

Research Article

Ideology and Power in Political Rhetoric: Perspectives into Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's 1963 Speech at Addis Ababa

Mohammed Tawfik Adamu , Mohammed Sadat* 

Department of Communication Studies, University of Professional Studies, Accra, Ghana

Abstract

As one of the process to create Africa Union, African leaders organised a conference of Heads of States and Governments in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in 1963. At this Conference, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah delivered one of the most powerful speeches in order to persuade the leaders to embrace the unity. This paper examines the speech delivered by Dr. Kwame Nkrumah during the Conference. It investigates the latent meanings inherent in the speech text. The study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to interrogate the speech based on the concepts of power and ideology in relation to political speeches. It examines how social power, ideology, and social relations are built and retained through communication. The theory goes beyond surface-level apprehension of language to explore the concealed meanings, power dynamics, and social inequalities enclosed within texts and conversations. The findings reveal that issues of power and ideology are subtly constructed in the speech through stringing of arguments via carefully selected pronouns to create power, identification and differentials between Kwame Nkrumah and his audience. The findings also discover embedded characterization of Nkrumah as an ideologue and unrepentant supporter of socialism who was obsessed with African unity. Lastly, the findings disclose Nkrumah's penchant for using logical reasoning in his speeches as a strategy to bring to the fore his ideology.

Keywords

Ideology, Power, Rhetoric, Speeches, Nkrumah

1. Introduction

Speech as an expression of thoughts is an important tool in human communication. It is used in communication to express different and divergent views. A speech could be used to persuade people into accepting a new idea, and it could also be used to incite people into violence. For this reason, speeches play a vital role in every endeavour because they can be considered as one of the greatest tools for persuasion to make people take the right decisions or otherwise in their lives. It is postulated that “speech communication is both a public act and an interrelated set of analytical and motor

skills that advance the individual or collective interests of a society” (p. 4) [10].

More importantly, political speech communication is an indispensable medium that politicians use to engage their audiences. In most cases, issues of power and ideology are subtly constructed in such speeches which make them conspicuously latent in the speeches. Power can therefore be operationalized as the probability that one person within a social relationship will be in a position to demand that his/her orders be obeyed and carried out even if those re-

*Corresponding author: sadat.mohammed@upsamail.edu.gh (Mohammed Sadat), sadat.mmed@gmail.com (Mohammed Sadat)

Received: 5 July 2025; **Accepted:** 21 July 2025; **Published:** 8 September 2025



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2025. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

quired to do so have contrary views. Power may be acquired through coercion (illegitimate power) or consensus building (legitimate power). Power can also be interpreted as the capacity of people to galvanize their resources in championing their interest. Examples are the cases of the United States of America, United Kingdom, China, Germany etc. Ideology, on the other hand, is people's belief systems, philosophies, values, worldviews and concepts that guide their lives. Usually, political speeches contain hegemonic genres which are latently constructed; thus, it is through a careful and meticulous analyses of such political speeches that they become apparent.

That notwithstanding, it can be argued that political speeches have helped shaped public deliberative space. In the case of Africa, the continent has witnessed great and influential political rhetoricians like Nnamdi Azikiwe, Julius Nyerere, Tafewa Balewa, Modibo Keita, Kwame Nkrumah, Nelson Mandela et. al. It is in light of this that Mensah posits:

The twentieth century has witnessed the emergence of great speakers who, through their oratory prowess, injected the feeling of nationalism and an unquenchable political consciousness on the continent of Africa thereby paving the way for the independence struggle in many parts of the continent that were under colonial rule (p. 1) [17].

Nkrumah was an extraordinary Pan-Africanist whose rhetorical prowess raised national consciousness in Africa. One can also mention Nelson Mandela, Emperor Hail Selassie, Obafemi Awolawo, Patrice Lumumba, George Padmore, W. E. B. Dubois and many others. All these great Pan-Africanists played monumental roles towards the self-determination of the continent of Africa through their oratory prowess. They opened a new dawn in Africa where Africans fought for their emancipation [16].

