

Politicians sometimes struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice; the tool through which they do this is language. In political discourse, language plays a critical role and every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by its usage. Political aspirants while campaigning use language to shape the political thoughts of the electorate with the aim of selling their ideologies to them. Ideologies are embedded in the language used by politicians during campaigns and they employ them to convince the people in a bid to acquire political power. The main reason for their campaign speeches is to persuade their audience of the validity of their political claims. This they do by employing different means and resources to shape the beliefs and behaviour of others. Therefore, efforts are made to convince the electorate to discard the political ideologies of their opposition and then hold on to theirs.

A good number of studies have been carried out on political discourse in African Studies by several scholars. Some of these are Ambuyoa, Indede and Karanja (2011), Taiwo (2010), Alo (2012), and Halim (2015) among others.

Taiwo (2010) interrogates the use of metaphor in (Nigerian) political discourse and submits that metaphorical expressions are deployed by Nigerian politicians to project certain ideological stances in their speeches.

In a bid to broaden the scope of scholarship, Alo (2012) examines an engagement of the development of rhetoric by selected African political leaders. He adds that African leaders employ persuasive strategies to achieve their political goals or ambitions.

Also, Akinrinola (2015) works on the rhetorical engagement of the inaugural speech of Nigeria's President, Mohammadu Buhari. He points out that the President expressed strong commitment and inclusiveness in the speech through verbal choices and pronominal items. Still in Nigeria, Ayeomoni (2005) carried out a study on the language of politics in Nigeria and preponderant features, which include the use of a simple declarative sentence typology, the use of figurative expression or metaphoric language and the use of coercion. Osisanwo (2016) explored politics in an academic setting by looking at the campaign messages used during the electioneering campaign in the 2015 deanship election in the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan. He adopted van Dijk's (2006) model of critical discourse analysis; twenty five texts were purposively retrieved from the numerous messages sent during the period. He indicated that the text messages sent during the period are ideologically polarised into positive self-representation and negative other-representation. He also observed that six discourse strategies which manifested in the messages include representation of the starting world and negotiation of the destination world, appeal to voters' emotion, appeal to history, appeal to experience/past achievement, counter-discourse and the creation of common ground between the self and the electorate. He also identified that four ideological stances, which are propagandist, framist, mediator and reformist, were persuasively developed.

In Kenya, Ambuyoa *et al.* (2011) examined politeness in political discourse during question-time discussions of the Kenyan Parliament. The findings show that certain strategies are employed to mitigate Face-Threatening Acts, thereby enhancing effective communication; others are a ritual requirement by the standing orders, political factions. Question time in Kenyan Parliament is full of FTAs such as criticisms, requests, accusations, blame, complaints, rebukes amongst other things, just as a manifestation of the power relations evident among the members of the Parliament. Michira (2014) worked on a critical cum descriptive analysis of persuasive strategies in the speeches of the presidential candidates in the 2013 Kenyan Presidential election.

In Pakistan, Khalil, Islam and Qazalbash (2017) focused on persuasion and political discourse by attempting a critical discourse analysis of Imran Khan's selected election speech. They posit that politicians make use of tactful language to propagate their ideologies. They opine that Imran Khan, the chairman of Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaaf (PTI), made use of repetition, word choice, positive self-representation and negative other-representation to influence the minds of the voters.

Based on the previous research referred to above, a good number of scholars have done research on the political discourse in Africa in which they have all proved that politicians employ linguistic strategies to persuade their audience to vote for them.

This work while also looking at political discourse, studies the ideologies embedded in the campaign speeches of Cyril Ramaphosa of the ANC and Julius Malema of the EFF in the 2019 South African presidential election. Apart from the fact that these candidates are foremost contenders in the elections, there is an underlying ideology of 'old versus young'. This age factor is not only about the two candidates, but also that of the parties whose flags they were flying. While the ANC was formed originally in 1912 but came into power in 1994, the EFF was formed in 2013. The campaign shows how both parties use the age factor to convince South Africans to vote for them. Also, the two contenders have opposing ideologies. While Ramaphosa is believed

to be pro-white, Malema has always projected himself as fighting for the black majority. This work seeks to study the ideologies employed by the two candidates.

