



Formulating emancipatory discourses and reconstructing resistance: a positive discourse analysis of Sukarno's speech at the first Afro-Asian conference

Mark Nartey & Ernanda

To cite this article: Mark Nartey & Ernanda (2019): Formulating emancipatory discourses and reconstructing resistance: a positive discourse analysis of Sukarno's speech at the first Afro-Asian conference, Critical Discourse Studies, DOI: [10.1080/17405904.2019.1617758](https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1617758)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1617758>



Published online: 14 May 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 89



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Formulating emancipatory discourses and reconstructing resistance: a positive discourse analysis of Sukarno's speech at the first Afro-Asian conference

Mark Nartey^a and Ernanda^b

^aDepartment of English, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Hong Kong; ^bFaculty of Humanities, Jambi University, Jambi, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

In this article, we analyze a seven-page speech delivered by Sukarno, first president of Indonesia, at the opening of the First Asia-Africa Conference where he advocated Afro-Asian unity/ solidarity as the panacea for colonialism, imperialism, and neocolonialism. Our aim, by focusing on a single text, is to demonstrate the role of an intensive analysis of 'outstanding' singular texts within the broad field of discourse analysis. The analysis is rooted within a positive discourse analysis (PDA) framework, with special focus on lexical choices and variation, modality, intertextuality/interdiscursivity, metaphorical representations, ideological use of pronouns, indexical meaning, and strategies of argumentation. Through these rhetorical techniques, we illustrate how an independence leader constructs an emancipatory discourse aimed at reconciling the ideas and beliefs of the leaders of two continents that have a common history of colonialism. The study sheds light on the role of key speeches and political leaders in promoting an emancipatory discourse, and exemplifies how (presidential) rhetoric can be construed as offering a message of hope, strength, and inspiration while playing the role of a unifier, thereby highlighting the major underlying assumption of PDA: a commitment to a discourse of social change.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 16 November 2018
Accepted 27 February 2019

KEYWORDS

Political discourse analysis; positive discourse analysis; discursive strategy; Sukarno; Asia-Africa unity; colonialism and neocolonialism

Introduction

Following Martin (1999, 2004), studies examining the role of language, including key speeches, and political leaders in promoting emancipatory discourses have gained scholarly attention in discourse studies. This growing literature, informed by positive discourse analysis (PDA) and examining text and talk that suggest inspiring discursive practices and strategies, have demonstrated how discourse can be construed as offering a message of hope, strength, encouragement and inspiration while playing the role of a unifier (e.g. Bartlett, 2012, 2017; Hughes, 2018; Macgilchrist, 2007). Emphasizing discourses of resistance, such research has illustrated how discourse can be used to advance the cause of marginalized or oppressed groups as well as promote the shared interests and collective aims of a social group (Bartlett, 2017). In all these studies, a common feature is a commitment to a

discourse of social change which is deployed by the social actors to reconstruct their oppressive circumstances and formulate a progressive discourse. Although PDA has been proposed as a complementary perspective to critical discourse analysis (CDA) which tends to focus more on deconstructing oppression and ideologically driven discrimination rather than reconstructing resistance (Hughes, 2018), PDA still remains relatively unknown and its combination with CDA is not yet firmly established in the discourse studies literature. Moreover, the existing studies that have focused on reconstructing resistance, thereby promoting emancipatory or progressive discourses, have hardly explored the discourses on colonialism and imperialism. Such discourses especially when looked at from the perspective of the colonized, the present study argues, represent an important 'site' for the manifestation of resistance and the promotion of national cohesion, unity and solidarity (Nartey, 2019).

Against this backdrop, the present study makes a modest contribution to the value of utilizing PDA by analyzing the discourse of Sukarno, first president of Indonesia, using his speech made at the opening of the maiden Asia-Africa Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, in April 1955. By using PDA to analyze a text to which it has not been previously applied, this study provides evidence for the utility of PDA as an analytic framework in discourse analysis in terms of its potential in highlighting the role of language/discourse and (post-independence) leaders in political decolonization. The role of leaders in political decolonization processes, as Nissimi (2006) rightly notes, is crucial. Often, much attention is placed on the leader's charisma, with charisma viewed as a 'quality of an individual personality' and as a 'specific gift of body and mind' (Weber, 1978). Using Sukarno's discourse, this study argues that a leader's language and enunciation more than their persona or personality is what makes their role in the process of decolonization extremely important. Unlike other Southeast Asian leaders like Hu Jintao, Xi Jinping, Jian Zemin and Tung Cheehwa, Sukarno's rhetoric has hardly been studied from a discourse analysis standpoint, despite his significant role in Asian and global politics as an independence leader. An understanding of his world conceptualization will, therefore, be helpful in comprehending the current and future political systems of Asia, in general, and Indonesia, in particular, especially in the postcolonial period.

The Sukarno speech¹ analyzed in this study is one of his landmark speeches (cf. Ajidarma, 2013) delivered at the inauguration of the Asian-African Summit in Bandung, Indonesia, and is construed in this study as an 'outstanding singular text ... that goes beyond the impact of "ordinary" singular texts that achieve their impact through repetition' (Bednarek et al., 2009, p. 21). Such texts are 'highly valued in the community or [...] [have] special significance in some domain such as history or politics [and, thus, can be treated] as artefacts – objects of study in their own right' (Matthiessen, 2006, p. 108). Additionally, these outstanding singular texts, including inspiring speeches like the one analyzed in this study, have been shown to give hope in moments of despair, lift hearts in dark times, give courage to the weary, inspire brave feats and change the course of history. Their importance as found in Luther King's 'I have a Dream', Gandhi's 'Quit India', Nkrumah's 'Africa must Unite', and Churchill's 'Their Finest Hour' is evident in how they are highly valued in the community till date and how they continue to empower, encourage and hearten, thereby enabling social groups and individuals to emancipate themselves from various forms of domination. The First Asia-Africa Conference, also known as the Bandung Conference, was attended by twenty-nine countries