This study focuses on Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, the first President of the Republic of Ghana who led Ghana to gain independence from the British on 6th March, 1957 [19]. The study examines his 1963 speech at Addis Ababa [18]. This is because issues of power and ideology are heavily constructed and hidden in texts. Critical Discourse Analyses (CDA) as a framework is employed to interrogate these latent meanings and then make them apparent. The study seeks to provide answers to two critical questions: Firstly, how are pronouns appropriated in constructing issues of power in the speech and secondly what are the issues of ideology embedded in the speech?

2. Related Literature

CDA considers the human being as essentially a socio-political being whose instincts are always manifested by the choices of words he/she makes. For this reason, it is prudent to critically analyse the ideology, and power behind the human speech. It must be stated that every text is polysemic and therefore can be subjected to different interpretations. Hence, CDA seeks to go beyond textual meanings in order to

uncover hidden meanings and other possible interpretations. CDA also seeks to analyse the consequences of linguistic expressions on the audience. CDA mainly focuses on language as a tool used for the construction and advancement of thoughts, philosophy, ideology, sexism, feminism, ethnocentrism, politics, social class and power of either an individual, a society or a group [22]. This means that language is used for the construction of the world, thus, without language the world would have been meaningless. This assumption is built on the common assertion that language mirrors society.

Cutting also buttresses the postulations of Van Dijk, when he posits that CDA is used to analyse how language is used to reflect social classes and also as a tool of power to control and maintain a social class [7]. An example is the Apartheid system that existed in South Africa. He further argues that CDA appeals to a reader's analytical mind through thought-provoking considerations and reasoning [7]. It exposes to the reader or listener of a text the embedded and latent meanings within a text. It also brings to light the inequalities, corruption and injustices in society by exposing them.

It is against this background that Van Dijk establishes that CDA draws attention to "... many inequalities and injustices ... enacted, reproduced and legitimized by text and talk" (p. 132) [23]. In view of this, Dellinger (cited in Abdullahi-Adiagbon, [2] cautions readers to be on alert when reading or listening to a linguistic communication [9]. Dellinger highlighted some characteristics of a language discourse based on CDA [9]. According to him, a discourse has an overtly political agenda that shows the inequality between the speaker (s) and the hearer (s) most often in terms of power relation, exposure, status, knowledge, and social class. There is therefore a strong tendency of information manipulation on the part of the producer of the text.

It is also important to quickly add that CDA is not only about politics, rather, its spectrum goes beyond politics to include ideology, power, gender, corruption, religion, social, history and political undertones which may not be apparent to a reader or a listener of a text. This is to reestablish the earlier position by Van Dijk that every text has a 'hidden' or latent meaning. CDA therefore seeks to critically analyse texts through a careful and systematic analytic processes with a view of bringing to light the 'hidden' meanings in the text [23].

Ahmed used CDA to study some speeches of the former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mian Mohammed Nawaz Sharif [1]. The focal point of the study was on the use of drones by America in its fight against terror mainly in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Ahmed's study revealed that the sovereignty of Pakistan was violated. However, this was subtly constructed through the use of diplomatic communication [1]. Deeply buried in the speech is the fact that the Prime Minister needed popular support from his people; thus, the need to adopt that stand since the nation was divided on the issue of foreign incursion in Pakistan. The findings further revealed that a [1] poll conducted by Pew Research Centre's Global Atti-

tude project, 97% Pakistanis consider drone strikes a bad policy. This work [1] is very relevant to the current study since the current study also intends to find out how Nkrumah subtly used language to construct power and ideology about the Africanization of the continent. It must be noted that just as the ideology of Prime Minister Sharif, Nkrumah's ideology was also to set Africa free from all forms of colonialism and imperialism [17]. The work will therefore help us in developing a broader spectrum in analysing the speech text.

Wang also did a critical discourse analysis of Obama's speeches. The article focused on the use of transitivity and modality [25]. According to Wang, transitivity is a basic semantic system which construes the world of experience into manageable set of processes [24]. Modality refers to the speaker's attitude towards opinion about the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence. From the results, it became clear that Obama was able to push forward his ideologies in his political speeches; a phenomenon that made him a successful president of the United States of America. The relevance of this is that even though this study looked at the mechanics of the language used by Barack Obama (transitivity and modality), the current study is more interested in the generally subtle construction of power and ideology which are inherent in the text.

