

Decoding the Construal of Change in Presidential Discourse

JLLE

Vol 17(1) 38–56

© The Publisher

DOI: 10.56279/jlle.v17i1.3

*Kelvin Mathayo Lukanga**

Abstract

Change causes changes in the language people use to talk about phenomena, including change itself. Such changes lead to the emergence of “new discourse practices” (Fairclough, 1992:6), which usually feature in the speeches those holding positions of power and authority make. Powerful speakers such as politicians deploy the discourse practices in question to partly influence how others react to, or perceive, what they are talking about, in mainly their own interest. This paper analyses former President John Pombe Joseph Magufuli’s maiden speech to find out how he rhetorico-linguistically construed the change he wanted to make after his ascent to the pinnacle of power. In analysing the speech, the paper draws on Norman Fairclough’s dialectical reasoning approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA as dialectical reasoning). The results show that the former president used metaphors, presupposition and other kinds of discursive strategies to critique the ominous state of the nation, provide detailed explanations about that state and tell the parliamentarians elected during the 2015 General Election and other Tanzanians that, because the state of the nation was perilous, change was inevitable and that they had to rally to his mission. It has also been found that, inasmuch as the speech focused on change, it fell short of educational renewal, for example, because real change can only occur in any society if the people therein are transformed with respect to the way they think and act.

Keywords: *Change, rhetorico-linguistic strategies, discursive strategies, metaphors, presupposition, educational renewal*

Introduction

A good or bad situation triggers changes in the language people use to talk about a given country. Tanzania is generally regarded as an island of peace, or *kisiwa cha amani* in Kiswahili, because, unlike some of its western neighbours, it is politically stable. Nonetheless, up until 2015 people used to deploy metaphors such as *shamba la bibi* “grandmother’s farm” to describe the country because of the widespread fraud or corruption it was facing. *Shamba la bibi* is metaphorically used to refer to a farm from which it is easy to steal anything because it belongs to

*** Corresponding author:**

Kelvin Mathayo Lukanga, P.O. Box 35040, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Email: kamugalo@yahoo.co.uk

‘everybody’s grandmother’. Tanzania was compared to such a farm in relation to how its resources were easy to steal through corrupt means. President Magufuli² also used the metaphor as he talked about the actions he was taking or was about to take to make sure that the resources were not stolen and that they benefited Tanzanians only. Fairclough (1992:6) observes that language use changes to reflect the changes happening in society, adding that social forces or changes lead to the adoption of “new discourse practices” such as *Hapa Kazi Tu* “Work and Nothing else”. *Hapa Kazi Tu* was Magufuli’s 2015 campaign slogan through which he wanted to introduce a work ethic into a nation he regarded as consisting of countless lazy people. The reflection of social changes in discourse is not surprising, for discourse (language use) and context constantly, if not always, shape or influence each other. This view is shared by Thibault (1991), who notes that speakers draw upon historical and social situations in their pieces of discourse. Writing of the phenomenon under discussion, Richardson (2008:5) says that “language is a social practice that, like all practices, is dialectically related to the context of its use.” Gee (1999:82) also observes that “language simultaneously *reflects* reality (‘the way things are’) and *constructs* (*construes*) it to be a certain way” (original emphasis). The president did that and much more besides as will be shown below.

This paper analyses the speech he gave on 20 November 2015 as he inaugurated the 11th Parliament in Dodoma, Tanzania. In particular, it examines the way in which Magufuli rhetorico-linguistically construed the change³ he had set out to make. And, given that language use and social situations are inextricably intertwined, the paper also looks at the relation that holds between the speech and the wider socio-political context in which it was embedded to understand it well. As Oddo (2011:290) so aptly puts it, the role of the analyst is partly to “(re)situate texts within their relevant social and historical contexts of production.” The analysis and discussion are both anchored on Norman Fairclough’s (2018) CDA as dialectical reasoning, which comprises critic, explanation and action.

President Magufuli succeeded President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete, whose tenure came to a close in November 2015. Before his ascent to the pinnacle of power, he had served as deputy minister for works and later on as minister for works under President Benjamin William Mkapa, the country’s third president. He also held three ministerial portfolios in the Kikwete government: fisheries, lands and works. He had all along been a very efficient and no-nonsense person. He achieved stellar

² He became president in 2015 and died in office in 2021.

³ The term is used to refer to changes happening in various sectors: political, social, cultural and economic.

performance and was hardly ever implicated in any of the corruption scandals that were ubiquitous in the country before his party chose him as its flag-bearer. It would seem that these were the credentials the ruling Chama cha Mapinduzi (henceforth CCM) sought to exploit. His credentials made him stand out from the multitude of presidential hopefuls within the ruling party in 2015. Thus, it was not like clutching at straws on the part of CCM when it fielded him as its presidential candidate. Of course, the party was also facing stiff competition from the opposition and widespread disenchantment and anger from the public. The public was not happy with the high poverty levels, the poor and insufficient social service provision, public servants' inefficiency, the stealing of natural resources (especially minerals) by multilateral corporations in cahoots with some Tanzanian individuals as well as the graft and corrupt practices of the lower and upper echelons of government (Mathayo, 2020; Mukandala, 2015). Tanzanians were desperate for change, which they thought would only come about if they shut the door on CCM's return to power. The opposition exploited the government's failures as well as the foul mood in which the populace was to project itself as an alternative to the ruling party with the key to unlock the country's great potential and make life better. Coming hot on the heels of the presidential swearing-in ceremony was the inauguration of the 11th Parliament by President Magufuli, who used the floor of parliament to talk about the agenda of his government.