and it discussed ‘the position of Asia and Africa and their people in the world ... and the contribution they can make to the promotion of world peace and cooperation’ (Wright, 1956, p. 11); hence the importance of Sukarno’s speech. The Conference led to the creation of the ‘Ten Principles of Bandung’ which underpinned the Non-Aligned Movement whose main objective was the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of the non-aligned countries as they oppose colonialism, imperialism, neocolonialism, racialism, and all forms of foreign aggression and domination. This relationship between the Bandung Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement lends credence to the importance of the Conference and the speech delivered by Sukarno. In this study, we discuss the various discursive strategies Sukarno employs in articulating the themes of colonialism, imperialism, and neo-colonialism in order to construct an emancipatory discourse of Asian-African solidarity. The rest of the paper is structured as follows: in the next section, we briefly explicate positive discourse analysis, the theoretical and analytic framework that informs the study, after which we present Sukarno’s discourse formation. The penultimate section discusses Sukarno’s discursive strategies using illustrative examples from the speech and the last section is the conclusion where we summarize the findings of the study and highlight its implications.

Positive discourse analysis

The central thesis on which PDA hinges is a commitment to a discourse of social change.² That is, it aims to analyze texts that signify inspiring discursive practices and strategies by focusing on discourse that promotes the needs of marginalized groups or advances agreed-upon collective aims such as social equality, national unity, and political reconciliation (Bartlett, 2017). In other words, PDA seeks to understand ‘how change happens, for the better, across a range of sites – how feminists re-make gender relations in our world, how indigenous people overcome their colonial heritage, how migrants renovate their new environs and so on’ (Martin, 2004, p. 9). It is proposed as a complementary perspective to CDA and it focuses on the power of revovatory discourses, thereby shifting attention from the reproduction of hegemonic discourses to the ways in which such discourses might be countered (Bartlett, 2012). Thus, it

argues the case for a more interventionist stance in ideologically oriented discourse analysis – one focusing not simply on deconstructing language in the service of power but focusing in addition on analysis of and participation in sites of successful social change (Martin, 2012, p. 3).

This focus notwithstanding, PDA does not ‘assume that the social problems, e.g. racism or gender inequalities, are somehow solved and we need to “cool it down”’ (Majid, 2007, p. 1). By privileging resistance as its object of analysis, PDA serves its emancipatory aim by highlighting and examining discourses that attempt to oppose injustices such as discrimination and exclusion (Hughes, 2018). Resistance within PDA is not only viewed as a response to injustice, but also as a social action capable of instigating progressive social change. Consequently, the analysis of discourses of resistance ‘is a generative project that treats objects of analysis as resources for imagining and implementing emancipatory agendas’ (Hughes, 2018, p. 199).

The choice of a PDA framework for this study is motivated by its usefulness in advancing theoretical understanding of ‘possibilities for transformations capable of enhancing

human flourishing and mitigating social ills' (Hughes, 2018, p. 199). That is, it provides us with a suitable framework within which to analyze the how and the why of Sukarno's anti-imperialist rhetoric and its implications for issues such as solidarity, postcolonial discourse, and the role of leaders in political decolonization processes. PDA tends to place less emphasis on the contextual, historical and social conditions that constrain emancipatory discourses (Bartlett, 2012). Consequently, this paper combines PDA with discourse-historical analysis (cf. Wodak, 2002) and argues that the combination of PDA with other 'traditional' approaches within CDA helps to further understanding on the renovatory or progressive discourses PDA seeks to shed light on. To this end, this paper re-echoes Bartlett's (2012) call for PDA to combine critique and design and situate discourses of resistance within wider sociohistorical contexts as an essential aspect of PDA's 'positive' and interventionist orientations to discourse.

Sukarno's discourse formation

Sukarno's speech at the opening of the First Asia-Africa Conference in 1955 directed at the representatives of the 29 participating nations (most of them being newly independent states) can be regarded as one of Sukarno's key speeches. This speech which has since become a point of reference for Afro-Asian diplomatic relations (Wright, 1956) was also directed at the people of Africa and Asia as well as the international media. An analysis of the speech reveals consistent themes which occur throughout the speech. By constant reification, these motifs are woven into a coherently logical discursive formation, comprising Asian-African solidarity, Asian and African emancipation, colonialism/imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Sukarno begins the speech by converting a present moment into a potentially historic one, stating that it was his 'great honor and privilege on this historic day to bid [the delegates] welcome to Indonesia'; a gesture he extends to them 'on behalf of the people and government of Indonesia'. Thus, he aligns himself with the people of Indonesia, implying their collective consent for the words and thoughts he was about to speak and express respectively. He recalls the Conference of the League against Imperialism and Colonialism held in Brussels three decades earlier and its connection with the present conference before proceeding to state his principal thesis:

If we look for the forerunner of this our great gathering, we must look to Colombo, capital of Sri Lanka, and to the Conference of five Prime Ministers which was held there in 1954. *And the Bogor Conference in December 1954 showed that the road ahead was clear for Asian-African solidarity and the Conference to which I have the honor of welcoming you today is the realization of that solidarity.*

As Asian-African solidarity was the primary focus of Sukarno's, he positioned himself via his utterances as a promoter of economic and cultural cooperation between Asia and Africa on one hand, and an opposer to colonialism or neocolonialism by any nation on the other hand. Having explicitly stated his overarching objective, Sukarno employs a range of discursive strategies realized by various linguistic mechanisms to further develop his ideas in order to get the delegates to concur with his position(s). Consistently, he points his audience to the possible historical significance of their gathering because 'this [gathering was] the first inter-continental conference of colored peoples in the history of mankind'; an occurrence which marked 'a new departure in the history of the world that leaders of

Asian and African peoples can meet together in their own countries to discuss and deliberate upon matters of common concern'. In what follows, the discursive strategies Sukarno used to promote his overarching objective of Asian-Africa unity are discussed.

