

An Analysis of linguistic features in the selected speeches of Bishop Kleopas Dumeni in the pre-independence era in Namibia

Petrus Angula Mbenzi
University of Namibia

Abstract

Linguistic features were used by Bishop Kleopas Dumeni of Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia (ELCIN) in the pre-independence era to persuade the audience to support the struggle for independence. Bishop Kleopas Dumeni used linguistic devices in an attempt to convince his target audience that the Namibians suffered a great deal at the hands of the colonial authorities. Thus international community support was desired to break the shackles of colonialism. Although Bishop Kleopas Dumeni employed various linguistic features in his speeches as a tool to whip up support for struggle for independence of Namibia, his language choices were never subjected to a critical examination to unravel their contribution to the effectiveness of the speeches. This paper thus examines how Bishop Dumeni used linguistic devices in his speeches to appeal to his audience as well as the effects these features had on the audience to support the struggle for Namibian independence. The paper is pegged on Aristotelian theory to reveal how language choice affects the three appeals of Aristotle namely, ethos, logos and pathos. Content analysis was used to deconstruct the selected speeches of Bishop Dumeni thereby identifying and evaluating the linguistic features in the speeches. The conclusion from this investigation is that Bishop Kleopas Dumeni effectively used the linguistic devices to woo his audience to his side to support in his efforts to end the wickedness of colonialism in Namibia.

Introduction

In political speeches language need to be chosen carefully to evoke feeling of pity or to convince the audience to support the ideals of the speaker. The crafting of a political speech takes into account the style and the delivery of the speech so that the linguistic devices of the speech may sway the attitudes of the listeners in the direction desired by the speaker.

The paper dissects the linguistic features of four political speeches of Bishop Kleopas Dumeni, the head of Evangelical Lutheran Church in

Namibia (ELCIN) from 1979 to 2000). He delivered selected speeches during the colonial period in Namibia. These speeches were either delivered locally or internationally to drum up support for the liberation of Namibia. The selected speeches include the Oniipa speech of 1980 which he delivered at the ruins of the printing plant destroyed by an unknown foe. The Hungary speech of 1984, a speech delivered at the LWF (Lutheran World Federation) conference, The Oniipa speech of 1985 delivered when he addressed the British parliamentarians, the Ottawa speech of 1986 delivered during his meeting with the members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, and the Minnesota speech of 1987 in which addressed the Americans on the plight of the Namibians.

The paper investigates how Bishop Dumeni used linguistic features in his speeches to persuade his audience to support his cause for the liberation of Namibia. It is important to: identify the linguistic devices that he employed, investigate how he used them and reveal the effects that these utterances had on the target audience. The linguistic features were “examined using Aristotle’s triangle of rhetoric which depicted the appeals. All three of Aristotle’s appeals are important when persuading a public through a text as they are necessary to raise an understanding and interest of the issue concerned” (Nelzén, 2017, p. 1).

Grammatical Constructions

Grammatical construction includes the types of sentences, voices, tenses, the use of deixes and grammatical persons used by Bishop Dumeni in his speeches. Beard (2000) observes that pronoun reference is always important in putting over a piece of political persuasion. Beard further argues that “the pronouns politicians use in their speeches are worth looking at because they make a significant contribution to the overall effect” (p. 46).

In addition Crowley and Hawhwee (1999) points out that “ the prominent feature of style that affect voice and distance are grammatical person, verb tense and voice...”(p. 121). In the next subsection, I want to analyse these three features in the speeches of Bishop Dumeni.

Grammatical Persons

A grammatical person is “a category used in grammatical description to indicate the number and nature of the participants in a situation” (Crystal, 2011, p. 359). Crystal also gives three types of persons such as first person, second person and third person, and distinguished between inclusive (the speaker, hearer and others and exclusive (the speaker and others, but not the hearer).

In his sermon at the ruins of printing plant in 1980, Bishop Dumeni made use of inclusion and emphasised collective desire and responsibility:

Finally, ELOC, what separates **us** from **our** love for God? ELOC, **we** sin if **we** do not serve the people of God. Whatever the cost might be: **We** are not after fame. **We** want to remain obedient to God. **We** do want God to show **us** what to do. **We** do not lose anything if **our** properties are destroyed. When **we** give **we** earn more. When **we** lose **we** earn. If **we** forget then **our** sins will be forgiven and if **we** are murdered **we** shall have eternal life.