Methodology

The data for this research are taken from the words, phrases and sentence in the selected campaign speeches of Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema. The data was obtained by the researchers from *www.youtube.com*. For the purpose of gathering substantial data, the researcher downloaded five (5) videos each for Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema. The longest running time for the videos was two (2) hours, and the shortest was twenty-seven (27) minutes. In collecting the data, the researchers devoted sufficient time to watching, listening and conscientiously transcribing the selected videos. The researchers paid close attention and while observing the content of the selected campaign speeches took notes and determined the utterances which may contain the ideologies that were embedded in it. Also, in order to ensure accurate data collection, the researchers spent 4-6 hours listening to and observing each video from which the data was obtained. The data collected was subjected to Critical Discourse Analysis based on Fairclough and Wodak's (1997) theory.

Data presentation and analysis

This section is aimed at presenting the data and analysis of the study. It discusses the ideologies embedded in the campaign speeches of Cyril Ramaphosa and Julius Malema and the motivation behind their usage. The data in the form of excerpts are statements made in their campaign speeches. Furthermore, in our analysis of the concept of ideology, the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as proposed by Fairclough and Wodak (1997) were employed.

Ideologies embedded in Cyril Ramaphosa's campaign speeches

Cyril Ramaphosa's campaign speeches are laden with the ideologies through which he convinces the electorate in order to win the election. He adopts the use of a 'them' versus 'us' ideology and the ideology of renewal as evident in his speeches. This is further expatiated with examples below.

'Us' Versus 'Them' Ideology

Excerpt1

Others talk, we do. Others scream; we build houses. Others criticise; we provide water to our people. Others make false promises, we build clinics and hospitals. Others want to create jobs; we create jobs ...

The element of the 'us versus them' ideology is evident in Ramaphosa's speech. He adopts the exclusive 'we' pronoun to represent himself and his party while using 'other' to depict the contenders from other political parties. This is to show the disparity between himself and his party on the one hand, and his rivals on the other hand. Ramaphosa intentionally used this ideology to represent his party as not just talkers but performers. By employing this ideology, he ridicules his opposition who are have never been in power but are known for making promises. With this, he presents his party as experienced and trustworthy unlike those who have had no experience whatsoever but make unrealistic promises. This ideology is premised on the fact that the ANC has been the ruling party since the country gained her independence. Therefore, it was easy for Ramaphosa to list the party's achievements in order to castigate the intentions of his oppositions since they have none to mention. He mentions the provision of housing, clinics, hospitals and jobs as the achievement of the government to show that they are concerned about the welfare of the South African people. He successfully uses the 'us versus them' ideology here to portray his party as the experienced side while subtly urging the electorate to allow their good

work to continue. He also uses it to make the people question the credibility of what other parties hope to achieve since they are greenhorns. To further cause distrust of the opposition in the minds of the people, he accuses them of always criticising when they (his party) do these things to improve the standard of living of the populace.

Excerpt 2

We now can confidently report that over twenty-five years the lives of South Africans have improved and they continue to improve but we also agree that much work remains to be done and we say that we are the only organisation that can tackle the tasks that lie ahead.

Still harping on the fact that his party is well experienced, Ramaphosa uses the exclusive 'we' here, to portray the ANC as the party that has brought improvement in the lives of South Africans. To show some modesty, he acknowledges that there is much work to be done. This portrays him as a realist who is in touch with the realities on the ground in the country. He tries to sway his audience, however, to believe that the ANC is the only political party that can tackle the many tasks that lie ahead. This shows that the party is still willing to take the responsibility of making South Africa better. In short, the pragmatic import of this sentence is to remind the people that the ANC has made some improvements in the living standards of the citizens and are still fully ready to do more, because they are the party that has the experience and capability to tackle the task ahead.

Excerpt 3

I think here of our people in the Eastern Cape, who are still waiting for a dam and that is another project that we will tackle. I think of our people in Giyani, who are still waiting for better water to flow through their taps. That we will also do. This we will do as we grow the economy of our country.