Secondly, both works focus on the use of language; therefore, this study provides a guide in appreciating the latent issues. In their study on Obama and Rouhani's speeches delivered at the UN, Sharififar and Rahimi reveal how the two presidents' language incorporated both ideology and power [21]. Just like Wang [24], Sharififar and Rahimi also used transitivity and modality to analyse the use of language by both leaders to push their agenda of power and ideologies across [21]. In the findings however, it became clear that Obama used more clear and simple expressions as against Rouhani who used more complex and formal expressions. The connection between this literature and the current study is that, both works investigate the use of language in disseminating ideologies and power. Secondly, aside ideologies and power that resonate in both speeches, there are also issues of security and sovereignty in both speeches. Clearly, this work, just like that of Wang deals with the inherence of ideologies and power [24]. This study offers an overview of how language is used to enact the agenda of ideology and power. It also sheds light on the use of grandiloquent expressions in the construction of power and ideology since Nkrumah used similar expressions very often.

Relevant to the current study is the work of Abdullahi-Adiagbon who employed CDA in language choices of presidential candidates in election campaigns in Nigeria [2]. The work investigated how feelings, emotions as well as ideological beliefs of individuals or groups were conveyed through linguistic expressions to manipulate the audience. The study further examines hidden truth in political speeches which relates to social structures, identities, and power relations between the electorate and politicians. The findings revealed

some levels of deceit, hypocrisy, dishonesty, pursuit of personal agenda, pride and greed which were hidden in all their speeches. As Nkrumah puts it, "the evaluation of one's own social circumstances is part of the analysis of facts and events...." (p. 1) [18] Thus it became apparent in the findings and analysis that the leaders used propaganda to mislead the people. This work helps us to investigate and to appreciate how Nkrumah used language to push home the unification of Africa. It also helps us to find out whether in constructing power and ideology, Nkrumah also used propaganda.

In furtherance to the literature, Sharndama also worked on President Mohamadu Buhari's inaugural speech [20]. The findings revealed Buhari as a unifier and patriotic who has good plans for Nigeria. Two major ideologies were found hidden in the speech. The first is historical allusion which was meant to draw the attention of Nigerians to good governance as a legacy left to them by their founding fathers and the traditional leaders of their ancient empires and kingdoms. [20] Secondly, there was also the use of personal pronouns to indicate personal responsibility in running a government [20]. On good governance, Buhari called for national unity among Nigerians irrespective of religion, ethnicity and politics. In all these, the issues were subtly constructed by Buhari [20]. This therefore makes the work relevant to the current study. Secondly, it assists us understand the appropriation of pronouns in the construction of power.

3. Power and Ideology

3.1. Power

When 'power' is mentioned in every discourse, the generic meaning that comes to mind is the ability to control, influence, or the use of physical force or pressure to achieve something. In this particular study however, the use of the word 'power' goes beyond the above generic meanings and interpretations. According to Foucault, power cannot be interpreted as though it is something that can be seen, touched, and felt. He posits that "In any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterize and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (p. 93) [13].

Foucault tries to argue that power is socially constructed. According to Foucault, power is derived from the society within which that power is exercised [13]. This is in tandem with our operationalization of power as the ability of a people to galvanize their resources in order to champion their interest. Foucault believes that all forms of power are motivated by a "demystification of ideologically distorted belief systems."

According to Fairclough, "power is an ongoing process that takes place under conditions of social struggle that is

exercised through coercion or consent; it can be won, exercised, sustained and lost in the course of social struggle” (p. 57) [11] An example is when in 1957, out of social struggles, Nkrumah won power (Independence) for Ghana and in 1966, he also lost the power through another social struggle; coup d’état [18].

It must be noted that people can use power either to empower themselves or to emancipate others or to suppress, oppress and to dominate. Therefore, power can be obtained and exercised through coercion or by consent. For example, the 1966 coup d’état that toppled Dr. Kwame Nkrumah and his Convention People’s Party (CPP) is an example of power by coercion. This included the use of force, brutalities, violence, conflicts, violation of the rights of people and so on [19]. However, the 1992 elections, which ushered in the Fourth Republic of Ghana is a demonstration of power by consent because it was the people who decided through a Universal Adult Suffrage to usher the government of the National Democratic Congress (NDC). This therefore means that power can be exercised either positively or negatively; then, power can be said to be neutral.

