

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Nelson Mandela's Defense Speech *I am Prepared to Die*

Bader Nasser Aldosari

Department of Law, College of Science and Humanities
Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This paper attempts to present a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Nelson Mandela's defense speech *I am prepared to die*, which was delivered in 1964 during his trial in what is often called as Rivonia Trial. More specifically, the paper tries to explore the hidden relations of power and ideologies that have been encoded in Mandela's defense speech. The main research question is: what are the ideological meanings Mandela tries to communicate through his speech, and how are these ideologies conveyed by CDA strategies? The paper draws on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as discussed in the writings of Fairclough (1989, 2013) and Van Dijk (1993, 2001, 2014). The analysis covers two levels of analysis: the lexical level and the pragmatic level of analysis. Both levels are discussed under the theoretical umbrella of CDA. The paper reveals that Mandela managed, by using specific CDA strategies, to communicate particular ideological meanings that reflect his political stance, as well as his rebellious spirit as the most distinguished revolutionary leader who struggles against racial discrimination in South Africa.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, court discourse, defense speech, ideology, *I am prepared to die*, legal discourse, Mandela, racial discrimination

Cite as: Aldosari, B. N. (2020). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Nelson Mandela's Defense Speech *I am Prepared to Die*. *Arab World English Journal*, 11 (2) 3- 17.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no2.1>

Introduction

Nelson Mandela is considered one of the greatest leaders in Africa and a person who represents the most critically revolutionary period in South Africa. Mandela was a leader, a revolutionary, an equality defender, an anti-apartheid activist, a famous prisoner, and a competent president. Mandela struggled against apartheid in various ways. His fight against racial discrimination constitutes his efforts to form the Youth League of the African National Congress (ANC). He also led the Defiance Campaign, which started in 1952. During such a period, Mandela worked jointly with members of the South African Indian Congress and the Communist Party (Mandela, 1995; Sampson, 2011). In 1961, Mandela effectively helped in the establishment of *Umkhonto weSizwe* (Spear of the Nation), whose target was to launch an armed fight against apartheid in South Africa. Mandela's core concern was to create the spirit of resistance among the blacks in South Africa against the racial discrimination and towards ending the white privileges, as well as the White rule in the country. Under the White rule, the blacks in South Africa led sever conditions of segregation and discrimination that deprived them of most of their rights and restrict their freedom in all aspects of life. Mandela's decision to adhere to a policy of resistance that is based on armed struggle, violence, and sabotage, leads him to trial for sabotage and treason against the state. During his hearing, Mandela delivered a long speech in which he refuted the accusations leveled against him and provided justifications for the violent acts he was accused of.

Nelson Mandela's defense speech during his trial in 1964 was one of the most famous speeches that effectively contributed to legal discourse studies. This speech abounds in linguistic tools that encode both the power and ideology of the speaker. A key feature of discourse analysis, in general, and legal discourse, in particular, is its concern with the contextual meanings of language. This means that legal discourse, as a type of discourse analysis, is determined by several factors, such as how it is expressed, the intentions of its users, their intended meanings, the purposes beyond its use, and the relationship it holds with other texts.

The significance of this paper lies in its attempt to offer a linguistic analysis that functions to shed light on the extent to which language is employed in legal discourse settings to encode ideology and communicate power. As such, the paper tries to establish a triadic relationship between what is legal (courtroom discourse), what is linguistic (linguistic expressions used in the selected speech), and what is ideological (specific meanings beyond surface structures of discourse). Crucially, revealing the way agency encodes ideology in courtroom discourse, instanced by Mandela's defense speech, aims to offer a better understanding of the way language is used to communicate ideologies its users within the different legal settings. The value of this paper, therefore, is twofold: legal and linguistic. Legally, on the one hand, the article provides a new analytical perspective to legal discourse in courtroom interaction. This is conducted by offering a CDA of the selected speech, which functions to explore issues related to power, ideology, and inequality in the discourse of the selected speech. Linguistically, on the other hand, the paper's value stems from the fact that it tackles legal topics linguistically. This linguistic analysis attempts to offer insights into the understanding of the different uses of language to communicate specific meanings of its users in legal discourse, which also functions to emphasize the reciprocal relationship between law and language. As such, the paper provides some sort of linguistic enlightenment to the ways through which language is employed in legal settings.