The pronoun 'we' was repeated thirteen times and the genitive 'our' three times to show the collective responsibility to serve God. The plural pronoun demonstrates the spirit of togetherness of the ELCIN members Samson and Mohammed (2010) argues that "certain types of words can activate particular presupposition, reveal speaker's attitude and require the agreement of the reader for interpretation" (Samson & Mohammed 2010, p. 173).

The speaker may tactfully use the inclusive "we" or exclusive "we." Commenting on Nujoma's speech, Mathe (2009) notes that the use of personal pronouns by Nujoma such as "my", "I", "us" and "we" is appropriate in that "my" and "I" confirms his authority and "us" and "we" makes the connection with the audience. Samson and Mohammed (2010) observes similar situation in the Nigerian Military coups announcements:

'I' is used only five times as a distancing strategy in order to show that the coupists are in charge. The speaker also displays a preference for "we" five times as speaker inclusive in order to show the collective essence of the coup event. "Our" as an adjective was used two times also to portray speaker inclusiveness. 'My dear countrymen' was used two times to create a more intimate association with Nigerian people (p. 171).

It must be pointed out that the speaker may choose the exclusive words when he wants to portray that he and the addressee are not in mutual agreement and that they do not support each other. In such cases the speaker may use the pronouns such as "you" and "they" to show exclusivity.

Bishop Dumeni used grammatical persons in Hungary in 1984 where he shifted from the first person singular to the first person plural:

I am from Namibia; a country in Southern Africa: on behalf of the 353, 000 members of **my** church. I bring you greetings and thanks for **your** witness... But **my** country is a country of suffering people: we are occupied illegally by South Africa and **we** are suffering under the brutal rule of apartheid, government enforced racism.

With this sentence, Bishop Dumeni used verbal tactics to complement pathos, thereby appealing to emotions of sympathy. Aristotle (as cited in Mathe, 2009) confirms that:

In addition to taking a stance that was morally worthy (ethos) and proofs to support argument (logos) the successful rhetorician should also be able to arouse the feelings (pathos). This could be done both through considering fundamental human experiences and arguments that appeal to the feelings (p. 67).

By saying “my country” and “my church”, Bishop Dumeni wanted to show his authority. The use of the possessive pronoun “my” illustrates that he was in charge of the church. Aristotle (as cited in Mathe, 2006) argues that competence, good intention and empathy are strong factors to achieve credibility. In this speech Bishop Dumeni used the pronoun ‘I’ to show his authority and inform his audience the information he provided was credible. He shifted to the use of the first person plural ‘we’ to emphasise the fact that he was part and parcel of the suffering masses and that fighting for freedom was a collective responsibility.

Here Bishop Dumeni also wanted to show the authority when he used the personal pronoun ‘I’ and ‘my’ which he repeated five times. Additionally, Bishop Dumeni applied a first personal pronoun ‘we’ inappropriately in some cases. In other words “he uses another pronoun in situations where he might have been honest to use the pronoun ‘I’ (Brozin, 2010, p. 12). For example, in the Minnesota speech 1987, he said, “When they rape our women, **we** speak out. When they detain our pastors, evangelists, our people, **we** speak out. It is an undeniable fact that Bishop Dumeni spoke. The incidents that Bishop Dumeni mentioned are honestly the one which all the Namibians hated and they would have spoken against them. The Namibian people might have motivated him to speak out, but he was the Bishop who had a strong influence in the nation. He also had the authority and power to oppose the colonial authority publically, therefore it could have been appropriate to use the pronoun ‘I’ “to cause less confusion.” (Brozin, 2010, p. 2). The researcher believes that Bishop Dumeni used the pronoun ‘we’ strategically to inform the international community that suffering was unbearable to all the Namibians who could have spoken the

same language had they been granted the chance to make that revelation.

Bishop Dumeni also incorporated the pronoun 'we' to show the spirit of inclusiveness and also to show that the suffering affects all the Namibians. He then switched to the second person singular to show the connection with the audience:

And so today **I** pray for **you** and for your strengthening in Christ and **I** ask **you** to pray for me and the people of Namibia, that **we** may also have the strengthening of Christ and that our suffering may also have the strengthening of Christ...

