Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (1999) **19**, 215–232. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 1999 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/99 $9.50

LANGUAGE AND POLITICS

Moira Chimombo

INTRODUCTION

This is an exciting time to be surveying the interrelationship between language and politics, both for political and linguistic reasons. The past decade, as everyone knows, has been witness to dramatic changes in the political map of the world, reflected most noticeably in the west in the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, but also, more quietly in some cases, more violently in others, in countries physically and politically as far apart as South Africa and China. Moves toward democracy in many areas of the world coincided with or followed on the end of the Cold War. These moves came about due to a return to democracy of postcolonial states that had become totalitarian and the granting of independence to most of the few remaining colonies. Through such changes we have come to see that "the language of democracy was mobilised against regimes that, in however perverted a way, were speaking the language of Marxism and socialism" (Schwarzmantel 1998:183), colonialism, and other totalitarianisms. Between 1989 and 1994, although later in some countries, the vast majority of newly (re)democratized peoples experienced for the first time in their lives the opportunity to express freely their political voice in democratic general elections, reflecting a move from bullets to ballots that appeared to be a "virtual miracle" (Joseph 1998:3). Since 1994, in many places, the optimism has faded as the "illusory nature of [the new regimes'] democratic institutions and practices" has become evident (Joseph 1998:3). Even in the long-established democracies, a disturbing rise in hate speech leading to violence has served to emphasize that speech can, and often does, provoke action (Owen 1998), while in certain particularly troubled areas, discourse, especially media discourse, has even been linked to genocide (e.g., Lemarchand 1994).

Interwoven with these profound political changes, people are becoming ever more aware of the implications for politics of the convergence of technology and the arts (Lanham 1993). In a number of previously totalitarian societies, from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Russia to Malawi, for example, the introduction of new technologies, such as the facsimile, has already played a direct role in political events, allowing information in and out of the countries before it could be censored (Nkhalambayausi Chirwa 1994). As a result of the new technologies, furthermore, it is possible that not only the democratic process but also the form of modern democracies will change (Glassman 1997), leading to changes in political discourse, at least in the West if not elsewhere. In the West, on the other hand, the increasing reliance on electronic technology in the mass media has necessitated a reexamination and reinterpretation of legislation, such as the First Amendment in the United States, to consider options ranging from a complete absence of censorship to government control of access to the media (cf. Collins and Skover 1996). Likewise, the global reach of the Internet and the difficulties of controlling electronic transfer of information have been a cause for concern to many governments (cf. Hart and Kim forthcoming).

We are thus reminded of the "deeply political" nature of texts (Lemke 1995:1) by two broadly interrelated moves: "the textualization of politics, and the politicization of texts" (Hartley 1992:5). Together, these two trends will provide the framework for a brief overview of recent research on the politics of language and the language of politics in relation to the discourse of democracy. I touch first on the context of political discourse, that is, political culture and ideology in the new and old democracies and the re-emerging manifestations of totalitarianism, censorship, and linguistic imperialism. Afterward, I examine selected linguistic features of political discourse and their manipulation for purposes of power, whether in the old or new democracies, or in the resurrecting totalitarianisms.

THE POLITICS OF LANGUAGE

The **textualization** of politics is integral with its **contextualization** in terms of political culture and ideology and its **cotextualization and/or intertextualization** in terms of the new technologies and censorship. In this section, I briefly survey the level of democratic consolidation in certain of the newly liberalized nations to determine the extent of contextualization of democracy. I then consider the relationships among democratic consolidation, freedom of speech, and the advantages and disadvantages of censorship in both the old and new democracies. Finally, I review the status of modern ideologies as they relate to postmodernism as well as technological and linguistic imperialism.

Political culture is a crucial factor in contextualizing political discourse. A major area of concern over the past decade has been the level of democratic consolidation in the new democracies. Miller, White and Heywood (1998:29) point out the need both for publics to develop a supportive pattern of values and for new governments to develop democratic institutions, and especially democratic precedents, if such consolidation is to be achieved. In their comprehensive 1993–1994 survey of political values of the populations and politicians of former communist bloc countries, Miller, *et al.* found that the Czech Republic seemed to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have been the most successful in internalizing and institutionalizing democratic principles (1998:17). In a 1996 follow-up survey in Russia, they found an increasing minority willing to express belief in communist ideals. "It did not, however, presage a return to the old regime, but, paradoxically, open support for communist ideals—now freed from the chains of communist practice—did represent an increasingly important, coherent and self-confident element in the new 'postcommunist' politics" (Miller, *et al.* 1998:386). This move toward political intertextualization occurs frequently after major changes, as populations look back on the advantages and disadvantages of previous regimes from a new comparative perspective, in some cases, as in Russia, leading to a new coherence, but in others, such as Zimbabwe, to a "discourse of disillusionment" (Morrison and Love 1996).

With regard to elsewhere in the 'second' and 'third worlds,' C.L.R. James, the well-known West Indian author, makes a telling comment on the immediately post-independence democracies of the 1950s and 1960s:

> British colonial officials have understood nothing about the development of colonial peoples. They have stood in the way of their forward movement from colonial status to freedom. The people who understand this had to go to jail. Gandhi and Nehru [India] went to jail for any number of years. Nkrumah [Ghana] went to jail. Dr Hastings Banda [Malawi] went to jail. Nyerere [Tanzania] went to jail.... So you notice that they didn't learn about democracy in British schools, they learnt it in the jails into which the British had put them; and from those jails they taught the population and the Colonial Office what were the realities of independence (James 1980, in Harlow 1992:3).