This study attempts to answer three research questions: first, what are the different CDA strategies used in Mandela's speech to defend his situation? Second, what are the ideological meanings Mandela tries to communicate through his speech? Third, to what extent does Mandela's defense speech reflect his political stance? The answer of these research questions represents the objectives of this paper: to shed light on the different strategies used by Mandela to defend his speech, by demonstrating the way language encodes power and ideology in the context of courtroom discourse; to explore the different linguistic manifestations through which power and ideologies are communicated in courtroom discourse; and, to highlight the reciprocal relationship between language and law in terms of message delivery and discourse interpretation.

Literature Review

This part offers a theoretical background to Critical Discourse Analysis as well as a discussion of the related literature concerning the topic under investigation.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a linguistic approach that is concerned with the exposition of issues related to language, power, and ideology concerning the way language communicates ideology and encodes power (see, e.g., Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 1993, 1997, 2014). The origins of CDA were dated back to *Critical Linguistics* and *Linguistic Criticism*, as introduced in the writings of Fowler (1991, 1996) and Fowler and Kress (1979). This field of study offers a way of understanding the role of language in the production of dominance and inequality. Its primary concern is to show how discourse reflects power and asserts it. CDA tends not only to study the acceptable power enactment but also to analyze the "illegitimate exercise of power abuse or dominance" (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 24). This form of power "is being exercised primarily in the interest of the powerful and against the interest of the less powerful" (Van Dijk, p. 24). CDA offers a type of illumination against the oppressive manipulation of language, and supports a way of resisting injustice and inequalities.

Van Dijk (1993) states that CDA focuses on "the structures of text and talk" (p. 259), and tries to reveal the linguistic devices that are used to exercise power in written and spoken discourse. This, in turn, helps the public differentiate between the linguistic tools which serve to illuminate and those dedicated to manipulating. The public's ability to understand the hidden motivations beyond any discursive act enables them to combat the oppressive use of language, and forces them to struggle against dictatorship and to resist inequalities. Emphasizing the significance of CDA in revealing the hidden discursive structures of exercising power and producing persuasion, Van Dijk (1993) proposes that:

If powerful speakers or groups enact or otherwise exhibit their power in discourse, we need to know exactly how this is done. And if they thus are able to persuade or otherwise influence their audiences, we also want to know which discursive structures and strategies are involved in that process. (p. 259)

Critical Discourse Analysis perceives language as a tool of ideological purposes. It addresses issues of power and ideology and shows the way language manifests power, control, and discrimination among discourse participants in the courtroom (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). CDA

attempts to uncover the hidden relations of power in discourse in general and in courtrooms in particular. CDA is described as critical since it criticizes the way language can be biased towards specific ideological assumptions of its users (Fairclough, 2013; Van Dijk, 2014). It exposes the hidden ideologies and offers useful insights towards the understanding of the use of language in different types of discourse. Van Dijk (2001) perceives CDA as a type of analytical research that is concerned with the ways through which power, dominance, and inequality are produced, reproduced, and exercised in text and talk within the different social and political contexts. As such, CDA focuses on the way language is used to produce control and exercise power in the discourse, either spoken or written.

Van Dijk (1993) argues that one characteristic of CDA is to clarify how language is used to confirm, reproduce, or challenge existing power relations of individuals and institutions. Stating the intimate relationship between CDA and power, Van Dijk maintains that "one crucial presupposition of adequate critical discourse analysis is the understanding of the nature of social power and dominance" (p. 254). Van Dijk (1989) states that "for power to be exercised, legitimized and reproduced, it must also be expressed and persuasively conveyed in discourse and communication" (p. 21).

Characteristics of CDA

One of the most distinguishing features of CDA as a model of analyzing text and talk is its relevance to describe, explain and interpret how "discourses construct, maintain, and legitimize social inequalities" (Mullet, 2018, p. 116). Mullet maintains that CDA rests much emphasis on the fact that the use of language in different contexts should always be purposeful, that is, ideological. One of the main tasks of CDA is to reveal the different ideological meanings encoded in the linguistic expressions of language. It also focuses on aspects of power and domination that lead to issues of inequality. Here lies the relevance of CDA to the study of Mandela's selected speech, mainly if we take into consideration the political and social contexts in which this speech was delivered. Nelson Mandela's *I Am Prepared to Die* focuses on the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, for social equality, and political rights for all South Africans. Further, CDA attempts to expose hidden strategies of domination and inequality in discourse. It reveals the ways through which what is forbidden is institutionalized for the sake of the elites and the powerful (Khafaga 2017a, 2017b), and attempts to shed light on the manipulative dimension of language that inherently depends on the rhetorical dimension of power (Khafaga, 2019).

