DOI:10.21776/ub.icon_laterals.2016.001.1.11

**The Spirit of Democracy:
Ideological Construction of the 2008 Australian Apology Speech**

Daya Negri Wijaya
History Department, State University of Malang
Jalan Semarang 5, Malang, Indonesia
daya.negri.fis@um.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Human right is an old issue but it is really prominent to discuss in a modern democratic society. This issue should be the base of a democratic country. Therefore, it is not only people's duty but also the government's policy to pursue the human right and to form the democratic society. In 2008, the Australian prime minister issued the national apology. He wanted that all Australians to be honest at their history but this might be on the people's superficial consciousness. It should be elaborated in order to find the chief factor behind that act of apologizing. Therefore, this study tries to figure out the ideological construction behind the speech. This comprises the political ideologies constructed in the 2008 Australian National Apology Speech depicted by the speech textual analysis and the functions of the speech ideology in terms of cognitive and social functions. This study used a qualitative approach using critical discourse analysis. The findings reveal that in the 24 data indicating ideological expression, two types of ideological construction of personal cognition and social cognition are found. The personal cognition shapes the speaker's consciousness and expresses the ideas in the form of speech. There are 9 data which are indicated as personal cognition of which 67 % are the general personal cognition comprising personal values, personal ideologies, personal attitude, and personal knowledge. The other 33 % refers to the particular personal cognition in term of models. The other 15 data are constructed by the social cognition in the mind of the speaker. Those contain sociocultural values, systems of attitude, and sociocultural knowledge. In addition, 6 ideologies of democracy, democratic socialism, humanism, historicism, hegemony, and cultural universalism are also found.

KEYWORDS: ideology, apology speech, indigenous people, Australia

It is believed that Australian political development may influence Indonesian political condition. Therefore, Indonesians tend to monitor the recent change and continuity of Australian political condition. One of the interesting political actions is

the Australian national apology speech delivered by the Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, on 13 February 2008. Briefly, he expressed remorse and repeated it all the times in his speech, for example “we apologize or we say sorry for the mistreatment of the stolen generations” (Rudd, 2008). He tended to accept all corrupt practices in Aboriginal Protection Act from 1910 to 1970s when more than 100,000 of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children were taken from their parents.

In Indonesia, one of the national newspapers (Harian Kompas, 27 November 2007-17 February 2008) has a significant role to shape Indonesian people’s awareness on Australian political development by following the sequence of the Australian apology speech. The speech could raise the sense of humanity. It could also show that the minority does not have any power to speak for their rights. Spivak (n.d) assumes that the subalterns could speak if they have a chance to speak in society and to write a history. In addition, they could exit from the repressed system if the ruler takes into account of the subaltern condition. This action would be a lesson for government of developing countries, including Indonesia, how to be a good government by considering the grass-root society condition.

The strange decision depicted in this occasion was why the national apology speech was issued in 2008. This was considered that the reformed policy on human rights was issued in 1997 and the proposed draft of reconciliation between the indigenous people and the Australian white people was argued in parliamentary debates around 1999. The Australian Government abolished the aboriginal protection act which was useful for indigenous people’s education in theory; however, in practice they forced to remove a lot of children from their parents to the government’s educational institution (Manne, 2004, p. 217). They did not appreciate the basic right

of human being: right to have freedom. This is humiliating for liberal country which upholds the human right.

Human right is an old issue but it is really prominent to discuss in a modern democratic society. This issue should be the base of democratic country. Therefore, it is not only people's duty but also the government's policy to pursue the human right and to form the democratic society. Generally speaking, democracy or democratic state is shaped from liberal tradition. This means that the land where its tradition occurred is the role model of how to be a good democratic society. However, the liberal countries face some problems on how to pursue the human right in their history. They seem to learn from their past and are easily charting their bright future.

This condition will be considered by any government when they make a policy. The government should be based on the people, not only the majority but also the minority, when issuing any decision. Consequently, they have to deliver a national apology speech to any political mistreatment. If apology speech could be defined as a speech act designed to promote reconciliation between two or more parties, the government apology speech should be defined broadly. This apology for a historical injustice is likely to be more comprehensive than a typical interpersonal apology. Tavuchis in Blatz, Schumann, & Ross (2009, p. 221) explain that:

“A government apology represents a formal attempt to redress a severe and long-standing harm against an innocent group because these harms are more severe than most interpersonal transgressions, a simple sorry is unlikely to suffice. A government apology is public and aimed at present and future audiences that include members of the no victimized majority, as well as the previously victimized group”

However, gauging opinion would say that the issued government apology is caused by Rudd's vision on the Australian willingness to be honest at their history (America Press Inc, 3 March 2008) but this might be on the people's superficial consciousness. It should be elaborated in order to find the chief factor behind that act of apologizing.