But even the United States has frequently set higher standards for democracy in the 'third world' than it has applied to itself (Downing 1990:51).

This context does not bode well for the future consolidation of the newly (re)democratized nations of Africa and Asia, especially if the international aid agencies insist on these nations adopting western models of democracy rather than being allowed to apply their own political intertext. Alatas (1997), for example, traces the factors that led to the differing outcomes of the imposition of democratic systems in Malaysia and Indonesia at independence. The former has maintained a semi-democratic system up to the present, the latter has lapsed back into authoritarianism. Alatas sadly notes that "if there is to be any force for democratic change in Malaysia and Indonesia, it will in all likelihood come from extra-bureaucratic forces rather than from within the state" (1997:162). We have seen the financial collapse which has recently led to dramatic changes in Indonesia, although we are yet to see whether these changes will lead to genuine redemocratization. Elsewhere in Asia, attempts to (re)democratize have met with varying success. Myanmar is one example of a country where international intervention has failed to ensure the implementation of democratic reforms despite the fact that the National League for Democracy under Aung San Suu Kyi won the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1990 elections, although in September 1997 the NLD was allowed to hold a national party congress, a sign of possible future progress toward democracy (Halperin and Lomasney 1998:143–144).

In the Middle East, the awakening of Islamic consciousness, along with moves towards democratization, has aroused fears about "the perceived absolutist and potentially undemocratic nature of [Islam's] political objectives...[because of] a basic incompatibility between what might be regarded as secular democracy and God's law" (Deegan 1996:51–52). This perception raises the paradox that anti-democratic groups are supported simply because they are secular and so presumed to be potentially more democratic—but they are not necessarily so, as we shall notice in the case of censorship. Another issue in democratic consolidation, in particular in Islamic countries but also elsewhere, is the participation of women, which is reported to be minimal throughout the Maghreb (Khoury and Moghadam 1995). Thus, we find an interesting cotextualization of the issues of religion and gender in politics.

Turning to Africa, as in Asia, different countries have had widely differing success in democratization. Docking and Dunn (1997) note that only six out of 52 African countries can actually be considered democratic, with eight others having made moves toward political liberalization. Mali is widely considered to be one of the success stories. While Mali's new political system has clearly been influenced by France, in a common form of political intertextualization, Konarï has introduced a number of innovations to increase transparency, accountability, and decentralization (Docking and Dunn 1997) which will improve the chances of *developing a locally viable democratic culture based on a Malian political* co- and intertext.

In a different cotextual and intertextual innovation, Uganda's "No party democracy" under Museveni has made the country more democratic than prior to his National Resistance Movement's (NRM) takeover in 1986. However, "without institutions, without an ideology, and, finally, without a rationale that can justify its no-party democracy, [the NRM] no longer has any existence apart from its leader" (Kasfir 1998:62). On the other hand, Mozambique appears to be locked into imitation, rather than innovation, continuing "its historical dependence on external political actors and models with the wholesale adoption of the Western democratic discourse and all of its concomitant institutions" (Docking and Dunn 1997). Thus, both Uganda and Mozambique, in radically different ways, clearly reveal potential dangers to the long-term consolidation of democracy.

In Malawi, one of the six African countries considered democratic, Chimombo and Chimombo (1996) claim that a culture of democracy, as reflected in the arts, is yet to take root following the 1994 democratic elections, concluding that there is little evidence of genuine democratic consolidation. In a related study, Moto (forthcoming), however, demonstrates how many of the values attached to a democratic ideology are evidenced in Malawi's traditional proverbs, a finding

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which contrasts significantly with C.L.R. James' observation quoted above and which is important for researchers examining the co- and intertextualization of democratic principles in other supposedly newly democratized nations.

Thus, despite the limited progress made in countries like Burundi, Niger, and Sierra Leone, and the failure of democracy to take root in Belarus, Myanmar, Cambodia, Congo, and Nigeria, some positive developments have been noted in the consolidation of democracy. These developments are seen both in the international community's commitment to defending democracy, as demonstrated in Albania, Guatemala, Haiti, Paraguay, and Serbia (Halperin and Lomasney 1998) on the one hand; and, on the other, in the increasing emphasis on internal growth of constitutionalism, civil society, and parliamentary government (Gyimah-Boadi 1998), for example, in South Africa.

One of the major indices of cotextualization of a democratic culture with a strong civil society is freedom of speech, and the concomitant freedom of the press. "In the last decade...that brutal threat [of censorship] has seemed to recede as democracy—at least in a nascent and often in a surprisingly vigorous form—has replaced tyranny in Russia, eastern Europe, South Africa, South America and elsewhere" (Dworkin 1997:148). But in many countries, the freedom of speech that came immediately prior to and following the democratic elections has faded as the democratically elected governments have slid back toward totalitarianism. In Russia, for example, "if a free press exists, it is thanks not to Yeltsin, but to democratically oriented politicians, social and human rights activists, and ordinary, decent people" (Kovalev 1996:57–58). And in Iran, which experienced freedom of expression for barely a year after Mohamad Khatami's election as President on a secular platform, the regime is once again trying to impose censorship (Sarkoohi 1998).