The first and second person in this text implies mutual responsibility. Bishop Dumeni showed his determination to pray for the people of Hungary and appealed to the Hungarians to reciprocate.

In his Ottawa speech in 1986, Bishop Dumeni employed the first person plural, 'we', the possessive pronoun 'our' [in bold] and the second person "you", "your" [in italics].

Greetings to **our** friends in the Church of God. **We**, *your* Namibian brothers and sisters wish to extend our gratitude for *your* welcome of **our** delegation and for all that *you* are doing on **our** behalf, both in moral and material support. *You* make **us** feel part of worldwide family. **Our** relationship was to have been strengthened by a visit from *your* national council last June, but **we** remain disappointed that the colonial regime of South Africa did not grant *you* the necessary visa.

The pronoun 'you' showed the immediacy and proximity with the audience. The inclusive 'our' in line one and three reveals the mutual relationship. Verderber, Verderber and Sellnow (2008) explains the significance of words in creating closeness between the speaker and the audience:

Develop your verbal immediacy to reduce the psychological distance between you and your audience. In other words, choose words that enhance the connection between you and members of your audience. Verbal immediacy can be achieved by using "we" language... The use of plural personal pronouns like 'we', 'our', 'us' rather than 'you' or they convey a sense of connection with your listeners and involve them in the topic and occasion (p. 200).

The pronouns 'we' and 'our' do not just show inclusiveness, but they may reveal binary opposition as it appeared in his Ottawa speech in which 'we' and 'us' exclude others. In this case Bishop Dumeni used 'we' and 'us' to refer to the delegation which represented the Namibian nation. On the contrary he included 'we' and 'our' strategically to show that assistance extended to Namibia by the Canadians is appreciated by the whole nation. Brozin (2010), analysing President Obama's speech, argues that "the use of the pronoun 'we' creates problems. It is not always clear who the speaker is including, because sometimes it represents the American people but sometimes it represents the audience who is present" (Brozin, 2010). Brozin further argues that "by using we or you in political contexts you always create two sides where one is the 'we' where the speaker includes himself/herself and then there is 'they' which depending on the context, is more or less acceptable (p. 6)

The use of 'we' and 'our' in the Ottawa speech by Bishop Dumeni may raise difficulties because it is not clear who is being referred to, for example, Does he refer to his delegation and himself? or Does he refer to the Namibian nation? And also when he said, "We pray that the soldiers of South Africa will leave our country and allow **us** peace and freedom." in his Hungary speech in 1984. One may not know whether the 'we' refers to the members of his church or to the entire Namibian nation without the closer examination. In this case the closer examination of the context in which a pronoun is used may provide an answer as to who the pronoun represents. In this speech Bishop Dumeni was referring to the suffering nation of Namibia.

Although the first and second person appeared frequently in the speeches of Bishop Dumeni, there were occasions where he used third person or the combination of first, second and third person. Since the first and second person was discussed in the previous paragraph, I would like to dwell on the use of the third person in this extract from the Minnesota speech, of 1987:

They kill, rape, torture imprison my people without trial. **They** call us communist terrorists. **They** kill the brave young people who are fighting for our freedom.

The third person, "they" and the third person subjects such as the government, South Africans appears to have shown that the people referred to are not part of the audience. This creates the distance between the speaker and the people he referred to.

Third person is appropriate when rhetors wish to establish themselves as authorities or when they wish to efface their voice so that the issue seem presented as objectively as possible In the third person discourse the relationship of the audience both rhetor and audience to the issue being discussed is more important than the relation between them (Crowley & Hawhwee, 1999, p. 12).

In this case Bishop Dumeni established himself as the authorities, because he presented the arguments in the way that showed that he had enough evidence for what he stated thus he did not leave room for avoiding responsibility for his statement.

It may be concluded that different grammatical persons were used by Bishop Dumeni to perform different functions. The first person and second person were used to show close proximity between the speaker and the audience. The third person was used to create the greatest possible rhetorical audience. The meaning of pronouns such as 'we' in a political speech requires closer examination of the context in order to determine what a pronoun represents because the pronoun may either be inclusive or exclusive.

Voices

Crystal (2008) defines voice as “a category used in the grammatical description of sentence or clause structure, primarily with reference to verbs to express the way sentences may alter the relationship between the subject and object of a verb without changing the meaning of the sentence.” (p. 515). Two voices are distinguished in languages namely, passive and active voice.