In the above excerpt, Ramaphosa uses the pronoun *I*, *our* and *we* in order to pass a strong message across to his audience. The use of the first person pronoun 'I' is used to identify his individual self as different from every other person. Therefore, the use of the expression 'I think', twice in the statement is not just to represent his individuality but to show that he knows what the people need and that he has them in mind since he thinks about them. This choice of pronoun is used to show the people that he is concerned about them. This is intended to boost his positive self-image among them. In using the pronoun 'our', Ramaphosa projects a collective identity. He identifies himself with the people of the Eastern Cape and Giyani using the expression 'our people' to show that he includes himself as a member of the people. This is to clearly show the people that unlike some politicians who distance themselves from the people they govern, he is a part of his own people. Whatever affects them also affects him. So his government is a government of the people. The last pronoun used is 'we', which was mentioned twice in the utterance. Ramaphosa uses the exclusive pronoun 'we' to refer to himself and his party here, indicating positive self-representation (us). Using the pronoun 'we' in the utterance above is to build the hope of the people that he would tackle the problem of the people with the help of his party and that he won't be doing the work alone. This pronoun projects him as a good team-player and his party as a resourceful one that can solve the problems of South Africa.

Excerpt 4

We are the ones who provide ARVs for those living with HIV, others praise themselves for what they have not done.

In this excerpt, there is another use of the exclusive 'we'. This is a positive self-representation technique. 'We' here refers to Ramaphosa and his team. He draws the attention of his audience

to how they have responded to the treatment of those living with HIV in the nation by providing ARV drugs for those affected. The use of the ideology here is to make the audience and the people see the other parties as parties that have been not been able to prove themselves to the people; they only praise themselves for what they are yet to do. This is the 'them' ideology to show other-negative representation. Ramaphosa uses this to point out the negative side of other political parties. He portrays them as liars and dishonest people who praise themselves for what they have not done. Saying this places a dent in the image of the political parties, reducing their acceptability among South Africans.

3.1.2 Renewal

Ramaphosa presents the ideology of renewal to the people of South Africa. This is strategic, because they have been in power for twenty-five years and it may seem that the people have lost hope in the party that once fought against Apartheid and led them into a democratic era. He adopts this ideology to convince the people to hold on and embrace the ideology of renewal which he projects as a new era of growth and transformation for the people. The credibility of the ANC is being questioned in South Africa, therefore the ideology of a renewal process will endear the people to the party they once trusted.

Excerpt 5

After a period of doubt and uncertainty, we have arrived at the moment of hope and renewal. The 2019 elections provide us with an opportunity to restore our democratic institutions and to return our country to a path of transformation and development.

Amidst the various scandals that rocked the ANC prior to the election, Cyril Ramaphosa sees the need to clear the doubt in the minds of his supporters using the ideology of renewal. The excerpt above shows vividly the ideology of renewal which Ramaphosa wants the people to embrace. As a way to further gain the trust of his supporters, he begins the statement by laying claim to the fact that the ANC has been faced with a period of doubt and uncertainty but nevertheless he promises them a new era which will be different from what they are used to in past administration. They are now in a different era, one that is about hope and renewal. He promises that, if voted for, he would restore and transform the country from its current state to a better one. By using this ideology, Ramaphosa intends to detach from the status quo and the scandals that have rocked his party to present a new era that will bring about development and transformation in the country.

Excerpt 6

Comrades, there is a lot that awaits us, this period of renewal and the new dawn is beckoning, is calling all of us to now embrace the new dawn and renewal process so that we can move South Africa forward and grow our economy.

Ramaphosa, projecting the ideology of renewal, seeks to draw the attention of the people to accept his ideology. He uses the renewal ideology here to entice and convince his audience of better leadership because he is aware that the people of South Africa are beginning to lose hope in the credibility of the ANC considering the issue of corruption and division that it faces. He uses the renewal ideology to vanquish previous conceptions about the party while urging them to adopt this new prospect as a lot awaits them. He urges South Africans to embrace this ideology in order to usher in a new era of transformation. This is to further persuade the audience to see him as the candidate that is agitated by their desired change.

3.2 The ideologies embedded in Julius Malema's campaign speeches

The ideologies underlying the campaign speeches by Julius Malema are economic liberation, 'them' versus 'us' and 'young' versus 'old', which were identified in our analysis.