In Africa, a major problem immediately prior to democratic elections has been the reluctance of the governments to relinquish control of the media to allow opposition parties to campaign fairly, for example in South Africa (Mkhondo 1993) and Malawi (Chimombo and Chimombo 1996). Ghana continues to experience very little freedom of expression (Obeng 1997). On the other hand, Nigeria continues to have a vibrant free press, despite the lack of progress toward democracy, and in Kenya, similarly, "there has developed a kind of freedom of expression such as Kenyans have never had before.... Yet...neither the Government nor the opposition has shown any intellectual maturity in what they express" (Ochieng 1992:189). In Malawi, Chimombo (1998) traces the return of interference in the media by the democratically elected government, despite the increasingly democratic rhetoric of the newspapers. However, Chirambo is more optimistic about the role of political cartooning in sidestepping censorship, claiming that "the cartoonist acts as a social censor against the social deviant,..expos[ing], clarify[ing], and exorcis[ing] the insanities, absurdities, and contradictions of contemporary life, most commonly politics" (1998:196). In this *way, political cartoons are a major cotext in instilling a democratic culture in*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Malawi (Chirambo 1998:216) in a way not dissimilar to the role played by satire in the development of a democratic culture in England in the days of Swift and Arbuthnot (Condren 1997) and visual images in the politics of the 20th century (Hartley 1992).

In the West, on the other hand, a particularly disturbing question with regard to the intertextualization of politics is the extent to which supposedly liberal governments should use totalitarian methods to sustain their democracies. Dworkin (1997:148) argues, "if we deny freedom of speech to opinions we hate, we weaken the legitimacy of our entire political system, particularly the legitimacy of the very laws we pass to protect victims of stereotype and prejudice." He goes on to analyze the pronouncements of the new chief executive of Hong Kong, Tung Chee-Hwa, that the new government must "...strike a balance between civil liberties and social stability" (Dworkin 1997:149), restating the fundamental need for freedom of speech in order for the governed to have access to the information they need to make appropriate choices. Significantly, access to information is not only a problem outside the West, as Fisher (1996) points out with reference to a potential new Freedom of Information Act in Britain: "What we need is a government which believes that, in the long term, freedom of information will lead to better decision making and a climate of greater trust between the public and politicians" (Fisher 1996:32).

Yet there remains a serious dilemma: How to permit individuals to exercise their right to information, that is, the necessary co- and/or intertext, and the corresponding freedom of expression (Article 19 of the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights) in a responsible way, while allowing governments to impose censorship "in the interests of national security"? This dilemma has surfaced in two different but related areas. First, it has surfaced in the desire of governments to monitor the free flow of information through the Internet by controlling encryption technology, while software producers try to ensure that consumers "...are not bugged from the very moment of purchase" (Banisar and Davies 1998:162). Second, it has surfaced during numerous limited conflicts since the Second World War, when governments have systematically manipulated the media, from the French wars in Indochina and Algeria to the Gulf war and in various peace-keeping operations, denying the public's right to know (Young and Jesser 1997). However, recent and imminent advances in technology have meant that the global media are becoming more sophisticated and thus freer to access communications and disseminate information without government interference, revealing a "...sense of purpose that promises much for the public's right to know" (Young and Jesser 1997:290).

A related dilemma has resurfaced because of Article 20 (1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights), which states that no one may incite others to "discrimination, hostility or violence" while exercising his/her freedom of expression. This dilemma is seen in connection with atrocities ranging from the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 to the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin in Israel in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

November 1995, and in incidents of neo-fascist resurgence in the West, where "...words of hate have turned into the deeds that kill" (Owen 1998:32). With respect to Bosnia, for example, "True, arms are the immediate instruments of death, but radical nationalist and ethnicist text and talk manufacture the state of mind, that is, the emotions, the biases, the prejudices, and the ideologies, that motivates and legitimates the choice of weapons to 'solve' a conflict in the first place" (van Dijk 1994:6). Even more disturbing, though, is the respectability being achieved in the New Right, both in the United States and the United Kingdom, with its "...new forms of racism, forms that disavow racist intent yet demonize and marginalize...immigrants and lesbians and gays" (Ansell 1997:10), as race is used "...to construct political enemies with labels such as 'reverse racism' and the 'loony left'" (Ansell 1997:37). The great danger lies in creating "...a culture of hate, a culture which makes it acceptable, respectable even, to hate on a far wider scale" (Owen 1998:36), resulting in "...one of the ultimate forms of censorship: the obliteration of the memory of a place, as if those lives and communities had never been" (Owen 1998:38–39).