Bishop Dumeni often used the active voice. A number of active sentences in the speech suggests the speaker used the active voice to show that he was in position speak on behalf of the Namibians, for example, in Minnesota, 1987: “I remind you under international law, South Africa is illegally occupying Namibia. They kill, rape, torture and imprison my people without trial”. By using the active sentence in the last sentence, Bishop Dumeni intended to draw the attention of the audience to focus their attention on the doer of the action in the sentence and in this case the South African soldiers who committed the atrocious acts against the Namibia. It shows also that the recipients of the action, which Bishop Dumeni referred to as my people to show his authority, were in the miserable situation. Crowley and Hawhwee (1999) explain that “active constructions force the rhetors to betray their presence as creator of the discourse; it also forces them to take over the responsibility for their assertions” (Crowley & Hawhwee, 1999, p. 129).

By saying: "They kill, rape, torture and imprison my people without trial" in his Minnesota speech, Bishop Dumeni shows that he took responsibility for his actions and showed that he could prove beyond reasonable doubt that the South African soldiers were indeed the culprits. In using his ethos as a knowledgeable person he wanted to appeal to the pathos of his audience to come to the rescue of the Namibians and save them from the predicament.

Apart from active constructions, Bishop Dumeni also applied passive constructions in his speeches. Nygaard (2008) asserts that:

The passive voice is not an invention of the devil; it is simply a grammatical option. Using it does not automatically make you a bad writer any more than it automatically makes you objective. It serves the full purpose by putting the focus on the object rather than the subject (p. 55).

Nygaard (2008) further opined that "in passive construction, the grammatical subject no longer names the agent, instead, the recipient becomes the grammatical subject and the agent is pushed into a prepositional phrase or dropped from the sentence" (p. 56). As opposed to the active construction, "the Passive constructions permit rhetors to avoid taking overt responsibility for their statements" (Crowley & Hawhwee, 1999, p. 129). In the second example below, Bishop Dumeni said, "We are being held incommunicado." This is a passive construction which avoids mentioning the names of the culprit (Crowley & Hawhwee, 1999). The following examples taken from various speeches of Bishop Dumeni illustrate the operation of the passive construction on various occasions:

1. At Oniipa, 1980: He is not destroyed in the bomb blast.
2. In Minnesota, 1987: His head was held under the water for many minutes.
3. In Hungary, 1984: We are occupied illegally by South Africa.
4. At Ottawa, 1986: Our relationship was strengthened by a visit.
5. At Oniipa, 1980: rejoicing is preceded by difficulties.
6. At Oniipa, 1985: People are still being beaten up, their properties are destroyed.

In example 1, 2 and 6, the doers were dropped from the sentences. "These are agentless passives which are called dishonest construction. In some contexts it means that no one receives the blame for the action" (Fahnstock, 2011, p. 160). The doer of an action was not specified in those constructions because the agent could be understood from the

context. In the example 2 the agent was left out purposely because the agent was unknown as there was no concrete evidence as to who planted the bomb which destroyed the printing press. In this way the speaker avoided the overt responsibility for the statement.

In the 3rd, 4th and 5th example, the recipient and the doer of action are transparent because the speaker wanted the audience to become aware of the evil of apartheid. In this case the speaker was prepared to take overt responsibility for his statement. He mentioned the doer of an action deliberately because he had substantiation for his assertion.

It is clear from examples of the sentences from various speeches of Bishop Dumeni analysed that both active and passive constructions are relevant in rhetoric. The active voice allows the speaker to show the authority and to demonstrate that he /she has substantive evidence for what he says. The passive voice, particularly the agentless ones enables the speaker to make statements without being held responsible for actions as he omits the doer of action. Thus it serves as immunity from the legal persecution. However, the agentive passive construction performs the same function as the active voice. Bishop Dumeni thus used the agentless passive and the agentive passive constructions to achieve his intended purpose such as to show overt responsibility and blame avoidance.

Sentence Constructions

Bishop Dumeni did not stick to a specific sentence construction, he used various sentence types to convey the message. He used simple sentences to appeal or persuade the audience. Lunsford & Ruszkiewicz (2010) advise orators:

To use simple sentence and further Avoid long complicated sentences and use straightforward syntax as much as possible. Remember, too, listeners can hold onto concrete verbs and nouns more easily than they grasp a steady stream of abstractions. So when you deal with abstract ideas try to illustrate them (p. 288).