Van Dijk (1995) postulates that the following criteria characterize CDA:

- (i) CDA is a problem-oriented approach to analyzing language that focuses on relevant social problems such as the different forms of social inequality (as is the case for the primary concern of the speech in the current paper).
- (ii) CDA is a multidisciplinary approach that allows the integration of more than one level of analysis within its theoretical plan, such as the lexical, the semantic, the pragmatic, the syntactic, etc. It also opens the door for contributions from other fields, including psychology, sociology, literature, law, and political sciences.

- (iii) CDA studies the role of discourse in society, with a particular focus on group relations of power, dominance and inequality, and the ways these are produced, reproduced, consumed, or resisted by members of a social group through text and talk.
- (iv) CDA thematic priorities revolve around topics, such as class, gender, ethnicity, race, language, religion, age, and nationality.
- (v) Much work on CDA attempts to reveal the hidden ideologies in discourse that play a significant role in the reproduction of or the resistance against dominance or inequality.
- (vi) CDA tries to expose the strategies employed to communicate and realize manipulation and legitimation intended for affecting the minds of the public in the interest of the powerful elites (pp. 17-18).

Language and Courtroom Discourse

According to Gotti and Williams, 2010, linguistic expressions are widely employed in court to defend or to accuse. Language is perceived as a tool that reflects social control and power (Fairclough, 2013 [1989]). This sociolinguistic characteristic is not only noticeable in social settings, but legal settings as well (Coulthard & Johnson, 2007). Within the courtroom, language is used to facilitate control and to exercise power among discourse participants, be they lawyers, judges, witnesses, or otherwise. This is because a trial is a linguistic activity in which a linguistic interaction is meant by language users to advocate their position and to challenge their opponents. Language, in this sense, is perceived as a tool of control. Thus, one can say that there is a reciprocal relationship between language and legal discourse, reciprocal in the sense that the latter is interpreted according to the linguistic interpretation of the former in discourse. From this context, the relationship between language and law can be said to be worthy of linguistic research to explore the ways through which language is used within the framework of courtroom discourse. In the context of this paper, the focus will be on exploring relations of power within the discourse of the selected speech, as well as the ideological meanings encoded beyond its linguistic expressions.

Methodology

This part is dedicated to present the process of data collection, data description, the rationale of the study, and the procedures of data analysis.

Data Collection and Description

The data used in the analysis of this paper consists of Nelson Mandela's defense speech entitled *I am prepared to die* which he gave from the dock during the Rivonia Trial, Pretoria Supreme Court, 20th April 1964. The speech consists of nearly 14307 words and is downloaded from Famous Trial site available at <https://www.famoustrials.com/nelsonmandela/691>.

The rationale constituting the selection of this speech, in particular, is due to three reasons. First, Mandela's trial represents one of the most effective events that reshape world opinion concerning apartheid. Second, the speech abounds in different CDA strategies that constitute different linguistic manifestations that are dexterously employed to communicate specific ideologies of the speaker. Third, the selected speech reflects a type of legal discourse in a courtroom setting that shows the manner through which language is employed to demonstrate relations of power, ideology, and dominance in discourse.

The procedure adopted here requires the process of downloading the selected speech, reading the whole text extensively, and then highlighting the essential expressions that are relevant to the current study in order to be ready for analysis. In the analysis stage, the focus is on marking specific CDA strategies employed in the speech to reveal the hidden ideologies and the intended meanings of the speaker.

Mandela's Trial: A Background

In 1963-1964, Nelson Mandela and ten other opponents of South Africa's apartheid regime went on trial for their lives in what is known as the Rivonia trial. Mandela and the other accused persons were charged for acts of sabotage, violence, and conspiracy against the then government of South Africa. These violent acts came as a result of the constant policy of racial discrimination adopted by the White rule in South Africa against Black South Africans. The increased state violence against the Blacks was also met by more violent acts against the government. To institutionalize their violent resistance, a group of persons, including Mandela, established what was known as *Umkhonto weSizwe* organization, which was in charge of recruiting the Blacks to join in the violent resistance against the state. After being arrested, for Onwumechili, Mponda, and Jenkins (2015), Mandela and his followers were charged with the following charges: (1) recruiting persons in preparation for guerrilla warfare for purposes of violent revolution and acts of sabotage, (2) conspiring to aid foreign military units when they invade the republic, (3) acting to further communist objectives, and (4) soliciting and receiving money for these purposes from sympathizers outside South Africa (Algeria, Ethiopia, Liberia, Nigeria, Tunisia, among other states). The trial ended with a life imprisonment sentence of Mandela.