In addition, Philpot et al (2013) have slightly different approach towards Rudd's apology speech. They use qualitative approach which is possible to analyze the data taken from interviewing the Indigenous people's responses to the 2008 Australia's apology. In other words, they focus on the meaning of intergroup apologies for their recipients. In addition, they reveal that the Indigenous people expressed positive, negative, and mixed views towards the apology and the forgiveness.

In contrast, Hastie (2011) seems to criticize the Rudd's apology using critical discursive approach. This approach believes that language constructs the reality. Therefore, the speech can be seen as a practical tool-kit for building an anti-racist rhetoric in Australia. Moreover, the speech could form the national identity among Australians and invite the present consciousness that Australian cannot change the past policy but they can decide the equal rights for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal society at present.

This will be useful if language is properly understood in order to reveal the main reason of the apologizing act. The feasible approach which could be used to solve that problem is critical discourse analysis (CDA). CDA is a three dimensional framework where the aim is to map separate forms of analysis onto one another: analysis of (spoken or written) language texts, analysis of discourse practice (processes of text production, distribution, and consumption), and analysis of discursive events as instances of socio-cultural practice (Fairclough, 1995).

This study tends to assume that people's action (delivering a speech) is determined by people's consciousness and the consciousness itself depends on what they believe and implement into the real action. In short, it is believed that the ideology could lead people's consciousness to interact and communicate with others. It is really intriguing to reveal what is the ideological construction behind the 2008 Australian National Apology Speech. This comprises the political ideologies constructed in the 2008 Australian National Apology Speech depicted by the speech textual analysis and the functions of the speech ideology in terms of cognitive and social functions.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Fairclough (2001) argues that language could maintain and change the power relation. We could borrow the case of a student's demonstration. This demonstration absolutely needs a language to communicate their claims. If the government accepts the claims, this means language could change the power relation from the government for some people to the government for all people.

Language has some definitions according to the linguists. Wareing (1999) explains that language is the combination of phonemes to form lexical items according to the syntactical rules of language we speak. Actually, language as a system is a notion introduced by Ferdinand de Saussure on dyadic tradition. This tends to realize a thing by binary opposition, for example language could be understood as *langue* and *parole*. *Langue* refers to the system of rules and conventions which is independent of, and pre-exists, individual users; *parole* refers to its use in particular instances (Chandler, 2007, p. 8). Fairclough (2001) does not accept the distinction and considers the emphasis on the language use called as discourse. In fact, *langue* is not constructed by the homogeneous conventions however they are characterized by diversity and by power

struggle. Language as a discourse could be defined as language as a form of social practice.

Language has a key role to create power as well as being a site where power is performed. Dahl (n.d.) explains that “power is defined in terms of a relation between people and is expressed in simple symbolic notation”. This shapes a statement of power comparability or the relative degree of power held by two or more persons. Therefore, it is possible to rank members of people according to their power. Fairclough (2009, pp. 3-4) insists that power should be realized as *power to* (the capability or ability to change something), *power over* (relations of power between people), and *power behind* (the forms which shape or influence what people actually do).

There is no neutrality in social practice of language. That is why this condition called by discourse and is determined by a set of belief called ideology. Discourse analysts treat a wide range of linguistic and non-linguistic data (speeches, reports, manifestos, historical events, interviews, policies, ideas, even organizations and institutions) as texts or writing (Howarth & Stavrakakis, 2000, p. 4). It needs a specific approach to reveal what is the thing behind the language comprising oral or spoken language. Fairclough (1991) proposes the feasible approach in term of critical discourse analysis (CDA) that it is not only analyzing the text as a product of language but also the process of text production or the process of interpretation and the social conditions of interpretation.

However, Fairclough’s explanation has enlightened the analyst to understand a discourse step by step from the text analysis and contextual analysis to the social contextual analysis but it looks a glimpse to comprehend the ideological construction of a discourse. One of discourse analysts who concerns on discourse and ideology is

Teun Van Dijk. He tends to connect the concepts of society, discourse, and social cognition in the framework of a critical discourse analysis. It is believed that there is a relationship between stylistic choice, text structure, and the ideological construction of a particular reading position (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). Van Dijk goes further to combine stylistic choice and text structure into text analysis and to reveal the ideological construction by comprehension of cognition analysis and social analysis.

Language can be used not only to steer people's thoughts and beliefs but also to control their thoughts and beliefs (Jones & Peccei, 1999). One of the goals of politicians must be to persuade their audience of the validity of their basic claims. There are three ways to achieve to goals. Those are presupposition, implicature, and rhetoric.

Presuppositions are background assumptions embedded within a sentence or phrase. These assumptions are taken for granted to be true regardless of whether the whole sentence is true. Take this sentence from the 2001 British Conservative Party Manifesto: "we want to set people free so that they have greater power over their own lives". Such a statement presupposes that people are not currently free (Jones & Peccei, 1999, p. 42). Like presuppositions, implicatures lead the listener to infer something that was not explicitly asserted by the speaker. However, unlike presuppositions, implicatures operate over more than one phrase or sentence and are much more dependent on shared knowledge between the speaker and hearer and on the surrounding context of the discourse (Jones & Peccei, 1999). The other tool of persuasive language is rhetoric. Jones & Peccei (1999) mentions that rhetoric is the skill of elegant and persuasive speaking. It could be defined as the art of using language so as to persuade or influence others; the body of rules to be observed by a speaker or writer in order that he may express himself with eloquence.