Bishop Dumeni used these sentence types in his speeches: indicative sentence, interrogative sentence, imperative sentence, subjunctive sentence, and hortative sentence. "The indicative sentence is commonly used in the speeches to connote force and authority in the speeches. It is used to inform, assert and declare" (Samson & Mohammed, 2010, p. 172). The indicative sentences consist of simple and, complex sentences.

In his speech to the audience in Minnesota in 1987 Bishop Dumeni began his speech in a simple sentence “I am very happy to be with you today. It is a long way from the occupied land of Namibia to St Peter Minnesota.”

There is, however, a sudden switch to complex sentence: “**I am very happy to be here, to see so many old friends, to meet so many new friends**, and of course many of the young people who are from my country and are studying in your country”. There is a use of subjunctive constructions to express the wish of the Bishop to come to Minnesota. The construction is characterized by asyndeton [in bold] “to yoke parallel commas”(Crowley & Hawhee, 1999, p. 67) thus vigorously and forcefully express the seriousness of the visit.

This complex sentence was used to give information about his connection with Minnesota. He portrayed the picture that he was not a new comer to the place because he did youth training course in Minnesota in 1962 and that Minnesota was host to the students from Namibia. The students which Dumeni referred to in his speeches were sent to the USA colleges as part of the struggle for independence. Bishop Dumeni often called for the international community to assist with the training of the Namibians in various fields and sending the students to USA was a response to his call.

Furthermore, the declarative sentences in the Minnesota speech include logos and ethos respectively. Logos is evident in the following sentences: ...the puppet government spends 700 dollars a year on white children, and less than 100 dollars per year on each black child, or children are 40 times more likely to die from tuberculosis than the whites. For every 180 dollars the white earns, the black man earns 10 dollars. *They* have taken 77% of the good farming for 6% of the people and left the rest for the 94%.... In this case Bishop Kleopas Dumeni presents himself as knowledgeable man on the subjects by giving figures, facts and statistical information.

Addressing the audience in Ottawa, Canada in 1986, Bishop Dumeni changed from indicative sentence to imperative sentence:

We ask you to support our efforts in the following ways:

- continue your prayers for the Namibian people and their independence;
- disseminate in the next 30 days the Hanover message to all congregations in the country, urging prayer and political action;

- appoint appropriate persons in your various structures to receive and share information from churches in Namibia and the Namibia Communications Center in London.
- provide these persons with necessary material support;
- represent in all ways possible the Namibian cause to your respective governments; urging the imposition of sanctions until the UNSC 435 is implemented;
- work with churches of other denominations for Namibian independence;-take up urgent issues when requested by the Namibian churches;
- avoid involvement in any way with interior government or other South African structures in Namibia.

This speech is inundated with “much of the imperatives normally used to ensure the grip of the situation” (Samson & Mohammed, 2010, p. 173). The series of command sentence is intended to request the Canadians to take swift action to ensure the implementation of UN Resolution 435.

The preceding quotation consists of seven command sentences. The first sentence was a request to the Canadians to carry on praying for the suffering nation so that the oppression and exploitation could come to an end which would lead to the dawn of independence in Namibia. The second sentence urged the Canadian Lutherans to urgently inform all the congregations that time came to step up pressure against South Africa to grant Namibia her independence. The third and fourth sentence was call on the Lutherans in Canada to establish a permanent link between the Namibian churches and Namibian communication center in London so that the Canadians could be kept abreast on what was happening in Namibia. The Namibia Communications Centre was a project of the Namibian Christian Communications Trust. The director was the Rev. John Evenson. The Namibia Christian Communications Trust was an ecumenical agency working in cooperation with churches in Africa, Europe and North America that provided information related to the Namibian independence struggle in the 1980s (Eriksen, 1989). The audience is also asked to provide the appointed people with facilities that could enable them receive and channel information to and from the relevant people. The fifth sentence urged the Lutherans in Canada to present the Canadian government with information about the situation in Namibia. The Canadian government vetoed against the impositions of the sanctions against South Africa. This sentence was therefore aimed at urging the Lutherans in Canada to convince the Canadian government to ensure that economic sanctions remained in force against South Africa until UN Resolutions 435 was implemented.