Political Discourse

Various scholars have defined political discourse. Reyes (2011:783) defines it as "a genre that involves political actors speaking publically. Those speech events are commonly made in public forums in which politicians attempt to project their political agendas. They can present their agendas in more or less subtle ways, sometimes by presenting the state of affairs as a simple narrator." This conception of political discourse focuses on speech-making by politicians to advance certain agendas. It leaves out a number of issues relative to political discourse. It is, therefore, important to look at other conceptions of political discourse. Chilton (2008:226) notes that "[p]olitical discourse is the use of language to do the business of politics and includes persuasive rhetoric, the use of implied meanings, the use of euphemisms, the exclusion of references to undesirable realities, and the use of language to rouse political emotions." As rhetors, politicians deploy discourse or language to present their agendas and seek support from both immediate and dispersed audiences. Commenting on politicians' language, El-Hussari (2010:99) says:

Political language is basically used as a powerful tool in winning the support as well as the consent of both the public and the

nation (sic) lawmakers, more especially at moments of crisis over which the nation may clearly divide. Whether in office or in the opposition, political leaders who deliver public speeches within a national context often tend to manipulate language to best-suit the rhetorical mode or genre they choose to pass a message through in an effort to gain political advantage, maintain power, and shirk responsibility. Unable, and perhaps unwilling, to coerce, political leaders in the so called (sic) democratic polities often need to ‘manufacture consent’ in order to undertake their agendas. Such a practice occurs through discourse and verbal representation. To this end, discourse can be seen as a cultural tradition that comprises the linguistic selfconsciousness (sic) as well as the skills and methodologies brought into play to shape the convictions of a particular audience and sustain a positive image of the public speaker.

It may also be pointed out that political discourse is aimed at making audiences perceive political messages favourably and back the proposals that are being made. One of the ways of achieving support is excluding “undesirable realities” (Chilton, op cit). Such realities are omitted so that people are in the dark about them and thus provide the backing that is being sought. In relation to persuasion in and by political discourse, Woods (2006:51) says, “Certainly the power of rhetoric, the oratorical art of manipulating language for persuasive ends, was well understood in classical times. It is often claimed that Pericles governed the great Athenian democracy for 30 years by virtue of his rhetoric alone [...]” Drawing upon Aristotle’s argument about deliberation, Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) suggest that language is related to politics because the latter is about argumentation or deliberation, which is what politics is all about. They also opine that it is only through language that political deliberations can take place. Nonetheless, in political deliberations people seek to legitimate some courses of action and delegitimize others, something that happens in parliament when politicians are seeking support from parliamentarians and others. In a country under a democratic dispensation this is crucial as it makes one seem to be following the relevant, legal and democratic procedures.

De Landtsheer (1998) explains that some scholars consider the role of language in politics to be influencing how power is acquired and maintained. Arguing practically along the same lines, Fetzer (2013:2) maintains that “[b]oth macro and micro politics require language as a means of communication in order to exercise governmental control and to communicate felicitously in the political arena.” What these scholars say shows the centrality of language to politics, so what is said and how it is said are both important with respect to political discourse.

Furthermore, change is not a topic that has received sufficient attention from critical discourse analysts, bar the attention it has received from analysts like Gruber (2013) and Fairclough (2018). Discussing political genres, Gruber touched upon change, in particular the personal and political party change that occurred in Austria, in terms of which political figures and parties assumed power. As for Fairclough, he has discussed change in relation to how politicians deploy language in discussing economic crises. In the present paper, we are examining how change is discursively constructed. The kind of change we are interested in is political, social and economic, and we relate it to its construal in the maiden speech former President Magufuli gave in 2015. This focus is broader than that of either scholar above and thus provides a greater opportunity for us to analyse and discuss the language the speaker used, as well as its social, political and economic relevance.

