

The discursive manifestation of two publics: The case of selected speeches of three former African leaders

Beatrice Ekanjume-Ilongo¹ and Ntsoeu Seephephe²
National University of Lesotho

Abstract

The explanation of the political problem pervading the majority of countries in post-colonial Africa lies in the existence of two publics namely, the amoral civic public and the primordial public, which African political leaders are said to operate in. The amoral civic public, which includes institutions such as the military and the civil service, is dominated by the primordial public, which is based on primordial ties and gives politicians their moral framework. Using the practices of Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) which falls under Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) and perceives discourse as an (social) action, this paper explores how the two publics manifest in selected speeches of three African leaders namely former Lesotho Prime Minister Pakalitha Mosisili, former South African President Jacob Zuma, and former Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe. The speeches, taken from media outlets such as newspapers, were chosen on the bases that they generated controversy and were widely discussed in media. The paper explains how some elements of the speeches that fulfil the requirements of a good image in the primordial public contravene the principles and norms of democracy. The findings show that there is an existence of two publics that have a relationship with each other and which are the cause most of the problems in post-colonial Africa.

Keywords: discursive, Manifestation, primordial public, amoral civic public, speeches

¹ Professor Beatrice Ekanjume-Ilongo is currently the Acting Pro-Vice-Chancellor at the National University of Lesotho. Prior to this, she was the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities. She is a holder of a PhD in Linguistics from the University of Yaounde 1, Cameroon. She has taught a broad range of linguistics courses such as Introduction to Linguistics, Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology, Advanced Grammar, Advanced Phonetics, Advanced Morphology, Translation and Interpreting, and Research Methodology. She also supervise postgraduate student in research. She also has a high profile of postgraduate supervision, at Honours, Masters and PhD levels. She is a prolific scholar who has published several articles in accredited and refereed journals, and an author of three books. Her research interests include Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology, Sociolinguistics, African Linguistics, Error Analysis, Onomastics, Communication and Pragmatics. Email: bilongo.ekanjume@yahoo.com

² Dr Ntsoeu Seephephe is a lecturer at the National University of Lesotho. Currently he is the Coordinator of the Communication and Study Skills Units in the Department of English. He is a holder of a PhD in English Language and Linguistics. He is a co-author of 'The use of intertextuality by males and females in South African parliament' (2016) *Language Matters* 47(2):166-183. DOI: 10.1080/10228195.2016.1169310 and 'Linguistic metaphor identification in Sesotho' In Susan Nacey, Aletta G. Dorst, Tina Krennmayr and W. Gudrun Reijnerse *Metaphor Identification in Multiple Languages: MIPVU around the World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. His research interests are in Critical Discourse Analysis, metaphor and illness, particularly in Sesotho, and language acquisition. Email: seephephe@yahoo.com

Introduction

This study explores the way the two publics, proposed to exist within the post-colonial African landscape, manifest in discourse. To provide a discourse-analytic approach to the analysis of speeches of three African leaders – Lesotho's former Prime Minister Pakalitha Mosisili, South Africa's former President Jacob Zuma, and Zimbabwe's former President Robert Mugabe – the study employs elements of Political Discourse Analysis (PDA), alongside the Theory of Two Publics formulated by Ekeh (1975). The speeches chosen are those that generated controversy and were perceived as flouting principles of democracy. The study explores the reasons for making these kind of utterances by the leaders despite the fact that the democratic dispensation they operate in prohibits them and why they may have been deemed acceptable by some members of society.

As an explanation of the political problems facing post-colonial Africa and the moral choices African politicians make, Ekeh (1975) advances the notion of two publics that have a dialectical relationship with each other. He argues that post-colonial Africa has seen an emergence of two publics, the primordial and civic, with different moral imperatives. On the one hand, there is the civic realm. The civic public consists of institutions that came with colonialism and are part of what constitute a state. It encompasses all civil structures such as the army, the police and the civil service. On the other hand, there is the primordial public based on primordial social groupings and ties. This groupings include the tribe, the clan and the family. According to Ekeh (1975), for moral framework the members of the ruling class in post-colonial Africa rely on the dictates of the primordial public, which they follow even to the detriment of the civic public. This is because, contrary to what happens in the West, where the same moral framework of generalised Christian principles guides an individual's behaviour in both the private and civic public, the civic public is seen as lacking any moral framework. Practices such as corruption, nepotism and abuse of human rights that harm civil institutions are perceived positively in as long as they do not violate principles of the primordial public and if they seem to be aimed at strengthening primordial ties (Ekeh, 1975).

From its inception the theory of Two Publics proved to be influential on research on post-colonial African politics (Osaghae, 1999). However, this influence does not seem to have extended to the discourse of the politicians in Africa. This is despite the fact that studies on the interface between discourse and politicians have confirmed to the discursive dimension of politics. Furthermore, studies using the Critical Discourse Analysis, and its political-orientated Political Discourse Analysis, have shown how discourse, including political discourse, is a form of action (Fairclough, 1995). Therefore, it can be assumed from this that apart from manifestation in the form of practices such as corruption, nepotism and abuse of human rights, the dialectical relationship between the two publics can be seen in a discursive form.