Discursive strategies employed by Sukarno

Four main discursive strategies are found to be favored by Sukarno in his promotion of the theme of Asian-African solidarity. They include an implied 'us' vs. 'them' dichotomy, the use of metaphorical framing, contrastive argumentation, and parallelism. Each of these strategies is often combined with other oratorical techniques, thereby intensifying the persuasive force of Sukarno's rhetoric.

Implied 'us' vs. 'them' dichotomy

Several previous studies have demonstrated how those in a position to influence society, including politicians, make use of pronouns and other linguistic items to construct a positive self-presentation and a negative other-presentation (e.g. Leudar & Nekvapil, 2000; Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004). In these studies, a strict 'us' vs. 'them' distinction is formulated mainly through the use of *we/us* to depict the positive attributes or noble intentions of an in-group and the use of *they/them* to emphasize the negative characteristics or ill-motives of an out-group. In the present study, however, the analysis demonstrates that to promote his objective of Asian-African solidarity to the participants of the First Asia-Africa Conference, Sukarno adopted an implied (as opposed to an explicit) 'us' vs. 'them' dichotomy as a discursive strategy. In this regard, he used both *we* and *they* as an involvement/inclusion strategy to ingratiate himself with his Afro-Asian audience, and employed *it* as an out-casting strategy (Lazar & Lazar, 2004) or 'othering' mechanism to refer to colonialism and war (and therefore indirectly to the West, especially, whom he implies throughout the speech as being the perpetrators of colonialism and world wars). So, instead of an explicit *us/we* and *them/they* dichotomy, this study found that Sukarno's use of both pronouns was in reference to an in-group to which he belonged. His reference to the 'other' group or out-group was always implied, as illustrated in extracts (1) and (2).

- (1) All of us, I am certain, are united by more important things than those which superficially divide us. We are united, for instance, by a common detestation of colonialism in whatever form it appears. We are united by a common detestation of racialism. And we are united by a common determination to preserve and stabilize peace in the world.

In (1), Sukarno constructs an in-group identity that is homogenous in character for the Asian and African leaders he was addressing by his use of *we/us*. It is important to note how he claims he is certain of the things that unite them. This claim to certainty together with his use of the present tense and parallel structures gives an indication of how politicians naturalize (Fairclough, 2010) their ideas in order to encourage their acceptance and build consensus sociopolitical action. He reinforces the 'more important' things that unite them by intimating that any division among them is only 'superficial'. Given that the leaders assembled at the conference were from two of the most ethnically diverse

and religiously varied continents of the world, Sukarno's assertion of their superficial differences can be analyzed as a persuasive strategy with a dual role of downplaying their differences and removing any doubt about the proposed Asian-African unity that any leaders might be harboring.

According to Sukarno, the in-group shares at least three things in common: the detestation of colonialism, the detestation of racialism, and the determination to preserve and stabilize world peace. These articulated common objectives of the in-group imply the presence of an out-group: the colonialists, the racists, and the perpetrators of wars. Although Sukarno does not explicitly mention the identity of this 'other' group or use the pronoun *they* to refer to them as has been found in other studies, he suggests by implication that these people are from the West or people with close ties with the West. Thus, he creates an implied 'us' vs. 'them' discourse that pits two camps against each other without necessarily stating so. Subsequently, he negatively evaluates the members of the 'other' group using the word *detestation* and positively characterizes the Asian and African leaders using the word *determination*, creating rhetorical contrast by a clever sound game (alliteration and rhyme). The derogatory attribution he ascribes to the colonialists/the West is buttressed by his assertion later in the speech that 'We have been the unregarded, the peoples for whom decisions were made by others whose interests were paramount, the peoples who lived in poverty and humiliation'. By this statement, Sukarno can be said to be playing the victim; a strategy that is likely to appeal to the emotions of his audience and elicit their sympathy.

- (2) What can we do? We can do much! We can inject the voice of reason into world affairs. We can mobilize all the spiritual, all the moral, all the political strength of Asia and Africa on the side of peace. Yes, we! We, the people of Asia and Africa. *We can demonstrate to the minority of the world which lives on the other continents that we, the majority, are for peace, not for war, and that whatever strength we have will always be thrown on to the side of peace.*

In addition to creating a sense of group solidarity and communal identity, the example in (2), it can be argued, is used by Sukarno to impose a sense of responsibility and a moral obligation on his listeners. That is, he foists the idea of Asian-African solidarity upon them as a commonly shared goal which they must necessarily pursue. This can be seen as a strategy of mobilizing support and instigating action on the part of his listeners. His use of material process verbs of 'doing' like *inject*, *mobilize* and *demonstrate* combined with the modal verb of ability *can* and parallel structures reinforces the idea of dynamic activity, suggesting that Sukarno's conceptualization of Asian-African solidarity was more of a practical and an actual movement rather than a theoretical construct or an abstract idea. Unsurprisingly, he declares elsewhere in the speech that

I hope that this conference will give more than understanding only and goodwill only. I hope that it will falsify and give lie to the saying of one diplomat from far abroad: 'We will turn this Asian-African Conference into an afternoon tea meeting'.

Apart from the use of *we* in (2), other lexico-syntactic items that bring Sukarno's formulation of an implied 'us' vs. 'them' distinction to the fore include expressions such as 'We, the peoples of Asia and Africa', 'other continents', and the contrastive use of 'the majority' and 'the minority'. By using these expressions, he suggests that the people of Asia and

Africa combined are in the majority while the rest 'on other continents' are in the minority. By this, he creates an 'us' vs. 'them' divide that implies that Asia and Africa are for peace (and not for war), unlike those on the other continents, typically Western Europe and America. And by conveying this idea via parallelism with the repeated structure 'we can', Sukarno places emphatic stress on the idea of Asian-African solidarity, compelling his audience to accept it as a noble goal.