Van Dijk also describes social power in terms of social control of a group or an organization by an individual, or a group [22]. He posits that an individual or a group may have more or less power depending on how the individual or the group controls the acts and minds of members within the group. [22] The use of the concept of power in this study is crucial because it helps us rationalise our analyses. More importantly, it serves as a blueprint to guide us put our analyses within an appropriate contextual framework.

3.2. Ideology

Van Dijk considers ideology as a ‘worldview that constitutes ‘social cognition’ (p. 558) [22] He posits that ideologies are “schematically organized complexes of representations and attitudes with regard to certain aspects of the social world” (p. 558) [22]. In most cases ideological tendencies are expressed unconsciously. As a result, people express them without knowing that they are being ideological. This is because they have been practicing it for a longer period of time and so they have become norms and conventions; therefore, people either express them or accept them willingly. Ideology can therefore be considered to be social constructions of realities by individuals or a group. This therefore means that there may be different ideological standpoints. For example, capitalism, socialism, communism, communalism, democracy, monarchy etc. These are different economic and political ideological standpoints that guide people’s way of life.

Marxists on the other hand speak of ideology as belief systems that help justify the actions of those in power by distorting and misrepresenting reality, [8]. In this context, it can be said that ideology is the foundation of meaning that is embedded in human life; especially, how human beings con-

struct realities through communication, how human beings understand the world around us, how human beings make it understandable to others, and how human beings make value judgments about the world. Ideology also deals with concepts such as worldviews, belief system, philosophies and values. This is because these concepts are subjective; it is perceived differently by different people at different times depending on the circumstances in which they find themselves. The use of the concept of ideology in this paper is of immense importance. Since ideology has to do with people’s standpoints, it is only appropriate if we use it to explain Nkrumah’s standpoints on subtly constructed ideological issues in the speech.

Althusser on the other hand considers ideology as systems of ideas and representations which dominate the mind of a man or a social group [3]. This means that ideology is a figment of a man’s imagination. This position is in congruence to the position of the early Marxists who posit that ideology is a belief system that justifies the actions of the powerful in society. It must be stated that Nkrumah’s ideas are more socialist and Marxist inclined and therefore since Althusser is also a Marxist, his ideas would be useful to this study. Althusser, further espoused that ideology is an imaginary assemblage, pure dream (unrealistic), empty and vain that is influenced by our previous experiences to form a tangible reality [3].

4. Methodology

A value judgment analysis of the speech employed in this study. Since every text is polysemic and can therefore be subjected to different meanings and interpretation, a subjected analysis was done through a rigorous interpretation process bringing to bare other possible educated guesses. Quantitative study is interpretative and therefore allows the researcher to discover other inherent meaning that may be embedded in a text. [15]. Secondly, because many concepts such as culture, power, religion and faith influence people’s ideologies and thoughts, the study considered these in the interpretations of the text speech so that it will be able to make value judgments. The analysis was limited to Dr. Kwame Nkrumah’s 1963 speech delivered at Addis Ababa [18]. The analyses were guided by Fairclough and Wodak’s eight requirements in doing a critical analyses of a discourse [12]. For this reason, the text was read several times in order to acquaint ourselves with the issues of power and issues of ideology as they appeared in the text. Various reading strategies such as skimming, scanning and critical reading were applied to the text. For instance, skimming as a reading strategy offered us a pictorial description of the text just to ensure that we assimilated the key issues that were raised in the text. At the scanning stage, a particular attention was paid on embedded key issues such as power differentials, ideology, hegemony, and historicity. We also considered the sentence patterns, the themes, the controlling ideas, the topic sentenc-

es, the supporting sentences, the choice of clauses and phrases and the choice of pronouns as well. We then made an outline of the key issues raised in the text. These details enabled us to make certain deductions during the study. At the critical reading stage, we paid particular attention to the various issues raised. We did this to see the chronology of presentations of ideas so as to draw distinctions between ideological issues, historical issues, and issues of power. At every stage of the reading, we carefully noted the issues. After this, we examined the issues beyond their manifest meanings and then went into their latent meaning. We also considered contexts (situation, cultural, textual) during this process.