Theoretical and Methodological Approaches

Since this paper analyses the speech to determine the construal of political, social and economic change, it draws upon CDA. It is often the case that CDA is used to examine discourse to delineate the relationship between discourse and social phenomena. The critical analysis of discourse is thus a critical analysis of social phenomena. Fairclough (2018:13) explains that “CDA is a form of critical social analysis [and that social analysis] shows how forms of social life can damage people unnecessarily, but also how they can be changed.” Fairclough (*ibid*) suggests that the objective of CDA is critique and “change for the better.” An example of a positive change that a critical discourse analyst might suggest may be ending or reducing inequality in a given society. Furthermore, CDA contributes to an understanding of social phenomena. It does this by critiquing phenomena, demonstrating how discourse relates to them so that (where necessary) action is taken to make the change needed. Specifically, this paper has adopted CDA as dialectical reasoning, which comprises three elements: critique, explanation and action. Critique involves talking about the weaknesses or shortcomings of the present state of affairs, explanation involves giving further information about that state and providing justification for making the change that is being proposed, and action relates to what needs to be done. It is important to point out here that critique and action are not directly related. That is why explanation is crucial. Indeed, it is explanation that links critique and action by showing the exact change needed. Fairclough (*ibid*) cautions that jumping from critique to action may lead one to make or propose wrong changes. Moreover, as a form of dialectical reasoning, politics involves making arguments to make certain changes (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012; Fairclough, 2018). Practical argumentation is, therefore, at the core of CDA as dialectical reasoning. This approach is built upon three kinds of

premises: a circumstantial premise, a goal premise and a means-goal premise. To elucidate, a circumstantial premise shows the present state of affairs, whereas a goal premise presents an alternative to the state of affairs. A means-goal premise “claims that the advocated line of action [...] is a means of achieving the goal” (Fairclough, 2018:16). Fairclough adds:

Practical argumentation moves from problems to solutions: the Circumstantial premise doesn't just represent an existing state of affairs, it 'problematizes' it, diagnoses what the problem is, what needs changing, while the Goal premise and the Claim advocate a solution, what change to aim for (the goal) and what action to take to achieve it (the Claim) (Fairclough, *ibid*).

Arising from the foregoing are four steps in CDA as dialectal reasoning: (1) Normative critique of discourse, (2) explanation of normatively criticised discourse, (3) explanatory critique of a phenomenon and (4) advocating action to change that phenomenon 'for the better' (Fairclough, 2018:18). Using CDA as dialectical reasoning, this paper shows how President Magufuli discursively critiques the state of affairs and talks about the change he has set out to make.

In analysing the speech, the paper focuses on change, as already indicated. Therefore, it discusses the arguments the speaker makes, showing how he moves from the premises to his conclusions with respect to the situation in which Tanzania is or was and the change he intends to make. The paper identifies the discursive strategies he draws upon. It also examines critique, explanation and action, and links this examination to the wider socio-political context in which the speech is embedded to establish the real change the president is talking about.

Data Analysis and Discussion

The speech analysed in this paper was given in the Tanzanian parliament with parliamentarians belonging to the ruling party and the opposition. The speaker gave the speech on 20 November 2015 to inaugurate the parliament in keeping with the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania, which demands that, after a General Election has ended, the newly elected president address parliament so that it can begin carrying out its business. The speaker also used the speech to inform both parliament and the public of the agenda of the new government. Given that the agenda was likely to differ radically from the one the previous government(s) had pursued, the speech played an additional role: presenting and critiquing overall reality, providing explanatory remarks and showing the actions to be taken to change the dismal situation. Thus, using CDA as dialectical reasoning,

we begin with an examination of how the speaker critiques the ‘present’ situation.

Critiquing the Present Situation

The speaker says Tanzanians are not happy with the bleak situation under which they live. Their unhappiness relates to what he saw or heard about while on the election trail and to the shared socio-economic knowledge the parliamentarians, the public and the speaker have of the bleak state of the nation. He shows that the situation is like that as a result of state failure. The situation inhibits development, cements poverty or destitution and ultimately makes the people disillusioned. One of the main reasons for the problems is graft/corruption. Graft is pervasive in the public and the private sector. It stifles the provision of social services such as health, education and potable water. Through the number game, Magufuli mentions the areas it affects, not least TAMISEMI, the port of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Revenue Authority and the natural resource sector. Van Dijk (2007:82) says the number game “not only plays a role in argumentation and legitimation, but also in the context of political interaction, namely to signal truth and precision and hence competence and credibility.” The speaker uses the discursive strategy to this effect.

It is worth pointing out that, under the Tanzanian administrative system, TAMISEMI and TRA⁴ collect revenue. Whereas TAMISEMI carry out the task in their areas of jurisdiction, the latter does so all over the country. The institutions operate in such a way that they do not interfere with each other. Magufuli says the institutions do not collect revenue as much as they are expected because of the corrupt practices of their staff. The workers collude with taxpayers so that they give them some money, rather than paying taxes to the government. The same problem, notably graft and embezzlement, characterises the port of Dar es Salaam, which should ideally make Tanzania a gateway to its neighbours. For starters, Tanzania borders Mozambique, Kenya, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) Zambia, Malawi, Rwanda, Burundi and Uganda. Except the first three countries, the others are landlocked and are largely dependent on the port of Dar es Salaam for the seaboard trade. The eastern and the central part of DRC also depend on Tanzania for that. In the president’s opinion, the country does not benefit much from the port owing to the graft and embezzlement bedeviling TRA and the port. Talking about the problems facing the two, he says, *TRA – Ukwepaji kodi, rushwa, ubadhirifu, urasimu na upotevu wa mapato kwa kushindwa kukusanya*