This paper examines the discursive manifestation of the two publics from excerpts of speeches of the three politicians mentioned above. To enable a discourse-analytic approach, the study employs the tenets of the Political Discourse Analysis. PDA is the branch of Critical Discourse Studies (CDA) that specifically concerns itself with political language (Chilton, 2004 and Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012). It prescribes the analysis of political discourse that includes not only political players such as presidents and prime ministers, but also what can be considered inherently non-political players such as the citizens, the audience and the media in as long as they are involved in the political action (Fairclough, 2012). As a branch of Critical Discourse, its preoccupation is to reveal power asymmetries hidden in language, especially political language. In other words, it unmask injustices that political language naturalises.

The three politicians whose texts are analysed have headed governments in countries with a history of colonial rule and it is the colonial system that developed the civil service that the

politicians are at the pinnacle of. Lesotho, which had hitherto been ruled by a monarch, King Moshoeshoe I, became a protectorate of Great Britain in 1889. From that period, to the attainment of its independence in 1966, Lesotho was relying on the colonial government for setting up the state apparatus that included the civil service. The institutions that were set up by the post-colonial governments include the army. Lesotho is a constitutional monarchy, with a King as the Head of State and a Prime Minister as the Head of Government. Pakalitha Mosisili was Prime Minister of Lesotho from 1998 to 2012 and from 2015 to 2017. On the other hand, Zimbabwe then called Rhodesia was a colony of Great Britain from 1923 to 1965. This was followed by a white minority rule that ended in 1980 when Zimbabwe got its independence and Robert Mugabe became the Head of Government as a Prime Minister. He ruled as a President from 1983 to 2017, though criticisms of the manner of elections and rigging were labelled at his political party - the ZanuPF. The current constitutions of the three countries use democratic principles as a framework and are the means through which civil liberties are safeguarded (cf. Constitution of Lesotho, Constitution of South Africa and Constitution of Zimbabwe).

Theoretical Framework

This study applies a discourse analytic approach to the study of the two publics. It therefore relies on the theory of two publics and the Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) theory which prescribes a discourse-analytic approach to discourse.

The theory of two publics

The theory of two publics suggests that the political problems in post-colonial Africa are due to the existence of two parallel publics that emerged as a legacy of colonialism (Ekeh, 1995). The opportunistic and unequal relationship between the two publics is what creates the political problems such as nepotism and corruption that have characterised African politics (Ekeh, 1975).

During the colonial period, there was a disconnection between the rulers and the people that they ruled. As a result two publics emerged, one that was based on primordial ties and another one that was associated with the colonial administration. Ekeh (1975) refers to the public associated with the primordial ties as primordial public. This public emerged as alternative to the civic public that the colonised Africans were feeling disconnected with. In it, duties and rights are emphasised, and measures such as ostracising are taken for violation of the values cherished in this public. Some of the values emphasised in this public are solidarity and involvement in acts that promote the cohesion of the group.

The civic public, however, is based on civil structures such as government, the civil service and military. During colonial period, these institutions were dominated by the colonial administrators. This association created an attitude of hostility towards these institutions. The African political bourgeoisie group utilised the disconnection between the civil structures and the ordinary people in their contestation of power with the European bourgeoisie group that was ruling at the time. The African bourgeoisie encouraged acts that could undermine the system, such as stealing from the system, strikes, underperformance as part of campaign towards independence. If one stole and abused the civic realm in any way and such act could benefit the primordial public, then one was perceived as a hero not a criminal (Ekeh, 1975).

Furthermore, the ideological package for independence included an emphasis of rights and benefits from the civic realm and de-emphasis of the duties of the people (Ekeh, 1975). What this achieved was a perception that the civic republic is a self-sustaining entity that does not depend on any effort to keep going and cannot collapse no matter how much one takes from it. In addition, the African bourgeoisie group made it clear that what they were fighting was the notion of being ruled by the European bourgeoisie group, not the system itself. Actually, as they did not come from families that were part of the traditional leadership, the African bourgeois depended on

ideologies of legitimisation to replace the European bourgeois (Ekeh, 1975). One of their legitimisation strategies as heirs of the colonial administrators was pointing out how much they have come to resemble the European bourgeois. These strategies included pointing that how, in terms of education, the African bourgeois resembled the European bourgeoisie group. Ekeh (1975) points out that this resulted in the 'poverty of ideas', in which there was a campaign for independence but no ideas on how the post-colonial Africa was going to operate.

These ideologies, that the civil realm is foreign and can only be exploited without giving back, and that the primordial public is the only one that the black African can claim to own, did not stop with the end of colonialism. Till date, access to civil institutions is used as means of acquiring resources for, amongst other things, benefitting the primordial public. There is no reciprocity in all these as rights and benefits are emphasised while there is a wholesale back-grounding of duties. The primordial public does not suffer such crisis of ownership; rather, the members of primordial systems such as ethnic groups are fierce loyal of their ownership of the group. The relationship in the primordial system is that of reciprocity, there is as much emphasis on duties as there is on rights. As a legacy of colonialism, the members of a primordial public do not perceive it wrong, and are actually encouraged, to engage in acts such as corruption and nepotism in as long as the beneficiary is the primordial group. In the end, it would seem that the primordial public has morals while the civic public is amoral (Ekeh, 1975).