5. Analysis: Pronouns as Power

The analyses began by providing answers to the question: How were pronouns appropriated in constructing issues of power embedded in the speech?

Your Excellencies, the remedy for these ills is ready to our hand. It stares us in the face at every customs barrier, it shouts to us from every African heart. By creating a true political union of all independent states of Africa, we can tackle hopefully every emergency, every enemy, and every complexity. This is not because we are a race of supermen, but because we have emerged in the age of science and technology.

A close reading of the above text revealed a strategic use of the pronouns “we”, “us”, and “our”. Consciously or unconsciously, these pronouns created power differentials between a powerful speaker and a marginalized audience. By the use of the above pronouns, one might think that Nkrumah was referring to the African masses who form the majority of the African population when in actual fact a close reading of the text would reveal that those pronouns referred to the political elites present at the conference. There was also the use of gendered language in the text which was appropriated to show power differentials. For example, the use of the expression, “...race of supermen...” gives a masculine impression of a superhero and neglects the feminine role of the numerous African heroine who played diverse roles in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism. It must be stated unequivocally that the use of such expression marginalizes the role of women in the struggle for the self-determination of Africa.

That notwithstanding, it also stereotypes women and makes their roles insignificant to nation building. It makes them passive contributors to development as against their male counterparts who are portrayed as active contributors. Such expressions promote the hegemony of men against women. Meanwhile, it is a known fact in history of the tremendous contributions pan African women played towards the emancipation of the continent. Examples of such ‘superwomen’ are the likes of Yaa Asantewa of the Ashanti Kingdom who resisted the British usurpation of Ashanti lands,

Winnie Madikizela-Mandela who also fought against the Apartheid in South Africa and a host of many other women. Such gendered expressions are manifestations of marginalization of women and their stereotyping as their contributions towards independence and national development have been downplayed in many cases via political speech texts.

However, either this was a conscious or unconscious move, the end result was that women were not properly represented in the current speech text and this provided a spotlight for gendered language in the speech. The pronoun choice obviously reveals the display of power relations between male and female. It therefore gives a picture of a patriarchal system since it portrays men as possessors of power and control. Hence, it can be said that Nkrumah used language to subtly construct issues of power. This was to assert his power and control and to further legitimize his authority and leadership.

That notwithstanding, other subtly constructed issues of power could be seen in the speech below:

Unless we can establish great industrial complexes in Africa, what have the urban worker and those peasants on overcrowded land gained from political independence? They are to remain unemployed or in unskilled occupation, what will avail them the better facilities of education, technical training, energy and ambition which independence enables us to provide?

There is a construction of power through the use of pronouns hidden in the statement above. Apparently, Nkrumah seemed to be talking about the social problems such as unemployment, illiteracy, lack of technical-know-how amongst many others. However, there also lies in the text the issue of power which was subtly constructed via pronouns. For example, the expression, ‘...enables us to provide?’ shows control of power by some few people mainly the political class. It meant that he (Nkrumah) and his government had the power to provide all those social interventions he listed in the text. He excluded the role of the masses in that effort. Meanwhile, in earlier statements he created the impression that governance was a shared responsibility.

Personal pronouns are either consciously or unconsciously used in political speeches to create a certain effect of power and control. From the statement above, the pronoun ‘us’ was used in the exclusive sense to exclude the masses and other private citizens from the exercise of power. According to Bramley [6], “the intention of the ‘us’ and ‘them’ separation is to set one group apart from the other group and their actions, and to include or exclude hearers from group membership” (cited in p. 14) [14]. This is because the pronoun ‘us’ can have either in-group interpretation or out-group interpretation. Based on the context, it can be interpreted that the pronoun ‘us’ represented the in-group which was the political class excluding the masses. The assertion means that the masses were excluded from the exercise of the power to develop the country when, in reality, development should be a shared responsibility of all. Without a critical look at the pronouns, an impression could be created that Nkrumah used

the pronouns to refer to the generality of the masses when in actual fact, he was referring to the ruling class. Such pronouns show that the power resided in the ruling class who had that singular responsibility of developing the continent. Van Dijk discusses social power in terms of social control of a group or an organization by an individual, or a group [22]. He posits that an individual or a group may have more or less power depending on how the individual or the group controls the acts and minds of the members of the group. By this assertion, it can be deduced that Nkrumah wanted to control the minds of the masses by hiding in the text his absolute control of power.