⁴ TAMISEMI is a Kiswahili abbreviation of Regional Administration and Local Government Authorities, and TRA stands for Tanzania Revenue Authority.

kodi hasa kodi zinazotakiwa kulipwa na wafanyabishara wakubwa “TRA – Tax evasion, graft/embezzlement, bureaucracy and revenue loss because of failure to collect revenue, in particular the taxes big businesses are supposed to pay.” He also says, *Bandari – Rushwa, wizi, ubadhirifu na urasimu* “The port – Graft, theft, embezzlement and bureaucracy.”

The central government and TAMISEMI are said to be very inefficient, bureaucratic and corrupt. Magufuli observes that the institutions do not work as they are supposed to. To the contrary, they operate in such a way that it is next to impossible for them to serve Tanzanians, in particular the common people. Talking about TAMISEMI, the speaker says, *TAMISEMI – Uptevu wa mapato, kushindwa kukusanya kodi, ubadhirifu, matumizi mabaya ya fedha na utekelezaji wa baadhi ya miradi chini ya viwango, wizi, uzembe, n.k.* “TAMISEMI – Revenue loss, failure to collect revenue, embezzlement, misuse of funds, and substandard implementation of some projects, theft, carelessness, etc.” It should be pointed out that, if TAMISEMI do not discharge their functions effectively, the people will face innumerable problems, for the simple reason that they are responsible for providing most of the services. To further let Tanzanians see how lethal graft/corruption is to their common wealth and lives, the speaker quotes a sentence from a speech Mwalimu Nyerere⁵ delivered in parliament in 1962. *Rushwa [na ufisadi] havina budi kushughulikiwa bila huruma kwa sababu naamini wakati wa Amani ufisadi ni adui mkubwa kwa ustawi wa watu* “Graft [and corruption] must be dealt with without mercy because I believe that in peacetime corruption is the chief enemy of the people’s well-being.”

In the same breath, he says:

Haya ni maneno makali ya mtu na kiongozi aliyeichukia na kuikemea rushwa katika maisha yake yote ya uongozi. Ni maneno yanayotukumbusha tu nini kinaweza kikatutokea endapo tutaendeleza rushwa na ufisadi. Chuki za wananchi dhidi ya rushwa na ufisadi ni dhahiri, wamechoka kabisa, wamechoka sana, hawako tayari kuvumilia upuuzi wa serikali itakayoonea haya rushwa na kulea mafisadi.

These are the words of a person and leader who hated and fought against graft throughout his time in office. The words remind us of what may happen to us if we nurture graft and corruption. The people’s hatred of graft and corruption is obvious. The people are tired; they are very tired indeed. They will not tolerate the

⁵ He was the first president of Tanzania.

absurdity of a government which will feel shy to fight against graft and which nurtures the corrupt.

The presupposition *upuuzi wa serikali itakayoonea haya rushwa na kulea mafisadi* “the absurdity of a government which will feel shy to fight against graft and nurture the corrupt” is an indirect reference to the previous government. Through it, the speaker engages in US/THEM polarisation, suggesting that the previous government, although not directly mentioned, tolerated graft and, thus, nurtured the corrupt, which is why graft was pervasive in the country. However, his government, he says, will not do such a thing; instead, it will fight against graft and corruption. This statement is intended to criticise the previous government and distinguish it from the government he is about to start leading.

The speaker also portrays the terrible state of the mineral and gas sector. Tanzania is endowed with abundant gas reserves and minerals of various sorts, including Tanzanite (a mineral type mined in Tanzania and nowhere else). Like several other resources, the minerals do not benefit the people. Instead, they benefit multinational corporations and a few government officials. The speaker says their discovery pepped up Tanzanians’ hopes, but the hopes have been dashed because the minerals do not benefit them for corruption-related reasons. Specifically, he says, *Madini – Wenyeji kutofaidika, viliovyo wachimbaji wadogo wadogo kutengewa maeneo ya kuchimba na kupatiwa mikopo, kutolipa kodi stahiki, usumbufu kulipa fidia, n.k.* “Minerals – The people are not benefiting, artisanal miners’ outcry about areas in which to mine and loans, non-payment of the right amounts of taxes, delays in paying compensation, etc.” In this excerpt, the speaker deploys strategic expressions such as *vilio* “outcry” to show how artisanal miners feel about the way they are treated and to show the other problems facing the mineral sector, including non-payment of the right amounts of taxes and delays in paying compensation. The delays in compensation payment he is talking about happen when local communities are removed from their lands so that mining activities can be undertaken there. The speaker shows that in such a situation compensation is not paid on time and thus those affected suffer. Therefore, he promises to make sure that the minerals are used in the interest of Tanzanians, saying, *Serikali itahakikisha kwamba madini na mali asili zetu zinatumiwa kwa manufaa ya Taifa letu* “The government will ensure that the minerals and our other natural resources are used in the interest of our Nation.”