The theory of two politics has been used in research attempting to explain the political problems besetting Africa. The dialectical relationship between the two publics have been proven to be the cause of many of the problems, and an explanation to the important question of why politicians who engage in acts such as corruption and nepotism are never disowned but are often protected by the members of their families and community. The current study explores the two publics proposed by the theory, and the interaction they have with each other. The study uses texts that have been purposively selected for being elements of controversy, which suggests that in their nature there is a certain deviation from the norms of the civic realm. The theory of two publics is used with the theory of Political Discourse Analysis, which, via its discourse analytic approach, enables the analyst to unmask power asymmetries hidden in discourse.

Political Discourse Analysis

Following the tradition of Critical Discourse Analysis, (CDA) Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) aims to explore the discourse practices that are both social and political (Chilton, 2004; Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012). It begins with the premise that most of political processes are carried out discursively. For instance, legislating and campaigning are mainly performed through discourse. PDA looks at how power, power abuse and domination and resistance of that domination is produced and reproduced by discourse.

Another assumption that PDA makes is that discourse structures are not neutral. Language is one site where power relations are contested and adjusted. The ideologies contained by language are at the supra-individual level, explained as social representation in socio-cognitive approach (Van Dijk, 2009). What gives the ideas their power is that they are not covert and are not available except to an analyst deeply scrutinising them.

What distinguishes PDA from rhetorical studies and other research in political science that have looked at language is that it does not only look at the principal actors such as politicians, but also includes all actors involved in political discourse. The context, the act, the discursive event and the purpose of the discursive event are some of the factors that can determine if a text can be deemed as political or not.

The proposal that discourse is an action, and that the production and reproduction of ideologies occur in structures of language are relevant for the current study. The study examines the actions that are performed by discourse structures that the politicians employ in their communication. Using the theory of two publics, the study explains some of the discursive breaches of principles associated with the civic realm by the controversial statements of the three leaders as a consequence of the primordial public taking precedence over the civic public.

Literature Review

Research on political discourse is vast. As Wilson (2004, p. 399) shows, this type of research goes back to the time of Cicero and Aristotle.

The discourse-analytical approach began with the emergence of the Critical Linguistics which was pioneered by the Frankfurt School of linguistics (Hart & Lukeš, 2007). Though the focus of Critical Linguistics (and later Critical Discourse Analysis) was broad, including all types of communication, politics was one area that was looked at (Van Dijk, 2004). In his discussion of power, Foucault (1972), amongst other things, looked at power dynamics in politics.

Pronouns have been some of the most popular elements of language that the discourse-analytic research on political language has looked at. Bramly (2001) analyzed the use of personal pronouns in Australian political interviews and found out that pronouns are strategically used to create the 'Us/Them' dichotomy. Similar findings were recorded by Hakansson (2012) who looked at political speeches of two American presidents, George W. Bush and Barack Obama. The two presidents were found to particularly use the inclusive we to create solidarity with their audience. Boyod (2013) found that in the last political debate between American presidential candidates Barack Obama and John McCain which took place on 12 October 2008, pronouns were efficient rhetorical elements to distance and negate one's political opponents. This brings out the relevance of pronouns as discursive action.

Another linguistic element that research on political discourse has looked at is conceptual metaphor. Lakoff (2002) found that Conservatives and Democrats in America used the family metaphor to refer to American nation in a way that fitted in with their political ideology. Conservatives used a strict father metaphor to refer to the American government. As a strict father, the American government would barely interfere in the affairs of his children, fostering qualities such self-discipline, self-reliance and respect for legitimate authority. Increased tax for the rich and welfare state are seen as interference which are signs of an overbearing parent. According to the logic of this metaphor, everyone in America can reach the 'American Dream' if the values of self-reliance and self-discipline are fostered in them. Democrats on the other hand advocate for a nurturing parent who helps those who have not made it by taxing the rich and providing welfare estate. Democrats view empathy as a greatest value in the family (which represents the American society). Apart from using pronouns to examine the argumentative strategies in the debate between Barack Obama and McCain, Boyod (2013) explored how the candidates used this metaphor of family to advance their political ideology. The findings of the study show that Obama, as a Democrat, used metaphors that advocate for a nurturing parent while McCain, a Republic used metaphors that advocate for a strict father. Paying attention to this ideological nature of metaphor, other studies on political discourse have used the critical metaphor analysis, a model that views metaphor as a rhetorical tool (Cammaerts, 2012; Charteris-Black, 2004).

The studies that use theories developed in the field of political science seldom use a triangulation of the theories, even if the phenomena that are being studied warrant such a triangulation. The theory of the two publics is one such example; despite the theory being very influential in research on African politics, it is seldom combined with other theories, especially those from linguistics.

Onuoha (2014) study, apart from using the theory to explore the Nigerian politics, argues for the timelessness of the theory, showing how relevant it is today in explaining the political situation in Africa. Osaghae's (2006) study reveals the wide scope in which the theory can be used. Osaghae uses the theory to explore the challenges facing civil society in Africa, which unlike its counterpart in the west, is often successful and powerful enough to be effective. The study confirms that the ineffectiveness is brought by the contradictions of the dialectical relationship between the primordial and the civic republic. The evidence of how broadly the theory can be used in terms of geography is in the study of Goddart, Assad, Issa & Mkagiwa (2015) which focuses on Kenya. Goddart et al. found that NGOs in Kenya have a high degree of accountability due to the fact that they are associated with primordial public. In contrast, the central government is very corrupt while the local government is the most corrupt as a result of the two publics playing a role.