3.2.1 Economic liberation

Julius Malema in his campaign speeches used economic liberation to draw the attention of the people to the idea of an economy that is free from white dominance in South Africa. He is optimistic that when he is voted for, the blacks in South Africa will own businesses and be given the chance to participate in the economy of the country. Following the name of his party, Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF), he mentions the fact that though South Africa has gone past the ugly phase of political apartheid, they are yet to be economically free. He insists on the fact that political freedom without economic freedom is meaningless. Julius Malema used this ideology to point out that when the people of South Africa are economically liberated, there will be jobs, the blacks will be able to own productive farms and there would be no need for government subsidised housing; fewer people will be living on social grants because many of them will be able to fend for themselves. This ideology is discussed below:

Excerpt 1

We must bring that nonsense to an end on the 8th of May. Political apartheid is over, we still have economic apartheid. Why do you behave like you have arrived, because you know that you are swimming in a pool of death. While you are working, they are paying whites more money than black people, yet you are doing the same job. That's what we mean by economic apartheid.

The name of Julius Malema's party, Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF), already implies the ideology of economic liberation. He protests against economic apartheid. He shows the people that the whites in South Africa enjoy better privileges by getting more pay than the blacks for the same job. He wants the people to know that they are not yet free economically; hence, voting for him on the 8th of May will bring an end to economic apartheid in South Africa. Apartheid is a very strong word that means a lot to South Africans, especially the black and coloured ones. To paint a grave image of what the government is doing to the blacks in South Africa, Malema uses the phrase 'economic apartheid'. It is evident that beneath the clamour for economic freedom is a political motive to soil the image of the whites in South Africa. This means that there is another underlying ideology of 'white' versus 'black' in Malema's speeches. Malema chooses to remind his audience of the better opportunities that the whites get even while carrying out the same job as blacks. Julius Malema reminds the people of the discrimination they face as black South Africans economically. He is aware that this will further instigate the blacks to vote in his favour as the leader who is ready to end economic apartheid in the country. He uses the pronoun 'you' to represent the black population while he uses 'they' to represent the 'oppressors' of the black people, which is the government. He uses this to paint the government in a bad light in order to discredit them in the eyes of the black population of South Africa.

Excerpt 2

They are charging us more when we apply for a point less than what they are charging white people. Comrades, why are farm owners white people? When we say economic freedom, we mean that black people would own productive farms.

In sending the message of economic liberation to the people, he speaks of the injustice the blacks receive in certain areas, that is, they are charged more when they apply for a point and also the fact that the whites are owners of farms in South Africa. The last sentence was used by Malema to point out that the ideology of economic liberation which he wants to offer the people will lead to black people owning productive farms. Malema uses this ideology here to draw the attention of the black South Africans to injustices they face and the disparity between the whites and the blacks. He chooses to awaken the people's interest in areas they can explore such as owning productive farms. He is aware that in presenting the ideology of economic liberation to

the people, he can easily convince his audience of his need to be voted for, and then portraying himself as a candidate who is ready to improve the lives of black South Africans. Very noticeable is the use of the 'they' versus 'us' dichotomy. This is discussed in detail under the 'us' versus 'them' ideology.

Excerpt 3

There is no more farming alone, there is no more owning a call center alone, yes, we will work in the call center, yes, we will answer the phones because we are shareholders, we are working in our company. End of the month salary, end of financial year, dividends ... that is the future of South Africa.

The ideology of economic liberation is embedded in the excerpt above. This speech was made by Malema to build hope for the people that the future of South Africa is one where the people would be able to work in all sectors of the economy and become shareholders. He paints a future where they would receive their salaries and dividends. Julius Malema uses this strategy to present to his audience what the economic future of South Africa will look like when he becomes the president. Therefore, Malema used ideology here in order to influence his audience to vote for him.

Excerpt 4

It's a wasted freedom because when you say people are oppressed economically; women are oppressed three times than men economically. One, because they are women. Two, because they are Africans. Three, because they are a working class. They are at the receiving end of the economic oppression, that's why they must benefit than all of us.

Malema uses the above utterance to substantiate his ideological opinion in a way that would draw the attention of the women in South Africa. As seen in the excerpt, Malema points out that the women are more oppressed economically and he gives reasons to support his stance. Therefore, his message of economic freedom is not just for the men but the women as well who he says are 'at the receiving end of the economic oppression' faced in South Africa. He uses his ideology here in a bid to convince them that the economic liberation for which he stands will be beneficial to all South Africans, whether male or female. This is intended to sway the women, particularly the black women in South Africa, to vote in his favour.