In the literature, the pronoun *they/them* is largely used to distinguish 'self' from 'other' or to exclude 'self from 'other' (cf. Sacks, 1992). It creates an oppositional dichotomy between 'us' and 'them' with members of the us-group described with positive attributes and members of the them-group depicted with negative labels. However, the discursive presentation realized by the use of *they/them* is not always oppositional, as it can sometimes be used to refer to others from the same group (Bramley, 2001) in which case it is positively evaluated by the speaker. This is how *they* is used in the analysed speech.

In extract (3), *they* is used to refer to the Asian and African leaders at the maiden Asia-Africa Conference. Although Sukarno himself was one of those leaders, he refers to himself and the other leaders he was addressing using the pronoun *they*. He then proceeds to construct an implied 'us' vs. 'them' discourse that suggests that Asia and Africa are no longer the victims of colonialism, imperialism, and the force of political domination and foreign exploitation.

- (3) And today in this hall are gathered together the leaders of those same peoples. They are no longer the victims of colonialism. They are no longer the tools of others and the playthings of forces they cannot influence.

The use of *they* in (3) clearly refers to the Asian and African leaders present at the conference. More importantly, the members of this group, the extract suggests, have demonstrated bravery, courage, and resilience despite the adversity of colonialism. Therefore, they are no longer the 'victims', 'tools' and 'playthings' of 'other forces'. The implied positive descriptors assigned to the members of the they-group (here, the in-group) implies that the members of the 'other' group were exploitative, manipulative and destructive. Thus, yet again, it is discernible how Sukarno positions himself in favor of Asian-African unity and at the same time against colonialism and by extension the West. His use of *others* and *forces* in reference to the countries who had colonized other countries marks them as external forces who do not have the interest of the Asian and African countries at heart. And although he does not overtly mention who these outsiders are, it is recoverable from the context of the speech that they are Western countries and their allies.

In another example, Sukarno again uses *they* to refer to himself and other Asian leaders and *others* to indirectly refer to the West, specifically Western leaders.

- (4) I have often since then asked myself why these five were successful when others, with long records of diplomacy, were unsuccessful, and, in fact, had allowed a bad situation to get worse, so that there was a danger of the conflict spreading. Was it because they were Asians?

Extract (4) begins with the first person singular pronoun *I* followed by *myself* referring to Sukarno. The use of *these five* refers to the five leaders who initiated the diplomatic talks between Asian and African countries, including Sukarno, and who had succeeded in

ending a conflict in Indo-China. He uses *others* to refer to the leaders of other countries, especially countries in the West who, according to him, were not successful in resolving the conflict, and had actually worsened the situation. In the last line, *they* is used to refer again to the five leaders including Sukarno. By claiming that some *other* Western leaders were unable to resolve the conflict in Indo-China and had, in fact, caused the situation to escalate despite 'their long records of diplomacy', Sukarno evaluates the actions of those Western leaders deprecatorily and even mocks them. Explaining how himself and four other Asian prime ministers were able to resolve the conflict, he says, 'They were not seeking advantage for their own countries' and 'They had no axe of power-politics to grind'. Thus, he designates this they-group with positive qualities such as selflessness and ethical leadership. At the same time, this explanation implies that those Western leaders failed because of their selfish interests and ulterior motives, thereby creating an implied positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

The implied other-group is also discursively constructed by Sukarno using the pronoun *it*. He does this by identifying colonialism and war as the common enemy of Asia and Africa. In this way, he indirectly creates an out-group made up of the countries with (erst-while) colonial territories in Asia and Africa and implicates them in crimes against humanity. He then does category work (Jayyusi, 1984) on this group, accusing them of causing conflict, war, and disquiet in certain parts of the world, as exemplified in (5).

- (5) For us, colonialism is not something far and distant. We have known it in all its ruthlessness. We have seen the immense human wastage it causes, the poverty it causes, and the heritage it leaves behind when, eventually and reluctantly, it is driven out by the inevitable march of history.

An 'us' vs. 'them' divide is created by Sukarno by his contrastive use of *we* and *it* to respectively refer to Asia and Africa on the one hand and colonialism and the colonial masters on the other hand. His use of *we* identifies him as a member of one of the groups, and he sets up this group against the *other* group whom he refers to as *it*. He then proceeds to indict the *other* group of perpetrating heinous crimes against and wreaking havoc on the us-group, particularly, and humanity, in general. Such denigratory characterization of colonialism and the colonial masters, including causing 'immense human wastage, poverty and leaving behind an evil heritage', is likely to appeal to the emotions of the audience, and hopefully make them accept Sukarno's views on Asian-African solidarity. Further, Sukarno's use of expressions such as *ruthlessness* and *immense human wastage* to describe the actions of the *other* group intensifies the negative attributes he projects onto this group and emphasizes the implied 'us' vs. 'them' dichotomy his discourse creates. This study argues that by referring to colonialism and war with the pronoun *it* and insinuating their perpetrators, Sukarno indirectly depersonalizes these people. Such de-personification reduces the members of this out-group to non-humans or even animals, making it easier for their actions to be vilified.

Use of metaphor

Metaphors present politicians with a persuasive and an effective means of popularizing their discourse and converting special knowledge into lay knowledge (Charteris-Black,

2011). Also, a metaphorical language which frames issues in terms of metaphorical juxtapositions such as good and evil, attack and defense, law and lawlessness, alliance and opposition, etc. contributes to an 'us' vs. 'them' polarity (Bhatia, 2015), which usually serves the purpose of politicians. To achieve his chief objective of uniting the people of Asia and Africa to resist colonialism, Sukarno uses metaphor to negatively frame colonialism as a common enemy that Asians and Africans must attack and as an evil they must expunge.