With evidence for the theory's relevance to different regions of Africa, the current paper uses it to explore the political situation in three Southern African states: Lesotho, South Africa and Zimbabwe. Since the focus is the manifestation of the publics in discourse, the paper also uses the theory of political discourse analysis. The triangulation allows the paper to exhaustively explain both the political and the linguistic phenomena.

Data Analysis and Findings

This section presents the analysis and findings and shows how the dialectical relationship between the two publics manifests discursively. Using discourse as an action framework, the paper finds that the contextual functions of the discourse structures in the selected texts include undermining the civic structures. The predatory and opportunistic approach towards the civic structure which can be seen during the acts of nepotism and corruption is shown to also manifest discursively when the politicians use the space allocated them by the civic realm to undermine its structures. It appears that the predominant beneficiary of this exploitation is the primordial grouping, in line with what the theory of the two publics postulate.

Use of divisive language

One dominant way in which the politicians undermine the civil realm, and which underlie their other discursive or verbal acts of sabotage of the civic structures, is by going against the precepts in their constitutions which prohibits divisive acts and use of divisive language. This behaviour seems to occur when the politicians attempt to promote solidarity, one of the values cherished in the primordial system. To promote solidarity and group cohesion, the politicians use a language that creates an '*us*' versus '*them*' dichotomy. Similar to other research, the current paper finds that the dominant tool the politicians employ in acts that enhance solidarity with others by excluding others are deictic pronouns, especially the inclusive 'we'. The politicians use this tactic when they want to justify their actions which would otherwise be deemed wrong in the democratic dispensation. The pronoun we (both as inclusive and exclusive) appear at least once in all of Mugabe's texts, at least once in three of six texts from Mosisili and at least once in three of Zuma's five texts. The texts below are examples of the use of the pronouns to foster solidarity amongst the members of the in-group and to exclude others as the strategy of justifying the speakers' actions against 'other'. Pronouns and other elements that distinguish the in-group from others are italicised.

1. I said, one day, *Africans* are different. During *our* time *we* did not have prisons because never did *we* say there was a problem that could not be resolved. No problem could not be resolved. Prisons are done by *people who cannot resolve problems*. Let *us* not be influenced by *other cultures* and try to think that lawyers are going to help *us*. Because lawyers will never change fact, no matter what the judge says (Zuma).

2. When *you* are a bishop and cannot interpret the Bible, *you* should resign and give it to those who can. *We* will not compromise *our* tradition and tolerate homosexuality (Mugabe).
3. *Manasi* and *MaCongress* are *water* and *oil*, they can never work together (Mosisili).
4. *Manasi* have exposed a hip, let *us* hit *them* (Mosisili).

Zuma uses the inclusive *we*, in its variant forms, to distinguish and foster solidarity among members of the African fraternity, and to exclude and alienate non-African *others*. The repeated use of the pronoun seems to have been intended to underscore the importance of recognising the boundaries and belonging in the in-group. As research on their use have confirmed, it appears that even in these texts the popularity of pronouns is due to the fact that they create the *Us* versus *Them* in a subtle way. This subtlety of pronouns is shown in the texts quoted above. Nowhere do the speakers implicitly indicate that they are dividing people into two groups; this is achieved by the employment of the pronouns such as *our* and *us*.

It is important to note that the in-group and *others* categorisation does not correspond to the civic public and primordial public dichotomy. The grouping here occurs only at the level of primordial realm. Those that belong in the group are identified and applauded as a form of creating cohesion; the *others* can be used as an example of the threats that the in-group faces. The role of the civic public in this seems to be only that of exploitation: the politicians, such as Zuma, use the opportunity they get as employee in civil institutions such as government, to access their audience and to discursively make the divisions.

Apart from the pronouns, the politicians use both common nouns and proper names to identify the groups that belong in each of the camps. The criteria of those who belong in the groups is flexible, depending on the issue that is being addressed. The only constant in measuring those outsiders is whether they agree with the speaker's position or not; if they are perceived as a threat to the speaker's position, then they are labelled as *others*.

In Mugabe's texts the outsiders include 'a white man' (as metonym for all white people), Tony Blair (former president of Britain). Zuma label as belonging in 'others' camp include 'Christianity', 'other cultures', 'judges', 'ungqingili' (homosexual). Mosisili seems to predominantly categorize people into *Manasi* and *MaCongress*. Mosisili's use of the expressions, which are informal names used to refer to those that subscribe to political ideology initially introduced by Basotho National Party and Basotho Congress Party, is more flexible than is normal. For him, *Lenasi* (singular of *Manasi*) is anyone that is in disagreement with his position, including the members of Reformed Congress of Lesotho who belong to the Congress bloc of Lesotho's political parties.