3.2.2 Pronouns – “They (them)” versus “we (us)” ideology

The use of pronouns is to substitute a noun in order to avoid the repetition of the noun being referred to. Therefore, pronouns can be used to refer to something that may have been mentioned earlier by a speaker. The use of pronouns in political speeches goes beyond substitution of a noun; rather it shows a dichotomy in defining the in-group (us) and out-group (them). Ideological political discourse is organised by positive self-representation (us) and other negative representation (them) (van Dijk 2006). There is evidence of them/us ideology in the speeches made by Julius Malema where he used the pronouns *I*, *we*, and *our* to express positive self-representation when referring to himself, the EFF, the blacks and the people of South Africa in general while he uses *they*, *them* and *theirs* to express other negative – representation when referring to his opposition (ANC and DA) party, the people of South Africa in general and the White people of South Africa. The different cases where the *they/them* and *we/us* ideology was used are emphasised in the excerpts below:

Excerpt 5

... But our neighbours here, what are they doing to change the lives of their neighbours? Do they have foundation? Do they put money and say this money will be

spent in Alexandra? They are not doing anything; they are staying in high walls. You know why? They are scared of us and they have got reason to be scared of us because they know that they are eating alone.

As seen in the excerpt above, there is evident use of the third person (subject, plural) personal pronoun which is repeated nine times in the speech. This utterance was made by Malema while addressing the people in Alexandra. The speech referred to the white people living in Sandton as "our neighbours". Malema expresses his frustration at how the whites are living around Alexandra (a township in the Gauteng province of South Africa, populated by mostly black South Africans and located near Sandton) but do nothing to improve the lives of their neighbours. He projects the use of the 'us'/'them' ideology here and the 'they' in his speech refers to the white people. According to him 'they' live in high walls which shows a form of disparity between them and the people of Alexandra. With the use of this ideology in the excerpt above, Malema shows the negative actions of the whites in Sandton.

Excerpt 6

Here is your party, we don't promote by selling, we don't promote by proximity, we don't promote by political affiliation, we promote by years of service and discipline and dedication.

By using "we" as seen in the excerpt above, Malema introduces the 'we' ideology to refer to himself and his party (the EFF). The utterance was addressed to the police in order to persuade them to belong to his party. He opined that his party imbibes the culture of transparency and promises that they would be treated fairly. Their promotion will be based on their years of service and dedication to the force. Here, he speaks highly of his party in order to indirectly paint the other party as one which lacks integrity. The aim of using the pronoun 'we' is to sell himself and his party to the police thereby drawing the attention of policemen who have been denied of their promotion when they were deserving of it. The pragmatic import of this is that he portrays the other party as one in which nepotism is the order of the day.

Excerpt 7

I am saying to you, please don't be impatient with them, be patient with them because your mind is liberated. Their mind is still oppressed but you are liberating their mind, then they are coming to join you one by one.

In the expression 'I am saying to you', the first person pronoun 'I' shows individuality; and sometimes politicians try to represent themselves by indicating their individual identity using the pronoun 'I' which sets them free from being under the umbrella of their party. Here, Malema shows that he is the one giving the advice as seen in the utterance and not his party. He also vividly uses the third person (object, plural) pronoun to refer to those who have not bought his idea of economic liberation while he uses 'you and your' to refer to his supporters who are already liberated like himself.

Excerpt 8

Our people don't want social grants; they want better jobs, better salary, so that they can feed themselves, so that they can build proper houses for themselves.

As seen in the excerpt above, there is evidence of 'our' which he uses to portray a sense of collectivity, bringing into perspective himself as one of the people. As someone who understands what it once felt like to depend on the government while growing up, he uses the pronoun to point out that he is quite aware of what the people want. He further differentiates himself from the people when he refers to them as 'they' and themselves'. Here, he associates the people as 'other'-representation in showing that he understands and knows what the people need, since he

has already stressed the fact that he is part of them. He knows that having acknowledged that he is part of the people, he also needs to present most essential needs such as food, jobs and houses from their own perspective. This will give Malema leverage over other candidates, as a candidate that truly knows their very needs, as this will increase his chances of being voted for.

Excerpt 9

They are going to come with lots of T-shirts here. That's what they do when you speak, they close your mouth with a T-shirt, they make you to be a zombie.