The sixth sentence called on the Lutheran churches in Canada to work in cahoots with other churches in Canada to mount pressure on the Canadian government to support the Namibians in their struggle for independence. The final sentence requests the Canadians to reject the representatives of the South African Government in Namibia, namely the Multi Party Conference (MPC) and leaders of the second tier authorities. In addition, Bishop Dumeni used interrogative sentences in a number of his speeches. This is evident in his address to the British Parliamentarians in 19865 at Oniipa. At this occasion where Bishop Dumeni asked rhetorical questions at Oniipa when he addressed guests from British parliament on the 25 February 1985. Here he asked series of questions. Howard (2010) emphasises that “the idea to ask questions in a row was to challenge the listeners directly” (p. 167). Hill (2007) expresses similar view that “the series of rhetorical questions get a listener into the mindset of yea or nea—saying. (p. 58). On this occasion Bishop Dumeni asked the following questions to challenge the listener to agree or disagree with him:

1. We would like to get our independence through Resolution 435 of the UN.
What is really blocking this process?
2. Why is the will of the majority of the Namibians up to now not taken into account in determining the future of this country?
3. What is the standpoint of the British Government with regard to the Cuban issue in Angola which is linked to the settlement of the Namibian problem?
4. What is the Western countries view with regard to Resolution 435? Is that resolution still alive or dead?
5. How do you feel when the wealth of our country is being exploited while people are suffering?
6. What else can be done so that the independence of this country Namibia can be hastened, that death and bloodshed can be stopped? What justice, peace and human right can be respected in Namibia like in other countries?

This plethora of questions was directed to the audience to evoke the feeling of pity in the British parliamentarians. When many questions are asked successively, this form of questioning is called *pysma*. These questions are asked to threaten someone or to express one’s feeling (Zimmermann, 2005). In these questions Bishop Dumeni gave historical facts regarding the linkage of Cuban issue to Namibian independence. This explains the persuasive technique through Aristotle’s words that “The speaker must, first of all, be provided with a special selection of

premises (facts)... The more facts he has at his command, the more easily he will make the points” Aristotle (as cited in Nelzén, 2017, p. 13). Such questions may require complex answers. The series of question asked by Bishop Dumeni needs complex answers, for example, the answer to the first question: What is really blocking this process [of implementing Resolution 435]?

The answers to this question may vary, e.g. the linkage of the Namibian to the withdrawal of Cubans from Angola, The fear of spread for communism in Africa and unwillingness of the western powers to force South Africa to come to the negotiating table. Bishop Dumeni deliberately asked these questions because the then British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher supported Ronald Reagan of USA in the linkage of the Namibian question to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. These rhetorical questions carried different implications.

The first question was a serious call to the British parliamentarians to inform the church what the obstacles were towards the implementation of the UN Resolution 435. The second question was an appeal to the British parliamentarians to ensure that the democratic process was allowed to take place in Namibia. The majority here referred to the oppressed particularly, the blacks. There is a clear reference to the implicature that the will of minority was taken into account but the majority of the Namibians are ignored. The third question was meant to challenge the British Government to reveal its position on the linkage of Cuban withdrawal from Angola to the Namibian question. The Prime Minister of Britain Margaret Thatcher was seen as an ally of the Reagan Administration. Margaret Thatcher was one of the advocates of constructive engagement, a policy devised by the Reagan Administration as a means of encouraging SA South Africa to gradually move away from apartheid (Toler, 1982).

The fourth question was posed as an argumentation to probe whether the western countries were serious about the implementation of the UN Resolution 435. By asking whether the resolution is dead or alive, Bishop Dumeni expressed his view on the status of Resolution 435. The use of contrastive words ‘dead or alive’ were meant to question the validity of the resolution as it did not produce the desired result since its adoption in 1978. The last two questions were an appeal to the pathos of the British parliamentarians. It alludes to the fact that the economic resources of Namibia was being plundered by the minority for their benefit whereas the majority of the Namibians suffered economically. The words ‘death and bloodshed’ were used to win the sympathy of the British parliamentarians to woo them to his side. There is an innocuous remark on the violation of

human rights in Namibia as the speaker asked, “What justice, peace and human right can be respected in Namibia like in other countries?” This was an indication that whereas in other countries justice and respect for human right reigned, there was a flagrant violation of human right in Namibia.