Some countries, for example Hungary, have tried to deal with hate and memories of the past by granting amnesties (de Gruchy 1993:6), denying the political intertext. But it is precisely because the past needs to be acknowledged in order to achieve reconciliation that we have seen in the 1990s such phenomena as truth commissions in South Africa, Rwanda, Chile, and Argentina (Harlow 1992), trials of the former Security Police (Stasi) in the German Democratic Republic (de Gruchy 1993), and the ongoing work of the Madres de la Plaza de Mayo in Argentina, the CoMadres in El Salvador, and the CONAVIGUA widows in Guatemala (Harlow 1992, Schirmer 1993). In what can only be seen as the height of ironic cotext in this era of the global village, in the same week, P.W. Botha, former president of South Africa, was found guilty of contempt of court for his refusal to appear before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to answer charges of crimes during the apartheid era, while President Clinton finally confessed to an affair with Monica Lewinsky. Such political communications leave us with uncomfortable questions: "Can nations, like individuals, be reconciled to their past...by working through traumatic events, by telling and hearing the truth? Whose truth is it? Can nations [like individuals] cleanse their past and start again? More important, perhaps, can they ensure 'never again'?" (Chirwa 1997:479).

Such questions relate directly to the (re)construction of truth, the naming of identities, and the identification of the concomitant ideologies in postcolonial and post-totalitarian societies. At the root of our identity as human beings is the need to acknowledge and remember the truth. The problem is, however, to persuade the perpetrators to accept their responsibility and the victims to agree to reconciliation (Harlow 1992). In either case, they must name both their own and the others' identities as constructions "...woven from the warp and woof of *cultural semiotic resources (language, categories, values, practices) in accordance* with the learned patterns of [their] communit[ies]" (Lemke 1995:89) as a prerequisite to deconstructing and subsequently reconstructing these identities in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the new dispensations, and thus acknowledging each other's truth (cf. Hall 1996). Such processes are extremely difficult in contexts of difference, as when, for example, westerners construct their self-image through the inferior projection of the non-western Other (Dunn 1997, Shi-xu 1994) or a "power imbalance of international identity construction" (Dunn 1997) is assumed. If it is difficult for the dominant identity, it is even more difficult for the dominated, for "...to control a people's culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relationship to others" (Ngugi 1986:16). But the interaction between subaltern, marginalized, or dominated identities and dominant identities is, unfortunately, rarely studied as mutually constitutive (cf. Grossberg 1996:90), denying the shared context, cotext, and intertext of postmodern politics.

This discussion then raises the question of ideologies, which are closely related to social identity in the sense that they are "organized in terms of polarized *structures" of dominant-dominated continua (van Dijk 1998b). One problem in the* postmodern world is whether the multiple sources of identity now recognized, including gender, sexual orientation, age, race, ethnicity, class, might "...be accommodated in one overarching picture of society, such as those provided by the 'classical' ideologies of modernity" (Schwarzmantel 1998:151). One candidate for an ideology which could integrate con-, co-, and intertext may be the concept of ecology extended from the environment to include the 'whole human' (body, mind, and spirit). A second problem is that the whole concept of ideology has, until now, remained largely undefined, amorphous, with little theoretical grounding, little appreciation of the need for application of any theory to the issues usually addressed by "ideological talk," and scant attention to the mutually constitutive relationship between ideology and discourse (cf. van Dijk 1998a).

However, frighteningly for the future of humanity, "with the computer, the problem of identity is moot, and the idea of reflection is transformed into the algorithm of replication" (Istvan Csicery-Ronay, Jr. in Shore 1996:136), opening up the related issue of imperialism—the technological imperialism brought about by such software and media giants as Microsoft and CNN in the postmodern age (cf. Shore 1996, Chapter 6), allied with the cultural imperialism of English as an international language (cf. Pennycook 1994, Phillipson 1992). Technological advances, from the introduction of writing to the invention of computers and the subsequent emergence of word-processing, made possible the long-term storage of memories such that the 'truth' could be (re)discovered in political texts, alongside their cotexts and intertexts, at a later date, supposedly without the interference of human forgetfulness (cf. Shore 1996:140–141).

But technological imperialism has implicated two further problems as outlined by Griffiths (1997):

> First,..the flow of information is still largely one-way and [is] determined by the economic control of the large Western international publishing houses and media distributors; and secondly,..when the postcolonial world

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> wants to employ the resources and technology of the metropolitan world to speak, it had better learn to do so in voices and accents (for these read formats and structures) which people in the West want to hear (Griffiths 1997:131).

This imperialism is most clearly confirmed in the fact that 80 percent of the information stored in the world's electronic retrieval systems is in English, with the vast majority of people communicating in English through the Internet (Crystal 1997:360). Far from being a "neutral" international language, culturally and politically, English is asserting and maintaining its dominance by "...the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages" (Phillipson 1992:47; cf. Pennycook 1994:12). The dominance of English is thus leading, if not to linguistic genocide, at least to "linguistic curtailment" (Pennycook 1994:14), as, for example, demonstrated by Yahya-Othman (1997) with regard to the respective roles of English, Swahili, and ethnic languages in Tanzania. The language planners of many countries are actually "planning inequality," whether or not they are actually aware of the ideological implications (Tollefson 1991). The global village is bringing about an increasingly English-based textualization of politics.

The above discussion highlights the wide variations in internalization of the principles of democracy within democratic cultures. For example, although freedom of speech is usually considered axiomatic in a democracy, the newly democratized nations differ in the willingness of their governments to allow a free press. But even the old democracies are experiencing concern as they adjust to technological advances which threaten their control over the media. At the same time, the modern ideologies are having to adapt to the postmodern world, with its contradiction between the global village brought about by technology and the fragmentation of nation states brought about by the new nationalism. I now turn to the language of politics to explore how political cultures are constituted by language.