- (6) And I beg of you, do not think of colonialism only in the classic form which we of Indonesia and our brothers in different parts of Asia and Africa knew. *Colonialism has also its modern dress in the form of economic control, intellectual control, actual physical control by a small but alien community within a nation. It is a skillful and determined enemy, and it appears in many guises. It does not give up its loot easily. Wherever, whenever and however it appears, colonialism is an evil thing and one which must be eradicated.*

Sukarno's (e)vilification and enemification (Lazar & Lazar, 2004) of colonialism can be seen in (6) by his explicit reference to colonialism as 'an evil thing' and as 'a skillful and determined enemy'. The (e)vilification of colonialism and the resulting binary opposition of good and bad can be seen to have two implications. Firstly, the use of the pejorative label 'evil' can be a source of legitimacy, as it encourages one's responsibility to resist it. This is demonstrated in the normative deontic modal *must* used in the extract. Secondly, Sukarno's use of 'evil' can be analyzed in the black and white terms of good and bad category-pair or a standardized relational pair of good and evil using Leudar et al.'s (2004) term. In this regard, the countries with colonial territories in Asia and Africa and supporters of colonialism can be said to be the evil ones and the creator of this metaphorical parallel, Sukarno (and by extension the people of Asia and Africa whom he represents), can be regarded as good, and therefore possessing all that the 'evil others' lack. The implied label of 'good' presents the judgments as warranted and projects a certain moral superiority, power, and credibility that can be associated with the label 'good'. Through his use of the evil metaphor, Sukarno denies the colonialists any grounds for an explanation. In doing so, he determines the moral order (hence, a moralizing discourse) through the identification of a deviant 'other', a harmful threat whose eradication by the 'good people' is justified. Further, the expression 'wherever, whenever, however, it appears' is used to buttress how comprehensive and all-encompassing the evil of colonialism is; hence, the need for an equally comprehensive and holistic combative approach in tackling it.

Generally, a political speech is most effective and powerful when it achieves collective consent. To achieve such (perceived) collective consent, the discourse needs to be naturalized (Fairclough, 2010) or transformed from specialized knowledge to lay knowledge (Bhatia, 2015) so that it resonates with the hopes and aspirations of the audience. It needs to be regarded by the audience as being in sync with their ethos and worldview, and more crucially, it needs to invoke strong sentiments within them. In addition to arousing strong emotions of morality, (e)vilification can trigger social fear which is an important tool as far as the manipulation of people's attitudes, behaviors and actions are concerned (Rediehs, 2002). Representing colonialism with the concept of evil underscores the severity of the threat it poses to Asia and Africa and, thus, necessitating defense and/or resistance.

It can also be asserted that referring to colonialism as evil 'reinforces the process of making the enemy look monstrous' (Rediehs, 2002, p. 69). Unsurprisingly, Sukarno's construction of colonialism as evil in (6) is followed by a second formulation of depicting colonialism to be the 'enemy'. Again, by ascribing the negative label of enemy to colonialism, an immediate 'us' vs. 'them' tension is established. This articulation of 'enemy' is 'pivotal to defining, establishing and maintaining a moral order' (Lazar & Lazar, 2004, p. 227). Enemification serves a number of purposes, including determining a target for missiles to aim at, creating a sense of unity and definiteness in objectives as well as engineering conditions which make people view military action as needful (Bhatia, 2008). Moreover, previous world knowledge and/or mental representation of knowledge of the world with regard to war and conflict include the presence of an enemy that is evil/bad and of the defender, the soldier/army, that goes to war to vanquish the enemy. This mental frame is likely to be invoked in the audience due to Sukarno's use of 'enemy' as well as unite them by arousing a moral obligation on their part to withstand colonialism.

The militaristic tone conveyed by the word 'enemy' is reinforced by verbs and nouns such as *battle*, *fight* and *eradicate* that normally collocate with colonialism in the speech, as emphasized by the following statements:

- (7) The battle against colonialism has been a long one, and do you know that today is a famous anniversary in that battle?
- (8) So I am not disinterested when I speak of the fight against colonialism nor am I disinterested when I speak of the battle for peace.

Like colonialism, neocolonialism is negatively formulated by Sukarno using metaphor. Referring to it as 'colonialism in a modern dress' in extract (6), Sukarno warns his audience of the deceptive nature of colonialism. He claims that one of the many guises of colonialism is neocolonialism and, thus, implies that colonialism and neo-colonialism, to his understanding, are one and the selfsame thing: they are evil and the enemies of Asia and Africa and threats to the two continents' quest to unite and live in a peaceful world. The attribution of the epithet 'guise' to neocolonialism metaphorically re-echoes the notion of (e)vilification Sukarno associates with (neo)colonialism. This is because past frames of experience pertaining to the use of guise (or mask) entail evil persons who try to hide their evil intentions or ulterior motives by putting on fake appearances. The metaphorical use of 'guise', thus, helps the audience to make this connection which can be considered as 'a mental representation of our knowledge of the world, a data-structure that is located in human memory and can be selected or retrieved when needed' (Bednarek, 2005, p. 689).

Contrast as a strategy of argumentation

Although Sukarno takes cognizance of the differences between Asia and Africa in terms of religion, culture, language, ethnic diversity, etc., he takes advantage of this contrastive situation to promote a discourse of unification and communality between the two continents. Contrast, then, becomes an argumentative strategy (Fairclough, 2008) by which Sukarno advocates for unity within and between Asian and African frontiers in order to impress on the world the need for all countries to be free and sovereign while co-existing with and inter-depending on one another.

- (9) Ah! Sisters and Brothers, let this conference be a great success. *In spite of the diversity that exists among its participants, let this conference be a great success.*
- (10) *I know that in Asia and Africa, there is greater diversity of religions, faiths, and beliefs than in the other continents of the world. But that is only natural.* Asia and Africa are the classic birthplaces of faiths and ideas which have spread all over the world.
- (11) *Yes there is diversity among us. Who denies it?* Small and great nations are represented here, with people professing almost every religion under the sun ... Almost every political faith we encounter here ... And practically every economic doctrine has its representative in this hall. But what harm is in diversity when there is unity in desire?