It is revealed in this subsection that Bishop Dumeni employed various types of sentences such as indicative sentences, command sentences, hortative sentences and interrogative sentences. The sentence types performed different functions to satisfy the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act of the speech.

The Use of Deixes

Apart from the types of sentences in the speeches of Bishop Dumeni, the Minnesota speech, was characterized by the use of deixis and epithets. “Deixis can simply be said to refer to a relative position or location such as here and there or to appoint of reference such as *me* or *you*” (Nabea, 2010, p. 191). Bishop Dumeni used deixis to dichotomise between suffering Namibians and the oppressors. He referred to the suffering Namibians as *we*, *our*, *us* and refer to the oppressors as *they*, *their*, *them* etc.

The inclusive *we*, *our*, *us* were intended to show who the sufferers were thereby evoking the feeling of sympathy in the audience to support the struggle for liberation in Namibia and also to exert pressure on the oppressors to allow the democratic election to take place in Namibia. Kangira (2010) explains the meaning of deixies in the speech of Robert Mugabe “the undertone of *those*, and *them* was that there people who were evil and there was *us* side which was good” (p. 32).

In the speeches of Bishop Dumeni, namely the Minnesota speech, the “othering discourse” (Bucher as cited in Kangira, 2010, p. 320) was used in reference to the South African government as an evil side and the church and black Namibians as good side. Bishop Dumeni thus seeks to maintain “positive face” (Brown & Levinson as cited in Makamani, 2010, p. 8) for himself while creates a negative face for South Africa. Bull (as cited in Makamani, 2010) argues that” Face management is not just about avoiding making yourself look bad but it can also involve saying things which make you look good in the eyes of others” (p. 8).

Writing on dichotomy between the Kalenjin and Kikuyu communities in Kenya, Nabea (2010) made similar observations:

The arguer who is the voice of the Kanjin presents the self-using person deixis like “I”, “we”, “ours”, “us”, and “ourselves.” Similar deixis are also used by the Kikuyu arguer to present the Gema community as the one that belonged together. The deixis of belonging are juxtaposed with those of othering such as “they”, “them”, “their” and “these” (p. 191).

Babe, Riggings and Wodak (as cited in Nabea, 2010) also show that “use of deixis are preceded by negative constructions presenting the self in good light and the other in bad light” (p. 191). Bishop Dumeni presented the colonial authorities in the bad light and the suffering Namibian in the good light in Minnesota in 1987. Presenting the negative and positive side was meant to appeal to the audience to develop hatred for the oppressors and to sympathise with the sufferers:

*We are **slaves**, they are the **baas**, the masters. We do the work, they get the riches. In education the **puppet** government spends 700 dollars a year on **white** children, and less than 100 dollars per year on each **black** child. I am a pastor in the church of Christ called to be a bishop by people of God.*

The use of *we*, *I* are juxtaposed with the othering such as *they* to distinguish between the sufferers and the oppressor. In this instance, the Namibians are portrayed as sufferers, the colonized and the third class citizens who are there to make the white wealthy. They are treated as inferior people. Whites are portrayed as real oppressors and exploiters of the blacks. The dichotomy is strengthened by the use of politically incorrect words such as *puppet*, *baas* and blacks. These words are used to score political points. It is well known that politics cannot exist without the strategic use of language (Chilton, 2001). Bishop Dumeni used the political language to inform the international community that blacks in Namibia were excluded from the system and that concerted efforts was necessary to liberate the Namibians from the yoke of colonialism. The words ‘*puppet*’ implies that the colonial government was imposed on the suffering people. It makes references to the interim and second tier authorities which were remote-controlled by Pretoria through the Administrator General of SWA/Namibia. By employing the word ‘*puppet*’, Bishop Dumeni persuaded his audience to reject the South African government as the government of the evil people. The word ‘*baas*’ established the ethos of Bishop Dumeni as an opponent of apartheid system and suggested that the South African government did not care about the well-beings of the blacks.

The word '*baas*' further suggested that whites were in the superior positions and were seen as people who were fit to rule and had to be treated as first class citizens whereas blacks are associated with dishonesty, low intelligence and primitiveness. By referring to the colonial government as a puppet government, Bishop Dumeni made use of *parrhesia*, a kind of figure that uses strong expressions or even unpleasant one. The use of the politically incorrect nouns shows the high level of persuasions (Aristotle, as cited in Nelzén) as it evokes the feeling of pity in the audience to sympathise with the suffering Namibians and hasten them to take measures to save the sufferers from further predicament.