It was apparent then that evidence will be collaborated to announce the defendants as guilty. Meanwhile, Mandela, within the courtroom, announced that achieving a free and democratic society is a goal that deserves death, or as he put it: "is one for which I am prepared to die" (Mandela's defense speech, 1963). During the trial, the government legal representative was Percy Yutar. He delivered his opening statement in which he emphasized that the defendants intentionally and spitefully plotted against the state, and launched acts of violence and destruction throughout South Africa. He maintained that these premeditated violent acts tended to bring about disorder and confusion in the Republic of South Africa.

On the other side stood the defendants attorney represented by Bram Fischer who denied all accusations launched against Mandela and the other defendants, refuting their relationship with African National Congress by stating that Umkhonto we Sizwe (a political movement formed and led by Mandela) was not created to practice violence against the state. He maintained that this movement resorted to sabotage only when it was evident that no other way remained to achieve their political rights. He ended his opening statement by denying the allegations made in the state's case that Umkhonto or the African National Congress depended on what was referred to as being 'the alleged hardships' suffered by people. Importantly, Mandela's speech, known as the Rivonia speech, is considered to be one of the most famous speeches of the 20th century.

Analysis

Before analyzing Mandela's speech, it is important first to present a brief account of the political and social contexts in which the speech was delivered, as well as the main themes addressed in it.

This is because the speech cannot be understood without a clear understanding of both the social and the political contexts surrounding the speech at the time of its delivery.

Political and Social Contexts of the Speech

Mandela's defense speech was surrounded by many political circumstances that significantly shaped and influenced the period when the speech was delivered. The black South Africans were deprived of their rights and freedom under a very severe White rule that imposed racial classification in South Africa through which people were categorized according to physical appearance. People were classified into native, colored, Indian, or White (Posel, 2001). This unfair racial classification adopted by the White government in South Africa led to more practices of segregations among South Africans; it determined the place where one lived, the school he/she could attend, the job he could hold, and many other activities whose practice depended entirely on racial discrimination criteria. Within this atmosphere of apartheid, black South Africans or natives led an unprecedented state of suffering.

The segregation policies were reinforced by several governmental laws that widen the blacks suffering, banning them from working or living in certain places, and preventing them from collaborating with specific types of people in the whole country. The blacks were also deprived of voting in elections. They were separated from their families in seeking work; even their movement from one place to another within the country was also controlled by the White minority (Worden, 2012). Significantly, the Whites were migrants from Europe. Although they were a minority, they controlled both the state and the economy and used it to oppress and dominate the natives (black South Africans) (Sparks, 1996).

With time, the Blacks tasted more bitter conditions under the White government; no freedom of movement, no access to public services, no health services, no housing, no schools, no sanitation, and above all they were treated with violence in the hands of the elites (the Whites). Under such ruthless conditions, appeared a resistance movement to fight against these bitter situations. Mandela was a member of this movement who admitted that violence and sabotage were the most appropriate methods to face this policy of racial discrimination and to end it (Sampson, 2011) However, Mandela and a number of the rebels were accused of treason. They were set for a trial in 1964 in which he delivered his famous speech, the core concern of this study.

Themes Addressed in the Speech

Tracing the discourse of Mandela's speech, one can say that it focuses on the struggle of the black South Africans to gain equal rights, both socially and politically, with the Whites minority. Mandela's *I Am Prepared to Die* is perceived as a defense speech in which the speaker discusses specific issues in defense against the accusations brought against him from the court. Thematically, the speech can be divided into parts. In the first part, Mandela provides the court with information concerning his background as a student of law and a lawyer, and then he rejects all the accusations leveled against him from the court. The second part presents a clear confession from Mandela that he is responsible for all violent acts prevailed in the country. Still, at the same time, he maintains that these actions were the only way towards equality in rights. This part also sheds light on the *Umkhonto we Sizwe* organization, its activities, and the role played by the Communist Party in the

fight for equal rights. The third part occupies a significant part of the speech in which Mandela advocates equal rights for all South Africans.