THE LANGUAGE OF POLITICS

Since ancient times, politicians have been aware of the power of language to persuade, manipulate, and control. This section reviews selected linguistic features of political discourse and how these features can be manipulated for purposes of power, whether in the old or new democracies, or in the re-emerging totalitarianisms. In the first part, I first look at negotiation and the related forms of mediation, interview, and argument. I then look specifically at nonliteral meanings at the lexical and phrase level. Although there are many other features of political discourse that have been researched, for reasons of space, they will not be considered here.

Political leaders have, since ancient times, realized that "political talk plays a vital role in shaping and transforming political reality" (Gastil 1992:470).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

However, it is not just leaders who need to be aware of and control the language of politics in a democracy, but also all citizens. "The most profound implication of a *textual politics* is that by examining the texts of our own community, we can come to understand how and why we make the meanings we do, and what other meanings might be made instead" (Lemke 1995:79; emphasis in original), thus becoming conscientized (Freire 1968) by politicizing these texts.

As Harlow (1992:viii) points out, negotiation, for a while, displaced armed struggle in South Africa, El Salvador, Palestine, Northern Ireland, and elsewhere "as another means to resolve long-standing conflicts from the continuing history of colonialism, decolonization, and 'post-colonialism'." Such negotiation is, hopefully, a far cry from Matthews' (1972, in Harlow 1992) representation of black-white discourse in apartheid South Africa:

> Dialogue / the bribe offered by the oppressor / glitters like a fool's gold / dazzling the eyes of the oppressed / as they sit at the council table / listening to empty discourse promising / empty promises / beguiled by meaningless talk / they do not realize ointment-smeared words / will not heal open wounds / the oppressor sits seared with his spoils / with no desire to share equality / leaving the oppressed seeking warmth / at the cold fire of / Dialogue (Harlow 1992:143).

An examination of the discourse of negotiation, as one subgenre of political discourse might help us understand why negotiation has succeeded in some cases and failed in others, and how to ensure its success in the future.

In the case of the very South Africa that Matthews had had cause to criticize, we have seen the positive results of negotiation. The negotiating process was long and slow, starting in 1989 with de Klerk's call for a new South Africa. During this period, the African National Congress had to make the transition "from the politics of protest and resistance to the politics of negotiation and, beyond that, of electioneering and administration" (Mkhondo 1993:142), and of course, in the process, practice the language of negotiation. The first phase of the process ended with the all-race elections in April 1994, but of course it has continued at all political levels in the society to ensure the consolidation of the hard-won democracy.

The success of the South African negotiations is somewhat surprising, given the strictly hierarchical nature of communication in most societies, particularly in Africa:

> Communication patterns...tend to be top-down, unidirectional, paternalistic and manipulative rather than being participatory, dialogical, horizontal and providing awareness of genuine feedback and interaction. The existing situation has been described as one in which 'the few talk to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> the many about the needs and problems of the many from the standpoint of the few' (Ansah 1992:56, in Morrison and Love 1996:66).

However, we have sadly seen how negotiation has repeatedly broken down in many areas, such as the Middle East and Northern Ireland.

On the other hand, in the latter case, Peter Brooke, British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland from 1989 to 1992, clearly used many key skills in negotiation, such as listening to all parties, being flexible, and showing discretion in making pronouncements (Bloomfield 1998). Significantly, although his Initiative did not lead to a great deal of visible progress toward peace at the time, it laid the foundation for future talks:

> First and, perhaps, foremost, it produced an enduring formula which has been universally adopted as the accepted orthodoxy for structuring political negotiations. Second, it was the initial step in assembling and then addressing the substantive agenda for any such negotiations.... Third, it was an initial and all-important learning experience of negotiation processes for the politicians involved. Even if at times it demonstrated how *not* to do it, it was part of the evolutionary process of turning rhetoricians into negotiators (Bloomfield 1998:197).

Mediation in other contexts of dispute and conflict requires similar skills, skills which may be more developed in women, a key feature being that women tend to "...see themselves as 'co-equal' to the disputants..." (Cooks and Hale 1992:279), "...controlling the process while denying the possession of power..." (Cooks and Hale 1992:295). This observation may be significant in the current appointment of a woman, Mo Mowlan, to represent Britain in the ongoing negotiations in Northern Ireland. Gender differences in mediation contexts are likely to be similar to those found in the political interview, at least in similar cultural contexts. For example, male and female reporters have displayed significantly different discourse patterns in interviewing politicians in similar contexts, on Australian television, with the female being more cooperative and emphasizing information exchange, but the male displaying a more adversarial, competitive style (Winter 1993).

A major feature of the language of negotation is clearly persuasion, which is achieved through a variety of strategies including specific argumentation devices and grammatical features. First, argumentation devices include logically relevant assertions, repetition of key statements, name-giving, and quoting (Sornig 1989). Each of these devices may be used to present an argument with its "actual or virtual counterargument" (Sauer 1989:23). In one kind of pseudo-argument, conversational participants collaboratively support a single position, whereas in another, they collaboratively dispute "...an absent antagonist's imported position and support..." (Kleiner 1998:192) so as to confirm the "rightness" of their own positions. A major requirement for the citizens of new democracies is to learn

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

both to distinguish between genuine and pseudo-arguments and counterarguments, and to structure their own arguments, if they are to achieve the necessary conscientization (Chimombo forthcoming). If these citizens are able to avoid being taken in by the extravagant promises of government politicians in infant democracies, with their pseudo-arguments against the previous regime or the current opposition, there is a much greater chance for ongoing consolidation of democracy through the internalization of democratic discourse.