A consistent pattern that can be observed in the extracts is a **concession-refutation or admission-rebuttal strategy** whereby Sukarno **first acknowledges the striking distinctions** between Asia and Africa in terms of religious beliefs and faiths, political philosophies, and economic principles. Expressions such as 'Yes' and 'I know' and a rhetorical question like 'Who denies it?' (which has positive connotations) indicate that Sukarno is fully aware (and **not naïve or in denial**) of these contradistinctions. However, he immediately shoots down this admission on his part by adopting a **refutation mechanism** that suggests that these differences are only superficial and that Asians and Africans share an affinity at a much deeper level. So, he asserts that these differences are **'only natural', appealing to common-sense logic**. He then proceeds to formulate an emancipatory discourse of unity and solidarity between Asia and Africa. The strategic use of contrast here can, therefore, be said to have a **three-part generic semantic content** underlying Sukarno's argument or **follow a three-stage process of accepting the existence of a situation, invalidating it, and developing a counter-argument**. The constant referencing of 'diversity' in the extracts (and in several other places in the speech) instead of an alternative like 'contrast' which is usually negatively evaluated (cf. Turgeon, Taylor, & Niehaus, 2014) implies that the diversity or contrast being talked about is neither detrimental nor inimical to the Afro-Asian unification being promulgated. Through the **topos of comparison** (Wodak, De Cilia, Reisigl, & Liebhart, 2009) realized by the expression 'than in the other continents of the world', the Asian-African contrast is heightened. This is, however, suddenly neutralized by the choice of lexis such as 'but' and 'in spite of', and the rhetorical question 'what harm is in diversity when there is unity of desire?' The contrastive use of 'diversity' and 'unity' in this rhetorical question, further, shows that as far as Sukarno is concerned, whatever differences that may be existing between the two continents need not be an impediment to Asian-African integration and cooperation. After all, the leaders and citizens of the two continents are 'Sisters and Brothers'. This reference to the people of Asia and Africa as 'brothers and sisters' not only forms part of a **strategy of unification, but can also be analyzed and interpreted as contributing to an invocation of positive emotions**. In the end, Sukarno repeats the sentence 'let this conference be a great success', despite the marked dissimilarities of the two continents, to emphatically buttress his belief in Asian-African unity.

Antithesis is another type of contrast Sukarno utilizes as an argumentative strategy. It is a **discursive technique that helps to convey meaning emphatically and in a way that is memorable** (Cuddon, 2012). By **putting two noticeably contrasting views side-by-side**, Sukarno ideologically **positions himself either for or against a certain viewpoint and conveys (even imposes) this viewpoint on his audience**.

- (12) Conflict comes not from variety of skins nor from variety of religion but from variety of desires.
- (13) The burden of the delegates to this conference is not a light one for I know that these questions – which are questions of the life and death of humanity itself – must be on your minds, as they are on mine.
- (14) This conference is not to oppose each other; it is a conference of brotherhood. It is not an Islam conference nor a Christian conference nor a Buddhist conference. It is not an exclusive club either nor a block which seeks to oppose any other block. Rather, it is a body of enlightened, tolerant opinion which seeks to impress on the world that all men and all countries have their place under the sun.
- (15) Let us not be bitter about the past but let us keep our eyes firmly on the road.

The antithetical constructions found in 12–15, especially the latter part of the utterances, reinforces Sukarno's stance on Asian-African solidarity. In (12) and (14), he alludes to the diversity of Asia and Africa but as already mentioned, he does not perceive this as a problem. Rather, he is of the view that 'variety of desires' (and this can be interpreted to include the desire to colonize others) is the main cause of conflict among nations. As for them, Asians and Africans, all that they are interested in is 'to impress on the world that all countries have their place under the sun'. Sukarno suggests that he is communicating agreed-upon collective aims using the expression 'for I know' in (13) in addition to hyperbolically equating the issue of Asian-African solidarity to 'the life and death of humanity itself'. Such 'over-the-top' language, when combined with the metaphorical use of the word *burden*, can be regarded as a rhetorical mechanism that foists a moral imperative and a shared responsibility on the audience in order to instigate action on their part. The idea of a moral imperative is re-echoed in (14) with the use of 'brotherhood', which again makes a causal metaphorical relationship between Asians and Africans as blood relations. As already mentioned, such rhetoric is emotionally-laden and, therefore, emotionally appeals to the audience to see themselves as one people with a common destiny. Sukarno conveys a message of hope, strength, wisdom, and inspiration which culminates into a discourse of grace (Martin, 1999) by his exhortation in (15) that the Asian and African leaders should 'keep their eyes firmly on the road' instead of remaining embittered and resentful about the past. The persuasion in such rhetoric, as Martin (1999, p. 52) points out, lies in the idea that it 'inspires, encourages, heartens, [and] cheers us along'. The metaphorical use of the expression 'keep eyes firmly on the road' also induces optimism, as it communicates a bright, glorious, and prosperous future. The effect of all this is that the audience is likely to be moved by the poignancy with which Sukarno constructs the notion of Asian-African solidarity and the positive prospects it portends, making them entertain it as a laudable idea worthy of pursuit.

Parallelism

Closely associated with antithesis, parallelism is found to be a rhetorical feature frequently used by Sukarno to enhance the rhetorical weight and emotive force of his oratory. Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005) explain that parallelism contributes to the conveyance of emotion; a position reinforced by Atkinson (1984) who submits that the emotional effect induced by parallelism is evidenced by the spontaneous applause that its usage usually draws from

audiences attending political meetings. It seems Sukarno takes advantage of the emotive force of parallelism in a bid to persuade his audience of the viability of an Asian and African integration. Consequently, his entire speech is replete with parallel structures.