Now, it is time to present analytically specific CDA strategies employed by Mandela to reflect his ideologies and communicate his intended meanings to both the audience in the court and the whole people of South Africa. In the subsections below, four main CDA strategies will be analytically focused on: (i) words selection, (ii) terms of address, (iii) the use of rhetoric, and (iv) organized argumentation.

Words Selection

The selection of specific words and/or phrases is one of the skillful CDA strategies speakers employ to convey their ideologies (Sornig, 1989; Schaffner, 2004). This strategy is used by Mandela in his speech to communicate his intended meanings. The following extracts from the speech show how specific words are employed in the speech.

- (1) There would be outbreaks of terrorism which would produce an intensity of bitterness and hostility between the various races of the country.
- (2) They are called volunteers because they volunteer to face the penalties of imprisonment and whipping which are now prescribed by the legislature for such acts.
- (3) We believed it was our duty to preserve this organization which had been built up with almost fifty years of unremitting toil.
- (4) We had no doubt that we had to continue the fight. Anything else would have been abject surrender.
- (5) had brought the African people nothing but more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights.
- (6) Our followers were beginning to lose confidence in this policy and were developing disturbing ideas of terrorism.
- (7) Experience convinced us that rebellion would offer the Government limitless opportunities for the indiscriminate slaughter of our people.
- (8) To overcome their legacy of extreme poverty. (Mandela, 1964)

The above extracts show a clever selection of some words and phrases, including *terrorism*, *intensity*, *bitterness* and *hostility* in (1); *penalties of imprisonment and whipping* in (2); *unremitting toil* in (3); *abject surrender* in (4); *more and more repressive legislation* (5); *developing disturbing ideas of terrorism* in (6); *indiscriminate slaughter* in (7); and *extreme poverty* in (8). These expressions are selected to describe the bad treatment the Blacks lead under the White government. They are intended to present the White government negatively by exposing the atrocities they practiced against the Blacks in South Africa. Mandela's words and expressions reflect his complete understanding of and concern with the situations of the Blacks under apartheid policy adopted in such a period. It is evident that Mandela tries to give justifications for the violent acts and the sabotage that he and his supporters did in the country. His intended meaning thus is to refute the accusations he is accused of before the court; that is to assure them the reason why they lead a violent resistance against the government.

Further, Mandel attempts to stimulate the feelings of sympathy for black South Africans and to reject the actions of the authorities represented in the many political and social violations committed against the blacks in South Africa. His repetition of the word *terrorism* conveys an implied reference to the government that terrorism is the only resort to face irrationalities and atrocities committed by the government. Mandela's *more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights* in (5) above is also an explicit accusation to the government in which he uses the oppositional phrases *more and more* and *fewer and fewer* to show the semantic link between the repressive legislation of the government and the deprivation of the rights of the blacks, where the former is semantically counterparted by the latter.

Terms of Address

Throughout the speech, Mandela utilizes specific terms to address the court during his defense speech. Among these terms are those used as *honorific terms* that are usually used in legal discourse and courtroom settings. In linguistics, honorifics are used to reflect the relative social status of the discourse participants (Levinson, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987). They are used to show politeness, deference, and distance between the speaker and his addressee. One of the distinctive features of using honorifics in legal discourse is that they are used to express respect from the speaker to addressee regardless of what is being talked about (Frawley, 1992; Sifianou, 1999). This means that these terms of address are employed in positive and/or negative situations of the speaker.

In his defense speech, Mandela uses 54 honorific terms to address the chief judge of the court; 50 with the noun phrase *My Lord* and 4 with the expression *Your Lordship*. Here we can notice how familiar Mandela is in addressing the judge of the court. His recurrent use of the honorific terms indicate that he knows for sure the social distance between him as a speaker and his addressee as a judge of the court. This also reflects the degree of politeness Mandela has in his address. In all his expressions in his defense speech, he keeps the use of honorifics, which in turn attempts to emphasize his legal background as a student of law and a lawyer which he starts his long defense speech with when he tells the judge: *I hold a Bachelor's Degree in Arts and practised as an attorney in Johannesburg for a number of years in partnership with Mr. Oliver Tambo, a co-conspirator in this case* (Mandela, 1964)

Using Rhetoric

In courtrooms, lawyers usually make use of rhetorical devices to communicate specific meanings and ideologies, as well as to make their arguments sound more appealing to the jury (Tiersma, 1999; Williams & Tessuto, 2013; Tessuto, 2016). The speech under investigation is full of rhetorical devices employed by Mandela to defend his situation. Among these devices are (i) the use of rhetorical questions and (ii) the use of oppositional constructions.