As he continues talking about the resources of the country being squandered, but specifically about wasteful trips abroad, Magufuli

draws on the number game again. He gives figures on the monies spent during the trips. He says:

*Napenda niwape takwimu za fedha zilizotumika ndani ya Serikali, Mashirika ya Umma na Taasisi nyingine za Serikali kwa safari za nje kati ya mwaka 2013/2014 na 2014//2015. Jumlaya **shilingi bilioni 356.324** zilitumikakwa ajili ya safari za nje kama ifuatavyo: Tiketi za ndege (Air ticket) zilitumia **shilingi bilioni 183.160**; Mafunzo nje ya nchi (Training Foreign) zilitumia **shilingi bilioni 68.612**; Posho za kujikimu (Per Diem Foreign) zilitumia **shilingi bilioni 104.552**.*

I would like to give you statistics for the money spent by government, public parastatals and other government institutions between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. A total of **356.324 billion shillings** was spent on foreign trips, as follows: Air tickets consumed **183.160 billion shillings**; overseas training consumed **68.612 billion shillings**; and overseas per diems consumed **104.552 billion shillings**.

Furthermore, the speaker mentions the institutions in the lead in this regard: Parliament, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, the Ministry of Finance, the Prime Minister's Office, NAOT and the Ministry of Home Affairs. The number game is deployed to show that Magufuli has not fabricated the figures and the government institutions he is presenting. It is also used to show that he is well informed, careful and, therefore, credible. It is crystal clear, however, that, as well as using the strategy to do that, he is deploying it to legitimate his plans to cut the number of trips in focus.

The president employs a metaphor to show the extent to which drug peddling and drug abuse have become a critical problem in Tanzania. *Madawa ya kulevya yamekuwa ni janga kubwa kwa taifa letu*. "Drug peddling and drug abuse are a major calamity in our nation." And, therefore, he wants to deal with the problem without *ajizi* "slackness." He shows that the nation has lost manpower because of drug abuse. It will be seen that the speaker deploys a metaphor that enables him to appeal to emotion in that he construes the problem as being widespread and detrimental to the entire nation, saying it is *janga kubwa kwa taifa letu* "a major calamity in our nation." Through this expression, the speaker appeals to emotion to make the immediate and dispersed audiences support him. As Vertessen and de Landtsheer (2008:271) aptly put it, "Metaphors are mostly associated with the appeal to pathos" and "can indeed arouse strong emotions" in audiences. The scholars note further that "[m]etaphors are part of a broader persuasive

language pattern in which ‘being emotive’ (original emphasis) plays a central role” (Vertessen & de Landtsheer, 2008:283). The support the speaker is seeking is for his determination to clear the country of the dirt by deploying strategic linguistic expressions such as [*kwa*] *uaminifu na umakini mkubwa* “very faithfully and carefully.” This expression also shows what kind of person or leader Magufuli was: an honest and serious person. This is not surprising, given the fact that prior to his ascent to the pinnacle of power, Magufuli had set himself apart from his ministerial brother and sister colleagues as that kind of person. For instance, he spent countless days and nights supervising people who were building roads and bridges in various parts of the country and punished those who had done shoddy work. Thus, the explanation about the way the government will fight against drugs is not surprising, but it is interesting because the speaker indirectly uses it to criticise the Kikwete government and to contrast his with that government, and himself with his predecessor.

Explaining the Present Situation

Apart from critiquing the status quo, Magufuli provides explanatory details of the state of the nation so that the MPs and Tanzanians more generally see how bleak the situation is. He shows that nearly every sector is facing a raft of problems, the major ones being graft, inefficiency, poor and insufficient social service provision, and natural resource-thieving. The people, he shows, are, as a result, disenchanted. He says Tanzanians abhor graft, because it prevents the country from making progress. Furthermore, the government/TAMISEMI are portrayed as having been bothering the people (including local and foreign investors) and wasting huge amounts of money and time. The former, the president argues, have caused the people not to be served satisfactorily when they visit government offices. In the interest of the uninitiated, when people visited such offices they were told *njoo kesho* “come back tomorrow.” This was very common in government offices. The phenomenon affected people and various sectors, including the economic sector. For instance, when someone intending to open a business went to a government office to register his/her business, he/she would be told to go to the office over and over again. In consequence, many shelved their business plans and those who could relocate moved to other countries, for example Rwanda and Kenya. This had devastating consequences for the country.

Regarding the mineral sector, it is said that citizens did not benefit from their minerals, the right amounts of taxes were not being paid, and artisanal miners were being denied areas in which to work. The benefits accruing to the government and the people were so insignificant that the minerals were not worth having. Magufuli argues that those

extracting minerals do not pay their fair share of taxes – *kutolipa kodi stahiki* “non-payment of the right amounts of taxes” – and that, generally, the country does not benefit from the resources, resources which Mathayo (2020) says were being siphoned off by multilateral corporations in cahoots with some government officials. Tanzanians complained about this issue for years, but their complaints reached deaf ears. It was business as usual in the sector, their endless complaints notwithstanding.