- (16) Let us remember that the stature of all mankind is diminished so long as nations or parts of nations are still unfree. Let us remember that the highest purpose of man is the liberation of man from his bounds of fear, his bounds of human degradation, his bounds of poverty. And let us remember, Sisters and Brothers, that we Asians and Africans must be united.
- (17) In your deliberations, *Sisters and Brothers, I beg of you, do not be guided by these fears* ... Be guided by hopes and determination, be guided by ideals and yes, be guided by dreams.

The context within which Sukarno delivered his speech can be said to be an emotionally charged one in that the leaders at the conference were still very much involved in the struggle for independence for their countries. For those leaders that had just gained independence for their nations, the 'wounds' of colonialism were still fresh. In such an atmosphere, the impact of a sentimental discourse instantiated via parallelism cannot be overstated. Extract (16) is how Sukarno ends his speech, foregrounding his parallel structures through the **topos of history as a teacher** (Wodak et al., 2009) and issuing the conference participants with a charge to unite through the use of the normative-deontic modal *must*. Thus, parallelism is used at the end of the speech to reinforce the main theme of the speech in a way that is memorable for the audience (Atkinson, 1984), giving the speech a clinching end focus. A vocative with interpersonal meaning (Halliday, 1994), the phrase 'Sisters and Brothers' which occurs throughout the speech is used here in conjunction with parallelism to strengthen the emotive force of the utterance in addition to achieving a strategy of unification. The 'fears' being referred to in (17) include 'fear of the future, hydrogen bomb and ideologies' which had been mentioned in the prior discourse. Sukarno is, thus, seen to again use his oratory to articulate a message of hope, positive change, encouragement, and wisdom – grace personified (Martin, 1999) – that is intended to motivate and propel his audience, the Asian and African leaders, to dream about or look into the future with optimism.

The rhetorical effect of parallelism, including reiteration, **reification, reinforcement of ideas/themes, and emphasis** (Tannen, 1989), when combined with other rhetorical techniques creates a more impactful effect. In the case of Sukarno, it is found that his use of parallelism is heightened by its combination with three-part lists, creating a powerful oratory.

- (18) But that was a meeting place thousands of miles away, amidst foreign people, in a foreign country, in a foreign continent.
- (19) Hurricanes of national awakening and reawakening have swept over the land, shaking it, changing it, changing it for the better.
- (20) ... because it is fear which drives men to act foolishly, to act thoughtlessly, to act dangerously ...

- (21) If this conference succeeds in making the peoples of the East whose representatives are gathered here understand each other a little more, appreciate each other a little more, sympathize with each other a little more – if these things happen ...

The effectiveness of the persuasive force of political speeches usually stems from the combined effect of various strategies since it is the interaction between diverse rhetorical strategies that ‘creates a powerful interplay that ensures persuasive political communication’ (Charteris-Black, 2004, p. 5). This is evident in Sukarno’s speech since all instances of the use of parallelism is merged with other strategies, including a three-part list (18–21), contrast (18), repetition (19), and metaphor (19). In addition to arousing the interest of the audience and sustaining their interest in the speech being delivered, the combination of a variety of rhetorical strategies, more importantly, can be seen as contributing to Sukarno’s attempt to persuade the conference participants to endorse the idea of Asia-Africa solidarity. It can also be observed from the examples that the lists of three take the form of matched clauses and phrases instead of single words. As Charteris-Black (2004) suggests, **such structures express assertiveness and simplicity**, two traits which the present paper argues are in sync with the intentions of Sukarno’s speech. The use of three-part lists, therefore, serves the rhetorical aim of argumentation rather than mere enumeration and exemplification of ideas. For instance, sequencing and indirect comparison are combined in (16) to contrast the Conference of the League against Imperialism and Colonialism held in Brussels with the current conference in order to emphasize the momentous and historic nature of the latter as ‘the first inter-continental conference of colored peoples in the history of mankind’. This claim that the conference was an epoch-making event forms a leitmotif running through the speech, thereby imposing a solemn duty on the conference participants to act in the supreme interest of posterity.

Conclusion

To demonstrate the role of key speeches and political leaders in promoting an emancipatory discourse, this paper analyzed a seven-page speech delivered by Sukarno at the First Asia-Africa Conference where he mooted the idea of Asian-African unity/solidarity as an answer to colonialism, imperialism, and neo-colonialism. Informed by a PDA framework, the study examined how an independence leader utilized his language to develop a sense of importance and direction for a social group, build a communal focus/identity and support for his ideas as well as bolster loyalty and group cohesion. The resultant effect is an emancipatory discourse of hope, comfort, and reassurance. It was found that four main discursive strategies – implied ‘us’ vs. ‘them’ polarity, metaphorical framing, contrastive argumentation, and parallel structures – were used by Sukarno to promote the notion of Asian-African unity and to obtain the collective consent of the masses. The persuasive force of these strategies was strengthened by their combination with other rhetorical techniques such as lexical choice/variation, three-part lists, and repetition. Currently, the idea of Asian-African solidarity is still in force with the establishment and declaration of the New Asian-African Strategic Partnership (NAASP) at the Asian-African Summit in Bandung and Jakarta, Indonesia, in 2005. This Summit was attended by 106 countries – 54 from Asia and 52 from Africa – and it advanced three core aims

of the NAASP: political solidarity, economic cooperation, and socio-cultural relations. Again, in 2015, the Asian-African Business Summit was held in Jakarta to boost Asian-African partnership. Thus, Sukarno's promotion of Asian-African unity in the 1950s has survived till date and continues to present Asians and Africans with a substantial platform for economic cooperation, political integration and, perhaps, resistance against foreign domination. Hence, by illustrating the role and importance of inspiring discourses, including key political speeches, this paper contributes to an understanding of postcolonial rhetoric within the context of Asia and Africa, especially in terms of Asia-Africa relations. Not outstandingly, collaborations between the two continents in the post-independence period can be seen in fora such as the India-Africa Forum Summit, Africa-Singapore Business Forum and in Sino-African relations. As noted at the outset of the study, the complementary use of PDA and CDA is beginning to gain grounds in the literature. Hence, by drawing on such an approach to analyze a text to which it has not been previously applied, this paper demonstrates the value of analyzing discourses on colonialism and imperialism within a PDA framework and, subsequently, contributes to an empirical understanding of issues such as solidarity, postcolonial discourse, and the role of (post-independence) leaders in political decolonization.