The Use of Rhetorical Questions

Rhetorical questions do not seek answers. They are considered a polite indirect way of communicating an idea to the addressees (Flowerdew, 2002; Pinto, 2004). They are often used by persons who are rhetorically powerful to motivate their recipients to accept their arguments. Consider these extracts from the speech:

- (1) Who will deny that thirty years of my life have been spent knocking in vain, patiently, moderately, and modestly at a closed and barred door? What have been the fruits of moderation?
- (2) What were we, the leaders of our people, to do? Were we to give in to the show of force and the implied threat against future action, or were we to fight it and, if so, how?
- (3) How much longer would it take to eradicate the scars of inter-racial civil war, which could not be fought without a great loss of life on both sides?
- (4) How could we continue to keep Africans away from terrorism?
- (5) How could black and white ever live together again in peace and harmony? (Mandela, 1964)

In the above extracts, Mandela manipulates several rhetorical questions to facilitate the delivery of argument in front of the court as well as to emphasize a particular idea. In all the above rhetorical questions, Mandela does not seek an answer from the judge, being the direct address, or from the audience, being the indirect addressees. However, by using this type of question, Mandela tries to communicate specific meanings that serve his case. His rhetorical questions function to direct the attention of the jury towards specific messages he wants to convey. In (1) above, Mandela attempts to communicate that he spent thirty years patiently in peaceful ways to demand equality and equal rights for the black South African. He tries to convey that peaceful ways end in vain as nothing changes concerning the situations of the Blacks or the policy of racial discrimination against them. His second question in the same extract emphasizes this idea: *What have been the fruits of moderation?* Again he does not seek an answer but to communicate the idea that restraint under apartheid proves to be useless and ineffective.

Similarly, in (2), Mandela directs his rhetorical questions to the judge, assuring him that they (the accused members) have nothing to do except to fight; when all doors are closed, one is enforced to illegal methods to realize his freedom. He asks the question and leaves the jury to bring the answer in their minds. Again, he wants to say that if black South Africans fail to gain their rights peacefully, they then will have no ways other than violence and sabotage. Here, another attempt is made to justify the violent acts that prevailed in South Africa in that period. Furthermore, in (3, 4, and 5), the three how-questions are rhetorically delivered to emphasize the argument that ultimate and inevitable consequences of the racial discrimination policies will be terrorism on the part of the Blacks. Mandela aims to communicate that violence breeds more violence. His questions imply a threat that racial discrimination will bring terrorism and terrorism will lead the country to a civil war between South Africans, both the Whites and the Blacks. This, for Mandela, will make it challenging to bring the South Africans back to live with each other in peace, which he communicates through the rhetorical question in (5) above.

Oppositional Constructions

The use of contrasts and oppositions also characterizes Mandela's defense speech. This is linguistically demonstrated in the frequent use of contrasted tenses and other oppositional expressions, either at the level of the word or at the level of the phrase. Consider the following extracts:

(1) The volunteers were not, and are not, the soldiers of a Black army pledged to fight a civil war against whites. They were, and are, dedicated workers who are prepared to lead campaigns initiated by the ANC to distribute leaflets, to organize strikes, or to do whatever the particular campaign required.

(2) But the hard facts were that fifty years of non-violence had brought the African people nothing but more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights. (Mandela, 1964)

The above examples show the skillful employment of oppositional construction to communicate specific ideologies. In (1), Mandela uses two contrasted tenses in his speech: the present and the past to emphasize the fact that the volunteers who conducted specific violent attacks in South Africa are mere workers and not soldiers. The use of the past tense in the negative form in *were not*, which is followed by the negative present in *are not* is dexterously employed to communicate the message that the *Umkhonto we Sizwe* organization did not recruit these persons to carry out violent attacks against the Whites. He wants to convey that they are not members of a *Black army pledged to fight a civil war against whites*. Here, Mandela tries to dissociate these people from being responsible for any mischievous acts. His emphasis that they *were not* and *are not* soldiers functions to eliminate any criminal intentionality on their part.