Talking about Change

Magufuli had set out to transform Tanzania. The president believed that the country was (is) not at the level of material development where it was supposed or deserved to be and that it could only develop if he made a radical and drastic departure from the status quo. Thus, the debate he engages in and the language he deploys in the speech have very clearly shown this. The speaker explains the despicable state of affairs and links this explanation to the measures he is going to take through a detailed explanation of both, but more so of the former than the latter. His explanations help to make Tanzanians see that change is necessary and that the state of the nation is perilous. For example, it is widely acknowledged that a country’s natural resources are among its primary resources, through the exploitation of which a country can exalt itself to a higher-income nation. It is also widely acknowledged that South Africa and Botswana are the African countries that benefit greatly from their mineral resources, but Tanzania, which has innumerable minerals, does not, not even by far (Kahyarara, 2015). The common reason for this situation in Tanzania is weak and poor governance and mismanagement of the sector (Kahyarara, *ibid*). Magufuli acknowledges that the previous government made laws for managing minerals and the fiscal resources accruing from the sector. He says, *Napenda kuipongeza Serikali ya Rais Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete na Bunge la 10 kwa kupitisha Sheria ya Usimamzi wa Mapato ya Mafuta na Gesi yaani The Oil and Gas Revenues Management Act* “I would like to congratulate President Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete’s Government and the 10th Parliament for passing The Oil and Gas Revenues Management Act. He, nonetheless, critiques the government, saying he will enforce the laws [*kwa*] *uaminifu na umakini mkubwa* “very faithfully and carefully.” This statement presupposes that the previous government did not manage the sector well, nor enforce the laws effectively. The president later found the laws deficient and enacted new, better laws, as exemplified by the Natural Wealth and Resources (Permanent Sovereignty) Act, 2017. As well as enacting the laws, he called a halt to the export of metallic mineral concentrates so that the smelting could be done within the country. The way Magufuli discursively construes the change he is seeking to make in the country

finds echoes in de Cillia et al (1999:157), who argue that discourses are “instrumental in transforming the status quo,” adding that “discursive practices may have an effect on the dismantling of or even destruction of the status quo,” a status quo such as that which the president set out to destroy to make Tanzania better.

Magufuli also says he will fight against graft and corruption, especially the corrupt practices of the upper and lower echelons of government, that is, grand corruption, which is the premier source of Tanzanians’ misery. In doing this, he is engaged in what Dunmire (2007:21) refers to as “the deontic modality of political discourse – that is it is concerned with what might, should or must be done in the future,” pointing out further that “in making proposals about future actions and policies, political actors also make claims, assertions, and declarations concerning the future “realities” (original emphasis) that give rise to and are implicated in those actions.” In the following excerpt, Magufuli says:

Mimi nimewaahidi wananchi, na nataka niirejee ahadi yangu kwao mbele ya Bunge lako tukufu, kwamba nitapambana na rushwa na ufisadi bila kigugumizi na bila haya yoyote. Dawa ya jipu ni kulitumbua, na mimi nimejipa kazi ya kuwa mtumbua jipu. Najua kutumbua jipu kuna maumivu lakini bahati mbaya halina dawa nyingine.

I have promised the people – let me repeat my pledge to them here in parliament – that I will fight against graft and corruption without bashing and ‘stammering’. The only way to treat a boil is to disembowel it and I have given myself the task of disemboweling boils. I understand that disemboweling boils is painful, but unfortunately there is no other way of treating boils.

He portrays himself as a good promise-keeper in the above excerpt. He also compares the process of fighting against graft and corruption to the process of disemboweling boils. “It is painful,” he says. The fight against graft and corruption is as painful as the disemboweling of boils because it involves taking stern measures against the corrupt by, for example, forfeiting their property, sacking or jailing them, or doing these and much more besides. It is a hard and very perilous undertaking, since it is the big fish, the well-connected and the rich who engage in grand corruption. Such people cannot sit back and watch him come down hard on them. They will want to hit back in self-defence. That is why the speaker asks the MPs and Tanzanians to pray for and support him. He remarks: *Hivyo nina omba Waheshimi wa Wabungena Watanzania*

wote mniombee na muniunge mkono wakati natumbua majipu haya “I therefore ask you MPs and all Tanzanians to pray for and support me as I disembowel the boils.” This also presupposes that he believes in the efficacy of prayer and that the fight he is about to begin requires concerted efforts. As the British say, “Attack is the best form of defence.” The statement also implies that there may be people who might use superstition or other means to prevent him from fighting against graft and corruption. *Ninafahamu ugumu wa vita niliyoamua kuipigana* “I know how difficult the war I have elected to wage is,” he says. *Nasema nafahamu ugumu na changamoto zake kwa sababu wanaojihusisha na rushwa sio watu wadogo wadogo* “I repeat. I know the difficulties and challenges involved in this war because those who engage in corruption are not ordinary people.” This means that fighting against graft and corruption is very difficult, and that protection, unity and support are very important in the war against graft and corruption.