A similar statement can also be found in the speech when he said: "In the task which is before us of unifying our continent we must fall in with that pace or be left behind." The pronoun, 'us' and 'we' are also used in the exclusive sense to exclude the masses from the exercise of power. The pronouns show that the power resided in the ruling class who had that singular responsibility. This is in tandem with Van Dijk when he defines social power in terms of social control of a group by an individual or a group [22]. He argues that an individual may have more power when the individual is able to control the minds and actions of the group.

Clearly, the expressions above show that Nkrumah wanted to control the minds of the people by making them believe that he and his government have the wherewithal and the capability of developing the country and also unifying the continent. The ability of an individual to control the minds and actions of people can foster unity amongst the people. In the case of Ghana, events leading to Independence can only vindicate Nkrumah on the need for the exercise and the legitimization of such powers and control. This is in line with Van Dijk [22]. position that dominant groups may resist, accept, condone and even legitimize such powers. They may integrate such powers and dominations into laws, rules, norms, habits, and even form a consensus over such power.

In the same speech, Nkrumah went on to say: "... and my last warning to you is that you are to stand firm behind us so that we can prove to the world that when the African is given a chance he can show the world that he is somebody!". The above statement is a show of power and authority. The expression, 'my last warning to you' depicts Nkrumah as someone who wielded the power and not the masses. The pronouns, 'my' and 'you' show power differentials between Nkrumah and the masses. It depicts Nkrumah as very powerful as against the people he (Nkrumah) claimed the independence was won for. This is in relation to what Brown and Gilman [4] noted that the choice of pronouns is determined by the relationship between a speaker and his audience. Clearly, the statement above showed the relationship between a powerful speaker addressing his subordinates. Even though, the text seemed to consider the masses as partners to development, they were not since a critical analyses of the text reveals a master-servant-relationship between Nkrumah and the masses. The statement showed inequality of status

and power between the addresser and the addressees.

6. The Place of Ideology

Interestingly, ideological issues can be seen in almost every speech that Nkrumah delivered. This is because Nkrumah was largely influenced by the socialist ideologies of Marx and Lenin. Just like Marx and Lenin, Nkrumah believed that state resources must be owned and controlled by the state as against the capitalist colonial structures bequeathed to Africa. Thus Nkrumah believed that these colonial structures promoted the interest of individuals as against the collective interest of the State. Althusser [3] espousing on the Marxist-Leninist concept of the State, espoused that "the State is a 'machine' of repression, which enables the ruling classes.... to ensure their domination over the working class, thus enabling the former to subject the latter to the process of surplus-value extortion."

Nkrumah who was influenced by Marxism also believed that capitalism offers nothing apart from exploitation; therefore, the need to have a new political and economic paradigm in Africa.

For this reason, Nkrumah, after independence canvassed for a paradigm shift from the affairs of Africa which for many years had been dominated by foreign interests and unfavourable economic policies that were western oriented than Afrocentric based [18]. We will therefore shed more light on these ideological issues in the preceding analyses.

Nkrumah posits in the speech:

Experts have estimated that the Congo Basin alone can produce enough food crops to satisfy the requirements of nearly half the population of the whole world and here we sit talking about regionalism, talking about gradualism, talking about step by step. Are you afraid to tackle the bull by the horn?