The creation of *Us/Them* dichotomy seems to be the starting point for the politicians. The other instances of compromising the civic public to benefit the primordial public, which are discussed below seem to have the dichotomy as an underlying principles. Most of the violations appear when the politicians affirm their membership in the flexible primordial public, especially by attacking those that seem to threaten its solidarity and unity.

Use of discriminatory language

Another way in which the politicians undermine the civic public is by using language that discriminate others on the basis of gender and sexual orientation. The text below serves as an example of this discrimination which, similar to other statements of power ideologies, is covertly stated via strategic use of certain language structures.

5. I was happy because I wouldn't want to stay with daughters who are not getting married. Because that in itself is a problem in society. People today think being single is nice. It's

actually not right. That's distortion. You have got to have kids. Kids are important to women because they give extra training to a woman, to be a mother.' (Zuma)

The claim that being single is not right for women, and that they should have kids interferes with women's rights to choose whether to get married or not. To emphasise the lack of freedom that one has in such cases, Zuma uses dialogic contraction stating these claims. However, for the other side, that perceives 'being single is nice', he uses hedging (people...*think*) to suggest that the stated proposal might not be the truth. In the final sentence, there is a suggestion that unless a woman has children, she is not 'well trained' which implicitly suggests that single women without children should change their status in order to be fully-trained people.

The text, in its inclusion of the deictic *today*, shows the motivation of this sexist discourse. It aims to defend a practice that in the modern world (*today*) faces criticism but was accepted in the primordial set-up (in the time preceding *today*). By making reference to values that promote patriarchy, Zuma undermines the principles of equality that are cherished in a democratic state such as the one he is heading.

Similarly, when they make utterances that vilify people because of their sexual orientation, in the two texts appearing in 6 and 7 below, Mugabe and Zuma indicate that their frame of reference is the traditional system.

6. When you are a bishop and cannot interpret the Bible, you should resign and give it to those who can. We will not compromise our tradition and tolerate homosexuality. (Mugabe)
7. When I was growing up, unqqingili could not stand in front of me, I would knock him out. (Zuma)

To emphasise his role as a spokesperson of the traditional set-up, Mugabe uses the pronouns 'we' and 'our'. Desmond Tutu, who has voiced support for a different view is excluded and alienated, mainly by using the pronoun *you*. The use of *you* is possibly intended to show a confrontational stance as it addresses the other person directly. Mugabe uses presupposition as a strategy for arguing that homosexuality is not permitted in the traditions of his community.

Zuma's reference to the time when he was going up seems to be intended to link his stance with the practices in the traditional setting. The primordial public did/does not approve homosexuality, therefore, he would act on its behalf and knock out a homosexual. In this type of discourse the speaker does more than verbally discriminate against and disprove of homosexuality. Through employment of the language associated with fighting, especially the context of boxing (knock out), he also seems to be implicitly encouraging a physical assault of homosexuals. The persuasion is made stronger by showing that the president himself would engage in such violent acts. This is an appeal to ethos since the image of the president as the figure of authority might influence people to act in the suggested way. The promotion of violence against homosexuals can also be seen in Mugabe's text, in which he promises that in the case in which homosexuals do not procreate 'we [would] chop off their heads.' While *we* as used above might be the royal 'we' that political leaders use, it functions also as a second interpretation that Mugabe is also including those of his 'tradition'. In this way, it insures him against dissent from that group for use of violent expression. Instead, he is likely to be applauded for using the extreme measure of violence to ensure that values of the in-group are protected.

Religious intolerance and racism

Religious intolerance and racism are other elements which undermine the civic public which come as a result of a politician attempting to defend his group against perceived enemies. Below are the excerpts of the politicians relating to religious intolerance and racism.

8. As Africans, long before the arrival of religion and the Gospel, we had our own ways of doing things... those were times that religious people refer to as dark days, but we know that, during those times, there were no orphans or old age homes. Christianity has brought along these things. (Mugabe).
9. The only white man you can trust is a dead white man (Mugabe).

It is possible that white man is metonym for the white race, with Mugabe adopting the once common style in English language of using words that traditionally use male referents (e.g. he, man and mankind) to represent all of humanity. The positioning of the clause 'the only white man you can trust' in the subject position foregrounds it and suggests that this is the issue Mugabe is interested in. The dead white man (or suggested killing of the white man) is portrayed to come inevitably as a consequence of an innocent act of trying to describe a white man that could be trusted. Apart from back-grounding of the noun clause that contains the gist of the information, the dead white man, Mugabe tactfully uses a declarative sentence to encourage the killing of white people which exonerates him from blame for his suggestion. He leaves it to the logic of his audience to infer what is presupposed by the statement, that if a trustworthy white man is a dead one then one could as well kill the white people so as to make them trustworthy.

If the arrival of Christianity can be likened with white people, Zuma's lamenting of the arrival of the former could be interpreted as an indirect criticism of the coming of the white people in South Africa, particularly because he contrasts Christianity with Africans. What is clear is his criticism of Christianity, which he blames for having brought along orphans and old age homes. Apparently, the use of orphans and old age homes is metonymic. When Zuma argues that in the ways of Africans there were no orphans, he probably is referring to a system in which children belonged to the community and orphans could always be adopted by relatives. Likewise, the declaration that there were no old homes seems to be referring to the same conception of family which included extended relatives and which ensured that the elderly could not be separated from other members of the family. This criticism of Christianity, which is a religion Zuma has advocated for is a counter-attack against the 'religious people's' (Christianity) reference to the pre-Christianity period in Africa 'as dark days'. This move, instigated by a motive to defend the period that was the height of traditional system against what seems to be an unfair attack, resulted in two breaches against the principles of democracy. It is an attack of a religious group and it also contains undertones of racism.