Critiquing the Speech as well as Some of the Steps Taken

The main agenda of the Magufuli government was change: transforming Tanzania from a poor country into a ‘developed’ one. The country became a lower middle-income economy in July 2020, five years ahead of the date that had been set. Although this achievement may not be seen in the quality of the lives of the majority of people in the country, perhaps the leapfrog was the result of the steps the government had taken. Several steps were taken, including plugging the loopholes through which unscrupulous people used to rob the nation blind, opening a judicial division at the High Court of Tanzania for dealing with economic crimes and money-laundering, vetting public servants to get rid of ghost workers and those with fake academic certificates, banning unnecessary trips abroad, providing free education in the state-run primary and secondary schools in the country and investing heavily in infrastructural development. These steps yielded good results.

However, the situation would have been much better and sustainable if the president and his government had at least borrowed a leaf from Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere. Tanganyika gained independence from Britain in 1961 and the Zanzibar Revolution took place in January 1964; three months later Tanganyika united with Zanzibar to form Tanzania. Mwalimu, as Nyerere is fondly called, realised that he had inherited a bad country from the British: classes, exploitation, disunity, illiteracy, poverty, etc. characterised the country. He made several changes to improve the situation; for example, he introduced education for self-reliance and socialism as the country’s socio-economic and political ideology, established a ministry of culture and youth, declared Kiswahili the national language and fought against negative ethnicity to make Tanzanians united, among others. Although some of the

measures he took did not produce the expected results, it is beyond dispute that socialism (*Ujamaa*) and the national language have played a great role in making Tanzania a nation rather than a collection of ethnic groups. Tanzanians consider themselves one people and have largely succeeded in throwing negative ethnicity to the wind, although the steps were taken more than five decades ago.

Why is that so? Once again, it is beyond dispute that these are the result of investing in the people's minds. Nyerere ensured that the ideological orientation he desired was inculcated in Tanzanians in schools, as well as through the mass media and other avenues. The *Ujamaa* ideology was part of the curriculum, which was guided by the education for self-reliance philosophy. Mwalimu ensured that it was taught effectively all over the country.

Although I do not intend to advocate the re-adoption of *Ujamaa* or the education for self-reliance philosophy, I consider the strategies the Mwalimu government adopted to have had a profound impact on Tanzanians' thinking. Changing the way people think is arduous and time consuming, but it can have a lasting impact in any society. Today Tanzania needs to transform its people that way while it is cognisant of the formidable influence and challenges wrought by the so-called globalisation. It should adopt the positives and leave out the negatives of globalisation, as far as possible. President Magufuli should have included educational renewal in his maiden speech so that he could impart to Tanzanians the kind of thinking which would have made them self-conscious, hardworking, creative, etc. The curriculum should have included topics on this issue and the government should have used schools, the mass media, social media and such other avenues as churches and mosques to inculcate that sort of thinking in the people. Various activities should have accompanied the theoretical part of the transformation process. It is obvious that the impact of this work would not have been realised overnight because transforming a people that way takes a long time to bear fruit. Nonetheless, if the government, other stakeholders, as well as the institutions and avenues mentioned above seriously played a role in the process the impact would have been phenomenal and lasting.

The president adopted the *Hapa Kazi Tu* slogan during the 2015 presidential election campaign. He also included the slogan in his maiden speech and used it very often to make Tanzanians work hard, for he believed that they 'were' extremely lazy. It will be recalled that former President Mkapa used the slogan *Ukweli na Uwazi* "Truth and Transparency" and that former President Kikwete used *Ari Mpya, Nguvu Mpya, Kasi Mpya, Maisha Bora kwa Kila Mtanzania* "New Vigour, New Energy, New Speed, a Better Life for Every Tanzanian."

Like its predecessors, *Hapa Kazi Tu* has not had any meaningful impact on Tanzanians' thinking and actions. Most people are still very lazy and many able-bodied people still kill time virtually all over the country, rather than working on farms and in other sub-sectors of the economy such as in petty trade. This means the slogan did not affect their thinking, regardless of the innumerable times the president deployed it. If their thinking had been transformed, the transformation would have been translated into concrete actions which, if sustained, would have become a habit, which would have, if passed from generation to generation, ultimately become Tanzanians' culture. In consequence, Tanzanians would be industrious, self-conscious, creative, etc. That did not happen because the virtue was used as a mere political slogan and people consider political slogans to be just slogans. In order for real change to happen, mind transformation should have been at the centre of the government's agenda and the president should have articulated this goal and the strategies for pursuing it in the speech I have analysed in this paper. The articulation of the goal and the strategies should have been followed by serious implementation and close supervision of well-thought-out plans and activities.