The grammatical features of political rhetoric are many and have been extensively researched. The most striking and pervasive are lexical and semantic features, which, it appears, are identifiable in modern political communication around the world. For example, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher used key words and formulaic phrases which were adopted widely by both Conservative and (to a lesser extent) Labour politicians, in the former case transforming the discourse of Thatcherism, and in the latter, resisting it (Phillips 1996). Nigerian politicians have consistently used metaphors in their addresses to the United Nations to reflect an Africanist ideology in an attempt to focus attention away from African leaders' own responsibility and toward the grim economic conditions which they seek to blame on foreign adversaries (Akioye 1994). Likewise, both Peres and Abbas used metaphors during the historic signing of the 1993 peace accord between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (Chimombo and Roseberry 1998:327–328), possibly to emphasize the significance of the negotiated outcome.

Politicians use, in addition to metaphor, a variety of other forms of indirect meaning like innuendo and circumlocution, and indirectness appears to be more common among the politicians of developing nations than among their western counterparts, with the aim of cushioning the dangers inherent in political discourse and helping politicians protect their jobs, parties, and governments (Obeng 1997). In western contexts, United States President Clinton uses antithesis and the hortatory subjunctive in addition to metaphor in his repertoire of tools of presidential rhetoric, with varied impacts (Perloff 1998). For example, Clinton has had difficulty mobilizing the support of the elite members of his party, the Democrats, as in the case of health reform, but he was able to reassure the public after the Oklahoma bombing (Perloff 1998:130–131). One of his predecessors, Reagan, exploited myths about the origins of America to win over the electorate and deflect criticisms by his opponents (Gastil 1992). And the last governor of Hong Kong, Chris Patten, made extensive use of presupposition as well as lexical reiteration to create the myth of Britain's democratic legacy to Hong Kong (Flowerdew 1997). Such nonliteral meanings "...constitute a kind of repetition on a more abstract level of the ideological, without having recourse to literal meaning" (Sauer 1989:14).

At the same time, it is important to be aware of the general public's skill in using the full range of nonliteral meanings in politically significant communication. In Poland, for example, under the communist regime, the people

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

developed their own skills in manipulating language to counter those of the government, using a "lexicon of inequality" (Zaslavsky and Fabris 1982:394, in Wierzbicka 1990). Voters in Ghana were even able to campaign while waiting to cast their vote in the 1992 general elections without breaking any electoral law simply by using traditional rhetorical skills, particularly proverbs, which were interpretable in relation to the candidates, who remained unnamed (Obeng 1997).

The above features, and of course many others, serve their users in the process of politicizing their texts, and although they have been treated independently of the process of textualizing politics in this survey, we must not forget that the two processes are inextricably intertwined. Political cultures are constituted by language; ideologies are (re)produced through discourse; negotiations and mediation are conducted through the process of trying to find shared meanings; politicians and populations both persuade and are persuaded in carefully chosen words. In engaging in politics, we must use language, and in using language, we are, whether we like it or not, engaging in politics.

CONCLUSION

For reasons of space, I have been unable in this brief survey to do justice to the huge amount of research currently being conducted into the politics of language and the language of politics, leaving us with as many questions as answers. I have focused on the textualization of politics as a form of democratic consolidation in the newly democratized nations, but "already one hears debates about instant referenda conducted through computer-television hookups, interactive town meetings conducted through computer-telephone combinations, and much more" (Glassman 1997:4). These developments make possible a new form of "mass-mediated 'direct democracy'" (Glassman 1997, Chapter 11) which could mean a retextualization of politics, at least in the West. The revolution in high technology is bound to affect the forms of governance in literate societies. I cannot help but wonder, however, to what extent the new modes of transmission and consolidation of democratic culture will filter down to the grassroots, particularly in the still predominantly illiterate 'third world.' At the same time, we have to ask to what extent the increasing globalization, as a result of media innovations, will lead to an ever greater standardization of political rhetoric and to an ever greater linguistic imperialism.

Nonetheless, although we acknowledge the paradoxes in the increasing complexity of the relationship between power and discourse, and language and politics, let us not forget the wisdom of Solomon: "The tongue has the power of life and death" (Holy Bible 1995:Proverbs 18:21), which is not unlike the Akan adage, "If you speak well, your lips do not offend anyone" (Obeng 1997:78). It thus seems that text has actually been politicized, and politics has been textualized, for over 3,000 years. The new technologies have merely made the politicization and textualization more obvious, and spread them more globally, than at any time in the past.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Discourse and Society. 1990–present. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

This journal, which first appeared in 1990, is making a major contribution to the study of discourse from multiple disciplinary perspectives. In almost every issue since it started, there is at least one article or book review relevant to the interaction between language and politics, power, and ideology, as well as a number of related issues, not only in the West but throughout the world.

Index on Censorship. 1972–present. London: Writers & Scholars International Ltd.