The excerpt above talks about the vast agricultural wealth of Africa. But deeply buried in the text is a hidden ideology. Nkrumah believed that the only way Africa could harness this vast agricultural prospects is for the continent to unite. However, Nkrumah consciously or unconsciously did not recognise the fact that it cannot happen overnight. He knew very well that Africa by that period did not have the resources and the technology for developing the agricultural prospects of the Congo Basin. But the ideology was to distort the reality on the ground so that he could win the support of the people into ensuring African unity which is his grand ideology. This is in line with Marxists ideology which posit that an ideology is a belief system that helps justify the actions of those in power by distorting and misrepresenting reality [8]. Nkrumah therefore, misrepresented the fact and the reality on the ground so as to mislead his audience into accepting his ideology of African Unity.

Secondly, it is interesting to draw our attention to the linguistic style Nkrumah used in presenting the above statement. One would ask why the use of rhetorical question? Generi-

cally, a rhetorical question does not require an answer. This may be because the question does not have an answer or the answer is a common knowledge. However, it is asked in order to make a point, to persuade, or to draw the attention of your audience to an important phenomenon or to make a literary effect [5]. Contextually, it can be deduced that Nkrumah used it to make a literary effect in order to draw the attention of his audience; mainly the political elites, of the importance of the unification of the continent. He also used it to persuade his audience into accepting his grand ideology for African unity.

A careful scrutiny and analysis of the excerpt above also revealed that Nkrumah attacked the use of diplomacy in solving the numerous challenges that bedeviled post-independent Africa. Nkrumah subtly bamboozled the use of diplomacy in attaining African unity when he said in the above excerpt that: “here we sit talking about regionalism, talking about gradualism, talking about step by step”. In effect, Nkrumah was trying to say that these diplomacies would not achieve Africa anything except to delay its effort in attaining that unity. Clearly, you could infer that Nkrumah was obsessed about his ideology of Africa unity and he wanted to achieve it through every means possible. This therefore rationalises the position of Althusser [3] when he said that an ideology is an imaginary assemblage, pure dream (unrealistic), empty and vain that is influenced by our previous experiences to form a tangible reality.

In the same speech, he made a sarcastic statement which subtly constructed the socialist ideology. He said:

We have emerged in the age of socialized planning, when production and distribution are not governed by chaos, greed and self-interest, but by social needs. Together with the rest of mankind, we have awakened from Utopian dreams to pursue practical blueprints for progress and social justice.

In the above statement, the expression “...governed by chaos, greed and self-interest” is in reference to capitalism but the expression has been subtly constructed such that it becomes difficult to get the line of conflict between socialism and capitalism. The ideology was to criminalize capitalism in order to glorify his ideology of socialism. Nkrumah in many of his writings and speeches projected what he calls ‘African socialism’ [19]. He seemed to equate social theory to Marxism. Nkrumah argued that: Capitalism is too complicated a system for a newly independent nation. Hence the need for a socialist society [19]. This position further accentuates the point that Nkrumah was an unrepentant socialist who tried to project his socialist ideology in most of his speeches including this one under review.

Nkrumah subtly constructed this ideological position with the aim of garnering support from both the political elites and the masses for African continental unity. To achieve this, Nkrumah had to denounce capitalism and thus make it unpopular in Africa. In the excerpt above, he said, “...we have awakened from Utopian dreams to pursue practical blueprints for progress and social justice.” This meta-

phor means that all programs under capitalist system is unrealistic. It cannot promote equity and social justice. Nkrumah carefully used this metaphor so as to strip capitalism of any positive attachments; thus create a fair ground to project his grand ideology of socialism. Nkrumah therefore, invoked pathos in his audience so as to win their support in favour of socialism. It is against this background that Van Dijk defines social power in terms of social control of a group or an organization by an individual, or a group [22]. He posits that an individual or a group may have more power depending on how the individual controls the acts and minds of the members of the group. Clearly, Nkrumah used such expressions to create presence in the minds of his audience and therefore to control their actions, opinions, and policies. It is no surprise that socialism as a political ideology became associated with most first generation independent African leaders.