Notes

1. See https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2001/9/5/88d3f71c-c9f9-415a-b397-b27b8581a4f5/publishable_en.pdf
2. For a general overview of PDA, including its origins, orientations, and core tenets, see Bartlett (2017).

Acknowledgements

The authors would want to sincerely thank two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Mark Nartey is a PhD Candidate in the Department of English at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. He specializes in corpus-assisted discourse studies and the theory, methods and application of critical discourse analysis in political and media discourses. His PhD project examines the relationship between discourse, ideology and mythology, taking as a medium of investigation the discourse of Kwame Nkrumah, a pioneering Pan-African leader. He has previously published in *Corpora*, *Social Semiotics*, *Critical Discourse Studies* and *Journal of Language and Politics*.

Ernanda holds an MA in Linguistics from Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen and a PhD in Linguistics from Leiden University. She is also a former Research Associate at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University and currently a lecturer in the Faculty of Humanities at Jambi University, Indonesia. Her research interests include morphosyntax and morphophonology, but she is currently focusing on discourse analysis, pragmatics and grammaticalization. Ernanda may be contacted at: ernanda@unja.ac.id.

References

- Ajidarma, S. G. (2013). Bahasa Soekarno: Indonesia dalam retorika dalang. In D. Dhakidae (Ed.), *Soekarno: Membongkar sisi-sisi hidup putra Sang Fajar*. *Prisma*, 32. No. 2 & 3. (pp. 174–197). Jakarta: Kompas.
- Atkinson, J. M. (1984). *Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics*. London: Methuen.
- Bartlett, T. (2012). *Hybrid voices and collaborative change: Contextualizing positive discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Bartlett, T. (2017). Positive discourse analysis. In J. Flowerdew, & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 133–147). London: Routledge.
- Bednarek, M. (2005). Frame revisited – the coherence-inducing function of frames. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 685–705.
- Bednarek, M., et al. (2009). Corpora and discourse: A three-pronged approach to analyzing linguistic data. In M. Haugh (Ed.), *Selected proceedings of the 2008 HCSNet workshop on designing the Australian national corpus* (pp. 19–24). Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Bhatia, A. (2008). Discursive illusions in the American national strategy for combating terrorism. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 7(2), 201–227.
- Bhatia, A. (2015). *Discursive illusions in public discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Bramley, N. R. (2001). *Pronouns of politics: The use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Australian National University, Australia.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politics and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cockcroft, R., & Cockcroft, S. (2005). *Persuading people: An introduction to rhetoric*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cuddon, J. A. (2012). *A dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. London: Penguin Books.
- Fairclough, I. (2008). Branding and strategic maneuvering in the Romanian presidential election of 2004: A critical discourse-analytical and pragma-dialectical perspective. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 7(3), 372–390.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hughes, J. M. F. (2018). Progressing positive discourse analysis and/in critical discourse studies: Reconstructing resistance through progressive discourse analysis. *Review of Communication*, 18 (3), 193–211.
- Jayyusi, L. (1984). *Categorization and the moral order*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lazar, A., & Lazar, M. M. (2004). The discourse of the new world order: 'Out-casting' the double face of threat. *Discourse & Society*, 15(2-3), 223–242.
- Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorization: 'us', 'them'. and 'Doing Violence' in Political Discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 15(2-3), 243–266.
- Leudar, I., & Nekvapil, J. (2000). Presentations of Romanies in the Czech media: On category work in television debates. *Discourse & Society*, 11(4), 487–513.
- Macgilchrist, F. (2007). Positive discourse analysis: Contesting dominant discourses by reframing the issues. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 1(1), 74–94.
- Majid. (2007). *Positive discourse analysis?* Retrieved from <http://lancastermaze.blogspot.com/2007/02/positive-discourse-analysis.html>
- Martin, J. R. (1999). Grace: The logogenesis of freedom. *Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 29–56.
- Martin, J. R. (2004). Positive discourse analysis: Solidarity and change. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 49, 179–200.
- Martin, J. R. (2012). The author's introduction. In Z. Wang (Ed.), *CDA/PDA. Volume 6 in the collected works of J. R. Martin*. Shanghai: Shanghai Jhao-Tong University Press.

- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2006). Frequency profiles of some basic grammatical systems: An interim report. In S. Hunston, & G. Thompson (Eds.), *System and corpus: Exploring connections* (pp. 103–142). London: Equinox.
- Nartey, M. (2019). "I shall prosecute a ruthless war on these monsters ... ": A critical metaphor analysis of discourse of resistance in the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16(2), 113–130.
- Nissimi, H. (2006). Mau Mau and the decolonization of Kenya. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 8(3), 1–35.
- Rediehs, L. J. (2002). Evil. In J. Collins & R. Glover (Eds.), *Collateral language: A user's guide to America's new war* (pp. 65–78). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures and conversation*. Vol. I, II. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turgeon, B., Taylor, T., & Niehaus, L. M. (2014). Contrasts and classtalk: A critical discourse analysis of welfare-to-work program managers. *Discourse & Society*, 25(2), 656–671.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wodak, R. (2002). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–69). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R., De Cilia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wright, R. (1956). *The color curtain: A report on the Bandung conference*. New York, NY: World Publishing.