This index, which serves as a watchdog on human rights, in particular the right to freedom of speech, is an essential, invaluable resource for anyone wishing to have a quick overview of the key current issues prior to pursuing more academic research on language and politics.

Lemke, J. 1995. *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.

This book analyzes the use of language to maintain, strengthen, challenge, or resist socio-political relationships. Chapter 5, on the social construction of the material subject is particularly useful.

Perloff, R. M. 1998. *Political communication: Politics, press, and public in America*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

This book is a comprehensive introduction to political communication from the early history of the presidency's relationship with the press and the public to the current rhetorical presidency in the postmodern world. Although not giving a linguistic analysis of presidential rhetoric, chapters 6 and 7 are particularly relevant for anyone interested in the relationship between language and politics in America, with the latter examining what Perloff labels genres, such as inaugural addresses, pardoning rhetoric, and crisis rhetoric.

Schwarzmantel, J. 1998. *The age of ideology: Political ideologies from the American revolution to post-modern times*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

This book provides a valuable survey of the history of ideologies of the modern world, questioning the relevance of ideology to the postmodern world, but concluding that it is vital to have some overarching theory if human thought, ideas, and beliefs are not to become totally particularized. It complements van Dijk's (1998a) book.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

van Dijk, T.A. 1998a. *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.

This book takes off from Schwarzmantel's conclusion, and will no doubt prove invaluable in its insistence on the need for a theory of ideology based on a joint psycho-social account of "the social mind in its social (political, cultural) context" (6). It examines closely each of the rather "fuzzy" concepts that have been connected with the term "ideology" and builds them into models for the theory. It is the first in what promises to be an exciting series of books on the theory and application of ideology.

UNANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akioye, A. A. 1994. The rhetorical construction of radical Africanism at the United Nations. *Discourse and Society*. 5.7–31.

Alatas, S. F. 1997. *Democracy and authoritarianism in Indonesia and Malaysia: The rise of the post-colonial state*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, and New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Ansell, A. E. 1997. *New Right, new racism: Race and reaction in the United States and Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Banisar, D. and S. Davies. 1998. The code war. *Index on Censorship*. 27.1.162–169.

Bloomfield, D. 1998. *Political dialogue in Northern Ireland: The Brooke Initiative, 1989–92*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, and New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Chimombo, M. 1998. Government journalism: From totalitarianism to democracy? In K. M. Phiri and K. R. Ross (eds.) *Democratization in Malawi: A stocktaking*. Blantyre, Malawi: CLAIM. 217–236. [Kachere Series No. 4.]

_____ Forthcoming. The meanings of democracy in Malawi: Implications for language teaching. In M. Chimombo (ed.) *Lessons in hope: Education for democracy in Malawi, past, present, future*. Zomba, Malawi: Chancellor College Publications.

_____ and R. L. Roseberry. 1998. *The power of discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Chimombo, S. and M. Chimombo. 1996. *The culture of democracy: Language, literature, the arts, and politics in Malawi, 1992–1994*. Zomba, Malawi: WASI Publications.

Chirambo, R. M. 1998. Politics in the cartoon in Malawi: The Democrat cartoons. In K. M. Phiri and K. R. Ross (eds.) *Democratization in Malawi: A stocktaking*. Blantyre, Malawi: CLAIM. 195–216. [Kachere Series No. 4.]

Chirwa, W. 1997. Collective memory and the process of reconciliation and reconstruction. *Development in Practice*. 7.4.479–482.

Collins, R. K. L. and D. M. Skover. 1996. *The death of discourse*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Condren, C. 1997. *Satire, lies and politics: The case of Dr Arbuthnot.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Cooks, L. M. and C. L. Hale. 1992. A feminist approach to the empowerment of women mediators. *Discourse and Society.* 3.277–300.

Crystal, D. 1997. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deegan, H. 1996. *Third worlds: The politics of the Middle East and Africa.* London: Routledge.

de Gruchy, J. W. 1993. Guilt, amnesty and national reconstruction: Karl Jaspers' *Die Schuldfrage* and the South African debate. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa.* 83 (June). 3–13.

Docking, T. and K. Dunn. 1997. Imitation and innovation: The construction of democracy in Mali and Mozambique. Paper presented at the GRAF Research Conference, "L'Afrique, les Etats-Unis et la France" [Africa, the United States and France]. University of Bordeaux, France, May 1997.

Downing, J. D. H. 1990. U.S. media discourse on South Africa: The development of a situation model. *Discourse and Society.* 1.39–60.

Dunn, K. 1997. Constructing Africa: Representation, identity and international relations. Paper presented at the International Studies Association Northeast Annual Meeting. Philadelphia, PA, November 1997.

Dworkin, R. 1997. Forked tongues, faked doctrines. *Index on Censorship.* 26.3.148–151.

Fisher, M. 1996. A little useful knowledge is a useful thing. *Index on Censorship.* 25.3.28–32.

Flowerdew, J. 1997. The discourse of colonial withdrawal: A case study in the creation of mythic discourse. *Discourse and Society.* 8.453–477.

Freire, P. 1968. *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* [Trans. by M. Bergman Ramos.] New York: Seabury Press.

Gastil, J. 1992. Undemocratic discourse: A review of theory and research on political discourse. *Discourse and Society.* 3.469–501.