Undermining the Justice and Legal Systems

The justice and legal systems also get undermined as a consequence of a politician attempting to strengthen institutions in the primordial system.

10. I said, one day, Africans are different. During our time we did not have prisons because never did we say there was a problem that could not be resolved. No problem could not be resolved. Prisons are done by people who cannot resolve problems. Let us not be influenced by other cultures and try to think that lawyers are going to help us. Because lawyers will never change fact, no matter what the judge says. (Zuma)

Zuma's praise of the restorative justice in the primordial system in example 10 above includes an attack of the retributive justice that governs South African legal system. He first asserts that 'Africans are different. During our time we did not have prisons because never did we say there

was a problem that could not be resolved' before arguing that 'prisons are done by people who cannot resolve problems,' in a clear indication that his criticism is of retributive justice (represented by prisons) versus restorative justice used in traditional set up. Lawyers are attacked alongside prisons, shown as elements countering the distribution of justice. However, being the head of a country that uses the same systems, and for which prisons and lawyers are important mechanism in the distribution of justice, this seems inappropriate as it seems to encourage lawlessness and anarchy.

In another instance, he criticises the newly passed law that prohibits the use of corporal punishment.

11. We have passed laws that prohibit you as a parent [from using] corporal punishment. Today, when, as a parent, you bring your child [to] order by using corporal punishment, you are breaking the law, but the person who passed that law cannot raise your child the way you want. (Zuma)

The text opens with the pronoun *we* that is not inclusive but refers to the lawmakers, who include the president. Using the pronoun that includes one in a group that did wrong gives the text an interdiscursive attribute; the text takes the format of a confession, where, one who realises a wrong doing one was involved in starts by acknowledging one's contribution first. This assures the audience of one's good faith and manages to convince them to forgive him for the crime. Confessions are part of the restorative justice used in the primordial system; so there is an exploitation of interdiscursivity in Zuma's act.

The criticism of the law seems to be influenced by an attempt to protect one of the practices common in the traditional set-up, namely that of punishing children using corporal punishment. To indicate that this is a practice that has been going on, and therefore quite harmless, Zuma uses the contrastive *today*. The use of the deictic *today* seems to be intended to highlight that the new laws contrast what has been going on. Furthermore, to downplay the violence aspect of corporal punishment, Zuma uses the euphemism 'bringing...to order'. What is significant is that the criticism of legislation that prohibits what it labels as violence occurs during an anti-crime campaign.

In the text analysed above, the relationship between the civic public and the primordial is clear and straightforward. In the instances in which they undermine the civic public, the politicians' intended beneficiary seems to be the primordial group. Some of the texts analysed below do not show if the breach of the principles of the civic public is intended to benefit the primordial public. However, especially in light of what the above analysis has confirmed, that the predatory and parasitic attitude towards the civic attitude is probably the consequence of the adversarial attitude that the primordial group has inculcated in its members towards the civic public, it can be assumed that the politicians undermine the civic public because they feel they do not own it in the way they are bona fide members of the primordial public. Therefore, even if in some of the texts the benefit of the primordial public might not be established as the motive for the undermining of the civic public, the subversion of the civic public will be sufficient evidence enough to suggest the relationship between the two publics.

Abuse of human rights

In some of their speeches Mosisili and Mugabe promote abuse of rights of perceived enemies by encouraging violence. After repeatedly using the expressions MaCongress and MaNasi to create dichotomy, Mosisili further asks the MaCongress to hit Manasi. The context of electioneering in which Mosisili makes the utterance 'Manasi have exposed a hip, let's hit them', suggests that he is bringing in a metaphoric language in which POLITICS IS WAR metaphor is used. Probably he

is suggesting that the Congress bloc that he is leading is strong enough politically to win the impending elections since the competition (Manasi) is not strong. However, in the context of Lesotho, where political violence and killings are a controversial issue, Mosisili's statement runs a high risk of being interpreted literally and could be judged as reckless. Probably Mosisili is aware that his statement can be interpreted literally, but he is possibly exploiting the value that the primordial system attaches to bravery and is trying to portray his group, MaCongress, as brave in the literal sense. This appeal to the value of bravery seems to echo Zuma's declaration that a homosexual could not stand in front of him because he would 'knock him out', and in Mugabe's threat to chop off heads of homosexuals if they did not produce babies.

A further promotion of abuse of human rights by violent means is seen in a text in which Mugabe accepts being likened to Hitler. Mugabe suggests that he finds no problem in being accused of being as brutal as Hitler if such accusation is based on the fact that he was serving the interests of his 'own' people.

12. I am Hitler of the time. This Hitler has only one objective, justice for our own people, sovereignty for his people, recognition of the independence of his people, and their right to their resources. If that is Hitler, then let me be a Hitler tenfold. Ten times, that is what we stand for.'