Here, Malema associates the ANC with the negative other-representation. He uses the pronoun 'they' to indicate precisely that his party is different and it's not one that doesn't let the people speak their mind. He presents the ANC as a party that is corrupt by enticing the people with material items during the election period, instead of allowing the people to speak up about what they really want. He uses the expression 'they make you to be a zombie' to make people see the ANC as one that would rather give out shirts than listen to the needs of the people. The reason for using this here is to gain an edge over the other party.

3.2.3 Young versus old

Julius Malema uses the 'young' versus 'old' ideology to campaign during the election. He portrays himself and his party as young, while his opposition, Cyril Ramaphosa and his party members, are regarded as old. Julius Malema of the EFF is younger than Cyril Ramaphosa of the ANC, therefore he sells himself to the people as a young leader that has new ideas and Ramaphosa as an old leader with nothing new to offer the people. According to him, the ANC has run out of ideas and the young ones should be given the opportunity to be in government. The ANC which was created over a hundred years ago, has been in power since the beginning of the democratic era in South Africa. Malema criticises Ramaphosa and his party (ANC) saying they lack fresh ideas to move the country forward. Malema constantly refers to his party as the future of South Africa in his campaign speeches.

Excerpt 10

When you go inside, there's an old person saying we want the young ones because they still have energy. They will go and fetch the land for us, they are the only ones who deliver, they do not make promises, they make commitment.

This statement is one of the ways Malema expresses the ideology of young leadership to the people. This is the ideology he chooses to buttress the fact that he is a younger than his opponent. He wants his audience to know that he is young and vibrant and would be in a better position to rule them. He uses the above statement to point out that the young ones still have energy and that they are not weak and as a result, they would be able to give the land which has been mostly allocated to the whites in South Africa back to the blacks. He further buttresses his point that the young do not make promises: they are committed to do as they have said. The pragmatic import of this is to sell himself as the ideal candidate to deliver the change that the people are agitating to get and for them to see the need to change their old leaders.

Excerpt 11

The ANC ...it's tired, hundred and something years old that's why they can't run. When you say to them, go and fetch water, they won't run, they are still going to fetch water for the people of Kumulatu ... They are still going to fetch them water twenty-five years into democracy. So we need young people with energy.

Embedded in this statement is the ideology of the young leaders over the old leaders. The goal here is to paint the ANC as an old party considering their long history in the country. Malema draws the attention of the people to the ANC being over a hundred years old and are yet to

provide basic amenities to the people and as this has been the case even after twenty-five years of democratic rule. Therefore, he pushes the need for the people to vote for the young leaders who have the energy to provide them with basic amenities. He consistently points the people's attention to the fact that all the promises made by the ANC in past administrations is yet to be fulfilled and as such they should be given the chance to continue with their leadership. Malema is indirectly asking the people to give his party of about five years the opportunity to prove themselves.

Excerpt 12

The ANC is too old and too tired, they can't think of anything new.

The above statement was used by Malema to paint the ANC as not just old but as a failure. It has failed in bringing something new to the development of South Africa. To Malema, the ANC has been in power for twenty-five years and no longer have anything new to offer the people because they lack fresh ideas. Therefore, their time in the political scene is over; it is now the time for young leaders like himself to take over. Furthermore, his five year-old party has better chances to bring up fresh ideas that will improve the lives of the people.

4 Conclusion

Politicians' campaign speeches are laden with ideology. Critical discourse analysis reveals these ideologies because it focuses not just on what is said but what is left unsaid. This work has focused on the discursive ideologies employed by Cyril Ramaphosa of the ANC and Julius Malema of the EFF. An observation made in this work is the major reason why politicians use these ideologies is to discredit their rivals. Their campaign speeches are either structured to attack a rival or defend an accusation brought against them. For a nation to move forward, the ideology driving the leaders should be more people-focused than this. Politicians are expected to generate and communicate worldviews in order to win and mobilise support from the electorate because of the efficiency gains that the electorate find in adhering to them. It should not just be about mud-slinging. For example, both Ramaphosa and Malema adopted the use of the 'us' versus 'them' ideology. This was employed not to present anything new to South Africans but to draw their attention to the fact that they are different from each other. They adopt the use of positive self-representation while they present their rivals as incompetent. Therefore, rather than raise issues that will positively affect the lives of South Africans in their campaigns, the politicians attack each other and try to present themselves as an alternative. Even though the politicians employ some ideologies that portray them as genuinely concerned about the electorate, they do not form the crux of their campaigns. Due to the fact that politicians are usually skilled speakers, their listeners are usually carried away by their speeches and they do not focus on the ideologies they project. Therefore, politicians use language to disguise certain ideologies in their campaign speeches. The electorate is encouraged not just to hear these campaigns but also actively listen so that they can identify the ideologies that drive the candidates and make an informed decision on who to vote for. Politicians are also advised to focus on serious issues that will positively affect the lives of South Africans rather than merely promote their campaigns.