Similarly, in (2), the same contrasted construction is used in *more and more repressive legislation* and *fewer and fewer rights*. This contrast intends to communicate the fact that the more there is a punitive policy adopted by the White government against the Blacks, the fewer rights will be gained on the part of black South Africans. The literal semantic contrast between *more* and *fewer*; and the associative contrast between *repressive* and *rights* are highly indicative in communicating the amount of suffering the Blacks led under apartheid. A clear and powerful contrast is made by Mandela at the very beginning of his speech when he told the judge that he is *a black man in a white man's court*. Again, the contrast between the two adjectives black and white is highly indicative in communicating Mandela's intended meanings. Here, one can highlight the role of language in communicating ideologies. Mandela tries to achieve verbally (linguistically) what he failed to realize nonverbally (physically).

Organized Argumentation

A further CDA strategy used by Mandela's defense speech is the skillful and organized way through which he delivers his arguments in the court. This is clearly shown from the very beginning when Mandela starts his defense speech by providing a brief background about himself as a speaker:

I hold a Bachelor's Degree in Arts and practised as an attorney in Johannesburg for a number of years in partnership with Mr. Oliver Tambo, a co-conspirator in this case. I am a convicted prisoner serving five years for leaving the country without a permit and for inciting people to go on strike at the end of May 1961. (Mandela, 1964)

In fact, these introductory terms that shed light on the personality of the speaker are a feature of legal discourse used by lawyers in courtrooms (Mead, 1985; Stygall, 2012). Here, Mandela is keen

to adhere to the legal norms that are supposed to be in courts. Afterward, Mandela offers a summary of the contents of his speech that he is going to argue for or against:

In the statement which I am about to make, I shall correct certain false impressions which have been created by State witnesses; amongst other things I will demonstrate that certain of the acts referred to in the evidence were not, and could not have been committed by Umkhonto. I will also deal with the relationship between the African National Congress and with the part which I personally have played in the affairs of both organizations. I shall deal also with the part played by the Communist Party. In order to explain these matters properly, I will have to explain what Umkhonto set out to achieve; what methods it prescribed for the achievement of these objects, and why these methods were chosen. I will also have to explain how I came, I became involved in the activities of these organizations. (Mandela, 1964)

As is shown from the above quote, Mandela listed the points that he will deliver in his defense speech. This indicates that he is well-prepared for the court, i.e., linguistically. This, in turn, implicates the degree of conviction he has concerning his case. It is evident here that the official intention of the speaker was to address the accusations brought against him, by admitting and explaining those that were true, and rejecting those that were false. However, the speaker's broader intention was to expose the injustices of the apartheid system and to gain national and international support for the cause of equal rights for black South Africans.

Mandela continues his organized argument by defending his actions. Although he firstly admits that he planned for committing violence and sabotage: *I admit immediately that I was one of the persons who helped to form Umkhonto we Sizwe, and that I played a prominent role in its affairs until I was arrested in August*, he denies committing any violent attacks against people in South Africa: *I shall correct certain false impressions which have been created by State witnesses; amongst other things I will demonstrate that certain of the acts referred to in the evidence were not, and could not have been committed by Umkhonto* (Mandela, 1964). Mandela's intended meaning seems to be an attempt to persuade both the jury and the audience that his mischievous, unlawful and violent acts are justified by the oppressive rule and repressive laws the blacks had under apartheid. This is clearly expressed in his speech when he says: *I did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness, nor because I have any love of violence. I planned it as a result of a calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny.* (Mandela, 1964)

Importantly, in admitting and/or rejecting the accusations leveled against him, Mandela tries to gain the sympathy of not only the national audience, but the international ones as well. He knows for sure that black South Africans cannot struggle against the white government alone, and, therefore, he tends to persuade the international community to support and advocate equal rights in South Africa, by practicing some sort of pressure on the government.

Mandela ends his defense speech with one of the most rhetorically powerful statement in the whole speech:

I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die. (Mandela, 1964)

Here, Mandela emphasizes that he fights for freedom, equality, and harmony in the South African society. Crucially, Mandela's *I am prepared to die* is worldly perceived to be the most famous statement he is known by. It shows his elastic and impenitent attitude towards black South Africans cases. He states that he spends most of his life fighting for equal rights in South Africa, both peacefully and violently, and expresses his willingly resilient readiness to die for his purpose.