After a metaphoric representation of Mugabe as Hitler, the text goes further to paint the source domain, Hitler, as filled with good attributes. All the attributes are those that tally with benefitting Mugabe's people, a point that is underscored by the use of repetition (of the noun phrase his people). Despite this tactic of trying to change the attributes of the source domain, there are still elements that suggest the Hitler that Mugabe is referring to is the one that engineered a murder of six million Jews. Firstly, Mugabe's speech has intertextual relations with the speeches Hitler made, in which he declared that his actions were meant to benefit 'his people', the Germans. Actually, the latter part of the speech, in which he would be Hitler tenfold in as long as he achieves his objectives, suggests that Mugabe is referring to the real Hitler. Once again there is an intertextual element in this since Hitler justified his methods on the basis that they were leading to goals of making his nation supreme. This statement justifies even extreme amount of violence in as long as one is fighting for 'his people'.

Accountability and service rendering

Most politicians seem to undermine the civic public by dismissing the principle that they should be accountable and regard themselves as servants of the public (this notion seems to be well captured in the expression 'civil servants' in denoting those employed in government). This is portrayed in some of the speeches of the subjects under this study. Below is a statement that Mosisili makes in response to an accusation that his government is not delivering well to the people.

13. If someone argues that LCD-led government is not doing anything, you should grab them by the edge of the blanket, lead them to the nearest road and ask them: is this the old woman? If they don't understand, ask them: is this your mother?

The rhetorical question, 'is this your mother?' (*ke mmao ntho eo?*) is one of the most offensive insults in Sesotho culture which the etiquette of public discourse prohibits. The use of this expression by Mosisili in the above extract seems to be intended to offend those that call for accounting in his work. Mosisili seems to prefer using tabooed language when referring or responding to those who do not share the same political orientation as him as the following expressions show.

14. No rag (*sekatana*) can stand before *us*.
15. *Fresh and yellow faeces* attract a lot of *flies*.
16. And I said, now a *dog* is going back to the *vomit*.

In one of his political rally, he assures his followers that no *sekatana* (a rag) can stand in front of them if they are united. In Sesotho culture a rag is a metaphor for someone of lower class, often very poor, homeless and very raggedly dressed. In another highly metaphoric language he indicates that 'fresh and yellow faeces attract a lot of flies,' in an apparent reference to the then newly developed "All Basotho Convention" (ABC) party which adorns yellow and green colours and the people that were converging at the ABC's political rallies respectively. In a speech in one of his rallies, Mosisili refers to those who belong to a different political formation as vomit, which the dog (Thabane) went back to after leaving the LCD party that was then led by Mosisili.

Apart from its lack of tolerance of political diversity, this language does not seem to fit in with someone who is a servant (as the then prime minister) addressing his employers (the public). Instead, it seems to mirror what used to occur in the primordial system where it was common to have absolute rulers who were not that much accountable to the people they were reigning. The same perception seems to be echoed in Mugabe when he says the following:

17. Zimbabwe is mine. Blair, keep your Britain. I will keep my Zimbabwe.

Mugabe portrays himself as owning Zimbabwe (metonym that refers to both the country as a geographic element and the people living there) who can 'keep' it, just the way Blair can 'keep' his England, and possibly do many other things to the country if he so wishes.

The poverty of ideas

Finally, the poverty of ideas that Ekeh (1975) proposed characterise the post-colonial Africa, in which there is no alternative offered by African leaders to the status quo, can be seen in the following statement made by Mosisili:

18. It is better to misgovern ourselves than to be governed well by others.

Ekeh (1975) argues that the ruling African class did not actually have a clear program regarding governance in the period after independence. The protests were always aimed at the ruling European group, not the system, and the African bourgeoisie group's main campaign strategy was giving an impression that things would automatically fall into place once the African elites replaced the European bourgeoisie.

Mosisili's statement does not only reflect *the poverty of ideas* in how post-colonial Lesotho should be governed but actually celebrates the situation. In his statement, in which he was responding to accusations from America and other international observers' that his government was abusing human rights and doing away with a rule of law, Mosisili concedes that they are probably not governing well. What is really significant about Mosisili's statement is his use of the *us* versus *them* dichotomy to justify ill-governance. He uses an inclusive *we* as a strategy of making his audience to have a perception that they are also mis/governing. Since they are governing, the members of the audience might be tempted to approve of the status quo, as challenging it would actually be an indirect way of giving up that privilege. Furthermore, as co-governors with Mosisili, they should not single him out for blame for the ill-governance. While highly misleading, as the majority of Basotho can never govern, the text has a potential to create positive feelings and tolerance towards the government even if it is underperforming. All in all, Mosisili's argument shows that the main issue is not whether governance is good. His main focus is on whether the person governing is the right one or not.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the discursive manifestation of two publics that Ekeh (1975) says exist in post-colonial Africa. The analysis of the selected speeches of Pakalitha Mosisili, Jacob Zuma and Robert Mugabe shows that the two publics can manifest in discourse just as they do in other forms.