Glassman, R. M. 1997. *The new middle class and democracy in global perspective.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, and New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Griffiths, G. 1997. Documentation and communication in postcolonial societies: The politics of control. In A. Gurr (ed.) *The yearbook of English studies: The politics of postcolonial criticism.* 27. London: W.S. Maney and Son Ltd. for the Modern Humanities Research Association. 130–136.

Grossberg, L. 1996. Identity and cultural studies: Is that all there is? In S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds.) *Questions of cultural identity.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 87–107.

Gyimah-Boadi. E. 1998. The rebirth of African liberalism. *Journal of Democracy.* 9.2.18–31.

Hall, S. 1996. Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds.) *Questions of cultural identity.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 1–17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Halperin, M. H. and K. Lomasney. 1998. Guaranteeing democracy: A review of the record. *Journal of Democracy*. 9.2.134–147.

Harlow, B. 1992. *Barred: Women, writing, and political detention*. London: Wesleyan University Press.

Hart, J. A. and S. Kim. Forthcoming. Power in the information age. In J. V. Ciprut (ed.) *Of fears and foes: International relations in an evolving global political economy*.

Hartley, J. 1992. *The politics of pictures: The creation of the public in the age of popular media*. London: Routledge.

Holy Bible. 1995. New International Version. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Joseph, R. 1998. Africa, 1990–1997: From *abertura* to closure. *Journal of Democracy*. 9.2.3–17.

Kasfir, N. 1998. "No-party democracy" in Uganda. *Journal of Democracy*. 9.2.49–63.

Khoury, N. F. and V. M. Moghadam (eds.) 1995. *Gender and development in the Arab world. Women's economic participation: Patterns and policies*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Kleiner, B. 1998. The modern racist ideology and its reproduction in "pseudo-argument." *Discourse and Society*. 9.187–215.

Kovalev, S. 1996. Old griefs revisited. *Index on Censorship*. 25.2.54–58.

Lanham, R. 1993. *The electronic word: Democracy, technology and the arts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lemarchand, R. 1994. *Burundi: Ethnocide as discourse and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, W. L., S. White and P. Heywood. 1998. *Values and political change in postcommunist Europe*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, and New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Mkhondo, R. 1993. *Reporting South Africa*. London: James Currey Ltd.

Morrison, A. and A. Love. 1996. A discourse of disillusionment: Letters to the Editor in two Zimbabwean magazines 10 years after independence. *Discourse and Society*. 7.39–75.

Moto, F. Forthcoming. Domesticating the definition of democracy: The case of Malawi's proverbial wisdom. *Bwalo II*. [Zomba: Malawi. University of Malawi Centre for Social Research.]

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. 1986. *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. London: James Currey.

Nkhalambayausi Chirwa, R. M. 1994. Information technologies in Malawi's political transition. In M. Nzunda and K. Ross (eds.) *Church, law and political transition in Malawi 1992–94*. Gweru, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press. 111–120. [Kachere Series No. 1.]

Obeng, S. G. 1997. Language and politics: Indirectness in political discourse. *Discourse and Society*. 8.49–83.

Ochieng, P. 1992. *I accuse the press: An insider's view of the media and politics in Africa*. Nairobi: Initiatives Publishers and Acts Press.

Owen, U. 1998. The speech that kills. *Index on Censorship*. 27.1.32–39.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pennycook, A. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* London: Longman.

Phillips, L. 1996. Rhetoric and the spread of the discourse of Thatcherism. *Discourse and Society.* 7.209–241.

Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarkoohi, F. 1998. Showdown. Index on Censorship. 27.4.136–139.

Sauer, C. 1989. Structures of consensus-making and intervention: The concept of Nazi language policy in occupied Holland ("Deutsche Zeitung in den Niederlanden" 1940–1945). In R. Wodak (ed.) *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 3–37.

Schirmer, J. 1993. The seeking of truth and the gendering of consciousness: The CoMadres of El Salvador and the CONAVIGUA widows of Guatemala. In S. A. Radcliffe and S. Westwood (eds.) *'Viva': Women and popular protest in Latin America.* London: Routledge. 30–64.

Shi-xu. 1994. Ideology: Strategies of reason and functions of control in accounts of the non-western Other. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 21.645–669.

Shore, B. 1996. *Culture in mind: Cognition, culture, and the problem of meaning.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sornig, K. 1989. Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion. In R. Wodak (ed.) *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 95–113.

Tollefson, J. 1991. *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community.* London: Longman.

van Dijk, T. A. 1994. Editorial: The discourses of 'Bosnia.' *Discourse and Society.* 5.5–6.

_____ 1998b. Ideologies in political discourse on immigration. Paper presented at the International Conference on Challenges in a Changing World—Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis. Vienna, April 1998.

Wierzbicka, A. 1990. Antitotalitarian language in Poland: Some mechanisms of linguistic self-defense. *Language in Society.* 19.1–59.

Winter, J. 1993. Gender and the political interview in an Australian context. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 20.117–139.

Yahya-Othman, S. 1997. Language and power in Tanzania. *LICCA Papers. 4.*

Young, P. and P. Jesser. 1997. *The media and the military: From the Crimea to Desert Strike.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190599190111 Published online by Cambridge University Press