Conclusion

This paper presented a critical discourse analysis of Nelson Mandela's defense speech *I am prepared to die* during his trial in 1964. The study revealed that the selected speech exhibits different linguistic manifestations through which ideologies are communicated to addressees. This is linguistically evidenced by the employment of four CDA strategies, including lexical selection, using specific terms of address, the utilization of rhetorical devices, and the skillful employment of organized argumentation. Mandela uses these strategies in his speech to advocate freedom and equal rights on the part of black South Africans. This is demonstrated by his skillful use of specific linguistic, rhetorical, and discursive devices to communicate his ideological meanings persuasively, both to the national and the international audience.

The paper also clarified that courtroom discourse is a type of institutional discourse that is characterized by linguistic features that, however expressed in a context of powerlessness, reflect ideology and power of its users. This, in turn, emphasizes the fact that legal discourse is goal-oriented; that is, it always targets specific purposes beyond the discursive practices delivered in court settings. Further, the analysis of the selected data showed that language is an effective tool in communicating ideologies as it can be used and abused to achieve particular objectives of its users, and to shape and reshape attitudes of its receivers.

Acknowledgments:

This publication was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University under the Research Project No. 2019/02/16395

About the Author:

Bader Nasser Aldosari is an Assistant Professor, Department of Law, College of Science & Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. He got his PhD degree in Law Studies at School of Law, Politics and Sociology at the University of Sussex, UK, in 2018. His research interests include law studies, law and politics, and law and language.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0769-6912>

References

- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>

- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An introduction to forensic linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203969717>
- Fairclough, N. (2013[1989]). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315838250>
- Flowerdew, J. (2002). Globalization discourse: A view from the east. *Discourse & Society*, 13 (2), 209-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926502013002407>
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. In C. Coulthard, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 15-31). London and New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. & Kress, G. (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, R. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.) *Language and control* (pp. 185- 213). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429436215-10>
- Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic semantics*. Associate, Inc.
- Gotti, M., & Williams, C. J. (Eds.) (2010). *Legal discourse across languages and cultures*. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0351-0011-2>
- Khafaga, A. (2017a). Linguistic manipulation of political myth in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(3), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n3p189>
- Khafaga, A. (2017b). Discourse interpretation: A deconstructive reader-oriented approach to critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(2), 138-146. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.138>
- Khafaga, A. (2019). Linguistic representation of power in Edward Bond's *Lear*: A lexicopragmatic approach to critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 404-420. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n6p404>
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313>
- Mandela, N. (1964). I am prepared to die, *Famous Trial*. Available at <https://www.famoustrials.com/nelsonmandela/691>.
- Mandela, N. (1995). *Long walk to freedom: The autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. London: Little, Brown and Company.
- Mead, R. (1985). *Courtroom discourse*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Printing Section.
- Mullet, D. (2018). A General Critical Discourse Analysis Framework for Educational Research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 29 (2), 116-142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X18758260>
- Onwumehili, C., Mponda, S., & Jenkins, J. (2015). *A rhetorical analysis of Nelson Mandela's two key speeches*. From the Selected Works of Chukwuka Onwumehili. Available at: <http://works.bepress.com/chuka-onwumehili/2/>
- Pinto, D. (2004). Indoctrinating the youth of post-war Spain: A discourse analysis of a Fascist Civics textbook. *Discourse & Society*, 15 (5), 649-667. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504045036>
- Posel, D. (2001). Race and common sense: Racial classification in twentieth-century South Africa. *African Studies Review*, 44(2), 78-113. <https://doi.org/10.2307/525576>
- Sampson, A. (2011). *Mandela: The authorized biography*. London: Harper Collins.

- Schaffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), 117- 150. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.3.1.09sch>
- Sifianou, M. (1999). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece*. Oxford: 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* (pp. 95-113). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ct.7.09sor>
- Sparks, A. (1996). *Tomorrow is another country: The inside story of South Africa's Road to change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stygall, G. (2012). Discourse in the US courtroom. In P. Tiersma, & L. Solan (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and law* (pp. 369-380). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199572120.013.0027>
- Tessuto, G. (Ed.). (2016). *Constructing legal discourses and social practices: Issues and perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Tiersma, P. M. (1999). *Legal language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). Structures of discourse and structures of power. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook* (Vol. 12, pp. 18-59). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 249-283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1, 17-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926595006001001>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.) (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-37). Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton, (Eds.) *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and knowledge: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107775404>
- Williams, C., & Tessuto, G. (Eds.) (2013). *Language in the negotiation of justice: Contexts, issues and applications*. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate.
- Worden, N. (2012). *The making of modern South Africa* (5th ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Limited.