Firstly, the politicians breach the principle of the civic realm that they, as heads of the executive in their country, should be agents of unity by creating a *us versus them* dichotomy. The disregard of this principle of the civic public is motivated by a need to foster solidarity with the members of the primordial group. The politician's promoter create boundaries between the in-group and outsiders as a way of creating unity and fostering solidarity between the members of the in-group. Strategies that are employed include pronouns, preferred for their subtle nature as tools of divisions, and lexical items such as metaphors that label the members of the in-group in a positive way and portray outsiders as bad people. That the politicians use the platform they have been allocated by the civic realm to compromise it (the civic realm) for the benefit of the primordial public is a clear evidence of the inequality and opportunism that Ekeh (1975) says exists between the two publics, where the primordial public is predatory and exploits the civic public for its own benefit.

The analysis has also shown that after creating division amongst the people they are ruling and promoting hostility with foreigners, the politicians go a step further to engage in acts of gender bias, religious intolerance, and racism. Once again the unequal relationship between the two publics can be seen. The politicians utilise the space offered to them by the civic realm to undermine institutions. It is the civil realm that gives the politicians positions of powers (i.e. being the head of governments in their countries) yet their speeches undermine the values of these institutions. And in this case what motivates the breach of the civic realm is an aim to benefit the primordial realm. For instance, Mugabe and Zuma employ homophobic language as a way of appealing to some traditions in their societies that are against homosexuality. Similarly, it seems that when Zuma makes utterances that portray other racial groups and Christianity in a bad light, the objective is to fend off criticism that has been levelled against the pre-colonial Africa.

Furthermore, in an attempt to defend the traditional system against criticism, the politicians undermine institutions such as the justice and the legal systems. This is particularly seen in Zuma's texts, where he goes to the extent of attacking a law against corporal punishment which he and other legislators have just passed. Also, the politicians use a language that promote abuse of human rights and choose words and expressions that are in conflict with the principle which, as political office bearers should be defending. For instance, Mosisili uses offensive language that is tabooed in public discourse in Lesotho in a response to the section of Basotho that question the attempts made by his government towards development. Mugabe, on the other hand, claims personal ownership of the country he is ruling, declaring that 'Zimbabwe is mine'. In the process of these violations of democratic principles, the politicians never cease to appeal for solidarity from in-group, which quite often is based on primordial group.

The poverty of ideas on how to deal with issues of governance in the post-colonial Africa, which Ekeh (1975) says influences the continued existence of the two republics, seems visible in Mosisili's text when he say that "It is better to misgovern ourselves than to be governed well by others". The statement confirms what Ekeh (1975) suggested, that the preoccupation of the African bourgeoisie group was finding ways of replacing the European bourgeoisie group, not finding a program that would be suitable with the needs of post-colonial Africa.

Similar to other previous research on the situation in post-colonial Africa, the study shows that there is an existence of two publics that have a relationship with each other and that cause most

of the problems in post-colonial Africa. More relevant for the interests of the study is that the evidence for the existence of the two publics is provided by texts excerpted from the speeches of the politicians. This shows that that two publics manifest discursively.

The predatory attitude towards the civic public seems to be influenced by a need to entrench one's membership in the primordial public. The study shows that the three politicians, Mosisili, Mugabe and Zuma breach the principles of the civic public by engaging in such acts as discriminating against others because of their gender and race amongst other things. This seems to occur mostly when the objective is to defend traditional practices that have faced criticism from others. The dialectical relationship between the two publics is shown by the fact that three politicians utilise the opportunity that the civil structures give them to undermine them and assist the primordial public.

References

- Aristotle. (1991). *On rhetoric: A theory of civil discourse*, trans. G. Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bramly, N. (2001). Pronouns of politics: The use of pronouns in the construction of "self" and "other" in political discourse. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University, Australia).
- Boyod, M. (2013). Reframing the American dream: Conceptual metaphors and personal pronouns in political discourse: The US 2008 presidential debates. In P. Cap & U. Okulska (Eds), *Analysing genres in political communication* (pp. 297-319). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Cammaerts, B. (2012). The strategic use of metaphors by political and media elites: 2007-2011 Belgina constitutional crises. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 2(3), 229–249.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cicero. (1971). *Selected works*, trans. M. Grant. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Ekeh, P. (1975). Colonialism and the two publics in Africa. *Comparative Studies in History and Society*, 17(1), 91–112.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London/New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. London, UK: Amazon
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge*. London, UK: Tavistock Publications.
- Goddard, A., Assad, M., Issa, S., & Mkagiwa, T., & Tausi, A. (2016). The two publics and institutional theory- a study of public sector accounting in Tanzania. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 40, 8-25
- Hart, C., & Lukeš, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse analysis: Application and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Onuoha, B. (2014). Publishing postcolonial Africa: Nigeria and Ekeh's publics a generation after. *The Journal of African Studies*, 40(2), 322-337
- Osaghae, E. (2006). Colonialism and civil society in Africa: The perspective of Ekeh's two publics. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-profit Organizations*, 17, 233-245.
- Osaghae, E. (1999). *Democraticisation in Sub-Saharan Africa: Faltering prospects of new hopes for peasantry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Van Dijk, T. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T. (2009). Critical Discourse Studies: The Sociocognitive Approach. In S. Wodak, & M. Meyers (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 62–86). London: John Benjamins.
- Wilson, J. (2004). Political discourse'. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 398-415). USA: Blackwell Publishing.