Finally, Tanzania stands a chance of becoming a developed country, if it gets the right people and finds the right leaders to transform it. However, unless measures such as those suggested in this paper are taken, that will not happen and political speeches will remain political speeches. *Hapa Kazi Tu* will remain a slogan just as its predecessors, *Ukweli na Uwazi* and *Ari Mpya, Nguvu Mpya, Kasi Mpya, Maisha Bora kwa Kila Mtanzania* did, and its successor, *Kazi Jendeleo* "Work must go on", is likely to do.

Conclusion

This paper has appraised President Magufuli's maiden speech to determine how change was discursively constructed. The main agenda of his government was to transform Tanzania into a country characterised by a high standard of living, little corruption and hardworking people, among other things. Thus, drawing on such discursive strategies as the number game, metaphors and a dazzling array of other strategic linguistic expressions, the speaker critiqued the dismal state of the country and articulated the change he intended to make, apart from telling the parliamentarians and other Tanzanians that change was inevitable and that everyone should back him in the process of pursuing it.

The paper has, nonetheless, argued that, although the steps the government took yielded good results, the situation would have been far much better and sustainable if the president and his government had at

least borrowed a leaf from Mwalimu Nyerere. In this regard, the paper has shown that the speech fell short of educational renewal, for example, and of strategies for implementing it, for real change can only occur in any society if its people are transformed with respect to the way they think and act, and not by adopting and deploying very often political slogans such as *Hapa Kazi Tu* or *Kazi Iendele*, which people consider to be just slogans. Mwalimu Nyerere concentrated on transforming Tanzanians' thinking principally through educational avenues, and succeeded in, for instance, building a nation and throwing negative ethnicity to the wind.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest(s) with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this paper.

Funding

The author(s) declared that the research was privately funded.

References

- Chilton, P. (2008). Political Terminology. In R. Wodak & V. Koller (eds). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 223–243.
- De Cillia, R. Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (1999). The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse & Society*, 10(2): 149–173.
- De Landtsheer, S. (1998). Introduction to the Study of Political Discourse. In O. Feldman & C. de Landtsheer (eds). *Politically Speaking: A Worldwide Examination of Language Used in the Public Sphere*, 1–16.
- Dunmire, P. L. (2007). “Emerging Threats” and “Coming Dangers”: Claiming the Future for Preventive War. In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (eds). *Discourse, War and Terrorism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 19–44.
- El-Hussari, I. A. (2010). President Bush's Address to the Nation on U.S. Policy in Iraq: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach. In U. Okulska & P. Cap (eds). *Perspectives in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 99–118.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge. Polity Press.

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2018). CDA as Dialectical Reasoning. In J. Flowerdew & J. E. Richardson (eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 13–25.
- Fetzer, A. (2013). The Multilayered and Multifaceted Nature of Political Discourse. In A. Fetzer (ed). *The Pragmatics of Political Discourse: Explorations across Cultures*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–20.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Gruber, H. (2013). Genres in Political Discourse: The Case of the ‘Inaugural Speech’ of Austrian Chancellors. In P. Cap & U. Okulska (eds). *Analyzing Genres in Political Communication: Theory and Practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 29–72.
- Kahyarara, G. (2015). Review of the Management and Development of the Mining Sector in Tanzania. In R. S. Mukandala (ed). *The Political Economy of Change in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.
- Mathayo, K. (2020). Language Use for Self-legitimation and Other-delegitimation in Tanzanian Presidential Campaign Speeches. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Mukandala, R. S. (2015). The State and the Provision of Public Services. In R. S. Mukandala (ed). *The Political Economy of Change in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press, 298–315.
- Oddo, J. (2011). War Legitimation Discourse: Representing ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ in Four US Presidential Addresses”. *Discourse & Society*, 22(3): 28–314.

- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of Legitimation in Political Discourse: Form Words to Actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6): 78–807.
- Richardson, J. E. (2008). “Our England”: Discourses of “Race” and Class in Party Election Reflects. *Social Semiotics*, 18(3): 321–335.
- Thibault, P. (1991). La Langue Enmouvement: Simplification, Regularisation, Restructuration. *LINX Linguistique*, 25: 79–92.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2007). War Rhetoric of a Little Ally: Political Implicatures and Aznar’s Legitimatization of the War in Iraq. In L. Chouliaraki (ed). *The Soft Power of War*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 61–84.
- Vertessen, D. & de Landtsheer, C. (2008). A Metaphorical Election Style: Use of Metaphor at Election Time. In T. Carver & J. Pikalo (eds). *Political Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*. New York: Routledge, 271–285.
- Woods, N. (2006). *Describing Discourse: A Practical Guide to Discourse Analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Author Biography

Kelvin Mathayo Lukanga is a lecturer in the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics at the University of Dar es Salaam. His research interests are in critical discourse analysis, English syntax and the structure of Bantu languages. His recent publication is *The Persuasive Effect of Legitimation Campaign Discourse* (Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2022).