Conclusion

It becomes obvious from the selected speeches that Bishop Kleopas Dumeni used various linguistic features in his speeches effectively to whip up the support of his audience. Grammatical devices also were used tactfully in the speeches of Bishop Dumeni, namely persons, voices. The most dominant persuasive strategy used in Bishop Dumeni's speeches was technique of "addressing an audience as if they are individuals by using inclusive, such as personal pronouns" (Inmaculada, Francisco & Juan-Salvador, 2013, p. 40). The frequent use of the second person enabled Bishop Dumeni to narrow the distance between him and his audience. In addition, he used declarative, imperative and interrogative sentences which include logos, ethos and pathos. It is mostly declarative sentences which include logos. The use of the passive, and the agentless active constructions enabled him to speak with authority and impunity respectively.

References

- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.
- Brozin, M. (2010). *The intensions behind Barack Obama's strategic use of personal pronouns*. Engleska C Handle care: Tore Nilsson.
- Chilton, P. (2001). *Politics and language: Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Crowley, S., & Hawhee, D. (1999). *Ancient rhetorics for contemporary students*. (2nd ed). London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed). Oxford: Blackwell publishers Ltd.
- Eriksen, T. L. (1989). *The political economy of Namibia: An annotated critical bibliography*. The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Fahnstock, J. (2011). *Rhetorical style: The use of languages in persuasion*. Newyork: Oxford University Press.

- Hill, F. I. (2009). Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action. In Kuypers J.A. (Ed.), *The "traditional" perspective* (1-10). Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Howard, T. H. (2010). *Dictionary of rhetorical terms*. USA: Xlibris Corporation.
- Inmaculada, B. Francisco, G., & Juan-Salvador, V. (2013) 'Ethos, Pathos and Logos in Facebook. User Networking: New Rhetor of the 21st Century. *Scientific Journal of Media Education*, XXI, (41), 127-135.
- Kangira, J. (2010). Mugabe' gravestone orations: collective memory and nostalgia. In O. D, Orwenjo, & J. O. Ogone (Eds.), *Language and politics in Africa: Contemporary issues and critical perspectives*. (pp. 1-23). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lunsford, A. A., & Ruszkiewicz, J. J. (2001). *Everything's an argument*. Newyork: Bedford.
- Makamani, R. (2010). Brown is saying nonsensical things, much more idiotic than Blair: Analysis of hate language in political discourse use in Zimbabwe. In O. D, Orwenjo, & J. O. Ogone (Eds.), *Language and politics in Africa: Contemporary issues and critical perspectives* (pp. 1-23). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mathe, A. I. (2006). *Canons of classical rhetoric in Sam Nujoma's state of national addresses* (1990-2004). Unpublished Masters thesis, University of the Free State, South Africa.
- Mathe, A. I. (2009). *Persuasion as a social heuristic: A rhetorical analysis of the making of the constitution of Namibia*. Unpublished doctoral book, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Nabea. W. (2010). Media argumentation in Kenyan 2007 political elections: Manufacturing of ethnic hate. In O. D, Orwenjo, & J. O. Ogone (Eds.), *Language and politics in Africa: Contemporary issues and critical perspectives* (pp. 183-199). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Nelzén, A. (2017). *Aristotle on social media? Investigating non-profit organizations' usage of persuasive language on Twitter and Facebook*. Bachelor's Thesis. Linneuniversitetet, Sweden.
- Nygaard, L. P. (2008). *Writing for scholars: A practical guide to making sense and being heard*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Samson, A. A. & Mohammed, A. (2010). Nigerian military coup announcements as political discourse: A pragmatic analysis. In O. D, Orwenjo, & J. O. Ogone (Eds.), *Language and politics in Africa: Contemporary issues and critical perspective* (pp.149-181). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Toler, D. (1982). Constructive criticism: reactionary pragmatism at its best. *Journal of opinion*, 12(3), 11-18.
- Verderber, R. F., & Verderber, K.S., & Sellnow, D.D. (2008). *The challenge of effective communication* (4th ed.) .USA: Lyn UI.
- Zimmermann, B. (2005). *Edgar Allan Poe: The Rhetoric and style*. Canada: Mcgill-queenpress.