This research paper has been able to focus on just two of the contenders in the South African presidential elections. It is recommended that further studies be carried out on other candidates so as to track their ideologies as well.

References

Aduradola, R.R. & Ojukwu, C.C. 2013. Language of Political Campaigns and Politics in Nigeria. *Canadian Social Science*, 9 (3), 104-116.

- Akinrinlola, T. 2015. Rhetorical Analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's inaugural speech. *Papers in English and Linguistics*, 19, 1-14.
- Atkinson, M. 1984. *Our Master's Voices: The Language and Body Language of Politics*. London: Methuen.
- Alo, M.A. 2012. A Rhetorical Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Prominent African Leaders. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 10(1),2046-2059.
- Ambuyoa, B.A., Indede, F.N. and Karanja, P.N. 2011. Face Threatening Acts and Standing Orders: 'Politeness' or 'Politics' in the Question Time Discussions of the Kenyan Parliament. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Social Sciences*. 1(9), pp. 209-218.
- Ayeomoni, M. O. 2005. A Linguistic Investigation of the Language of Political Elites in Nigeria. *Nebula*, 2(2), 153-168.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C. 1997. *Discourse and Politics: Discourse as Social Interaction*. (eds) Teun Van Dijk. London: Sage.
- Chilton, P. A. 1998. Politics and Language. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*, London: Elsevier.
- Chilton, P. 2004. *Analyzing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis: An Overview, in T. van Dijk, (ed.) *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage, 67-97.
- Halim, S. A. 2015. 'Impoliteness Strategies Used in a Politician's Facebook". MA Dissertation: University of Malaya.
- Khalil, U., Islam, M., Chatta, S. and Qazalbash, F. 2017. Persuasion and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's Selected Election Speech. 18,193-210.
- Linford, A. 2011. Inequality Trends in South Africa. GeoCurrents. Retrieved 11 March 2020, from <http://www.geocurrents.info/economic-geography/inequality-trends-insouth-africa>
- Michira, N. J. 2014. The Language of Politics: A CDA of the 2013 Kenyan Presidential Campaign Discourse. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(1),1-18
- Nwagbo, O. G. 2014. Language and Identity in Oru refugee camp, Ogun state, Nigeria. An unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Linguistics and African Languages, University of Ibadan.
- Okeke, B. S. 2007. *Politics of Education. The Nigerian experience*. Akwa: Doone Printing and Publishing.
- Onuigbo, S. 2013. Language as Action in Political Culture. *Journal of Nigerian Languages and Culture*. (A Publication from APNILAC) Vol.14 No. 1-8.
- Osisanwo, A. 2016. Vote for us, not them: Discursive Strategies and Ideological Structures in the 2015 Campaign SMS messages for the Next Faculty Head. *Ibadan Journal of Humanistic Studies*, Vol 26, No.1,135-157.
- Pelinka, A. 2007. Language as a Political Category: The Viewpoint of Political Science. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 6(1), 129-143
- Pennycook, A. 2001. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*: London, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Pfeffer, J. 1992. *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organisation*. Harvard: Business Press.
- Rozina, G. and Karapetjana, I. 2009. The Use of Language in Political Rhetoric: Linguistics Manipulation. *Sosyal Bilimer Dergisi*, 111-122.
- Szanto, G. H. 1978. *Theatre and Propaganda*. Austin: University of Texas Press
- Taiwo, R. 2010. *Metaphors in Nigerian Political Discourse*. Obafemi Awolowo University. Harvard Business Press.
- Van Dijk T. A. 2006. Ideology and Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 11(2) ,115-140.