7. Conclusion

The 1963 speech delivered by Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah at the Conference of African Heads of States and Governments at Addis Ababa in Ethiopia is embedded with many issues of power and ideology [18]. The significance of the two concepts used in the study cannot be underestimated. This is because the two concepts have rationalised and justified the analyses. That notwithstanding, the analyses have also justified the postulations of Althusser [3], Van Dijk [22], and Croteau and Hoynes [8] that ideology helps justify the positions and actions of the powerful in society. It has also accentuated the positions of Foucault and Gordon [13], and Van Dijk [23] Fairclough [11] that power is the ability of persuasions and influences over people’s minds, actions and decisions. For this reason, the study exhumed some of the buried issues embedded in the speech text. The study therefore established that CDA as a research approach is very useful in unearthing hidden meanings in texts. This approach has revealed the hidden ideologies and issues of power which hitherto were not apparent in the text. The study further concludes that Nkrumah arguably gave Africa a sense of purpose and a sense of identity and ignited a renaissance movement for the continent to reclaim its lost glory. However, there was an imposition of ideology on his audience through his selective projection of socialism as against capitalism. The study finally concludes that Nkrumah gave a theoretical perspective to the ideological issues that confronted Africa through stringing complex sentences and grandiloquent expressions to hide issues of power and ideology from his audience.

Abbreviations

CDA	Critical Discourse Analyses
CPP	Convention People’s Party

NDC National Democratic Congress

Author Contributions

Mohammed Sadat: Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Mohammed Tawfik Adamu: Conceptualization, Validation, Writing – original draft

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Ahmed, S. (2014). Critical discourse analysis of prime minister's speech on harmful aerial vehicles (drones). *International Journal of Languages and Linguistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.sage.com> on September 17, 2016.
- [2] Abdullahi-Idiagbon, M. S. (2010). Language use in selected Nigerian presidential election campaign speeches: A critical discourse analysis perspectives. *Journal of the Nigerian English Studies Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org> on September 17, 2016.
- [3] Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses*. In L. Althusser (Ed.), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- [4] Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960). *The pronoun of power and solidarity*. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- [5] Black, E. (1992). *Rhetorical question: Studies of public discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [6] Bramley, N. R. (2001). Pronouns of Politics: The Use of Pronouns in the Construction of 'Self' and 'Other' in Political Interviews (Thesis: Australian National University). Retrieved from <https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/46225/5/01front.pdf>
- [7] Cutting, J. (2000). *Pragmatics and discourse*. London: Routledge.
- [8] Croteau, D. and Hoynes, W. (2014). *Media and society: industries, image and audiences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org> on November 15, 2016.
- [9] Dellinger, B. (1995). *A critical cross-cultural analysis of the American commercial discourse style*. Vaasa: Universitets Wasaensis.
- [10] Ehninger D., and Gronbeck B. E. (1990). *Principles and types of speech communication*. London: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- [11] Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. (2nd Ed.) London: Longman.
- [12] Fairclough, N. L., and Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis*. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 2. Discourse as social interaction. London: Sage.
- [13] Foucault, M., and Gordon, C. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- [14] Hakansson, J. (2012). *The use of personal pronouns in political speeches: A comparative study of the pronominal choices of two american presidents*. Retrieved from www.diva-portal.org/...fulltext01.pdf (February 20, 2017).
- [15] Lindlof, R. T. & Taylor C. B. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods (second ed.)*. New Delhi: Sage Publication, Inc.
- [16] Mensah, E. O. (2014). *The rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah: An analysis of his political speeches*. An unpublished PhD thesis presented to the Center for Rhetoric. Studies, Faculty of Humanities, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- [17] Nkrumah, K. (1962). *Towards colonial freedom*. London: Heinemann.
- [18] Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and ideology for decolonization and development with particular reference to the African revolution*. New York: First Modern Reader.
- [19] Nkrumah, K. (1957). *The autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- [20] Sharndama, E. C. (2015). Political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of president Muhammadu Buhari's inaugural speech. *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics. Research Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 12-24*. Retrieved from <http://www.eajournal.org> on September 17, 2016.
- [21] Sharififar, M., Rahimi, E. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN. *A Journal of Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 343-349. Retrieved from <http://www.dxi.org/10.17507/tpls.0502.14> on September 17, 2016.
- [22] Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary study*. London: Sage Publications.
- [23] Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and society*, 4(2), 202-285. London: Sage Publications.
- [24] Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 254-261. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.254-261> on September 10, 2016.
- [25] Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.