Ideologies are the important explanations to know the “deep structure”, if we borrow Saussure’s concept, of the discourse. According to Van Dijk (2006, pp. 116-7), there are four assumptions on ideology. The first assumption is primarily some kind of 'ideas', that is, belief systems. Secondly, ideologies consist of social representations that define the social identity of a group, that is, its shared beliefs about its fundamental conditions and ways of existence and reproduction. Thirdly, ideologies are not any kind of socially shared beliefs, such as socio-cultural knowledge or social attitudes, but more fundamental or axiomatic. Fourthly, as the socio-cognitive foundation of social groups, ideologies are gradually acquired and (sometimes) changed through life or a life period, and hence need to be relatively stable.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach using critical discourse analysis. The data were 24 data containing ideological expression delivered by Kevin Rudd in the 2008 national apology speech. The researcher used the written documents (the speech transcript) to gain an understanding of the phenomenon. This comprised the textual, cognitive, and social analyses based on Van Dijk’s theory (2006). The data analysis involved data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification following Miles & Huberman theory (1994).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher found two types of ideological construction of personal cognition and social cognition between 24 data preceding the textual analysis. Fifteen data are constructed by the social cognition in the mind of the speaker. There are two samples of the text affected by the social cognition.

The first sample is datum 1 of “I move that today we honour the Indigenous peoples of this land, the oldest continuing cultures in human history...” The researcher

found three types of textual analysis. Those are schematic structure, syntactic sentence structure, and semantics. Firstly, the speaker (PM Kevin Rudd) has proximity or closeness between him and the object (the indigenous people of the land). It could be seen from his words of "...the indigenous people of this land, the oldest continuing cultures in human history..." that he understands the development of Australian culture from the first settlement of Australia to the present. Secondly, the speaker puts himself as a subject rather than an object in a sentence. This shows that he is a part of the majority and this type of text analysis is called syntactic structure or word order. Finally, this datum has an unclear word and an abstract phrase like "we" and "indigenous people of this land". This is really difficult to understand without contextual comprehension. The word "we" refers to Australian government. The phrase could refer to the native people of Australia, namely Aboriginal people and Torres-Strait Islander. This tendency, in linguistic analysis, is called by semantics. It could be clearly seen that the social cognition shapes the speaker's mind. The speaker expresses the ideas based on his knowledge; however, his knowledge is influenced by the sociocultural knowledge. A man is a part of the social system then particular human thought is constructed by the sociocultural knowledge. Therefore, the individual knowledge is actually the representation of sociocultural knowledge. This case, from social analysis, shows that the speaker wants to place his position and his identity between the white Australian people and the aboriginal people. He places his position as a leader as well as a representative of white Australian people. He acts as the prime minister who has a power to deliver an apology speech to the stolen generation. He shapes the Australian identity by remembering all Australians that the native people lived in Australia before they (the white people) came to Australia.

The second sample is datum 15 of "...a woman who has travelled a long way to be with us today, a member of the stolen generation who shared some of her story with me...". The researcher found the analysis of schematic structure. The speaker tends to promote the voice from the subaltern. He uses the confession of the woman's story. He argues that the woman's story needs to re-consider. The woman is a member of the stolen generation. The use of the grass-root society as a supporting data makes the speaker influenced by the ideology of democracy. It could be clearly seen that the social cognition shapes the speaker's mind. He seems to use the Smith's fellow feeling. The fellow feeling is the ability to re-construct the other's feeling. Therefore, Rudd could convince the listener because he imagines himself as a member of stolen generation. He realizes that society gives him a lot of knowledge and values. He seems to learn the meaning of being equal from the stolen generation member. He learns indirectly the ideology of democracy when realizing the equality. The woman's story tends to build an identity of being Australian. Therefore, the speaker as a leader of new government knows the suffering of stolen generation. In addition, this is the duty for him and all Australians to keep egalitarian in Australia.

The other nine data are classified as personal cognition. Datum 19 and datum 24 are the well-representation of personal cognitive analysis of the text. Datum 19 is "...instead, from the nation's parliament there has been a stony, stubborn and deafening silence for more than a decade." The researcher found two types of textual analysis. Those are schematic structure and rhetoric. The speaker describes that the past government sticks on the political mistreatment over a decade. They could not distinguish the right and the wrong. They issue the policy based on the majority's importance. They argue that the wrong action is a right action. The speaker invites all people including historians, academics, cultural warriors, or researchers to reveal the

past mistreatment. In addition, the speaker also uses the three-part statement of “stony, stubborn and deafening silence”. It is a rhetorical device to influence the others. The speaker wants the listeners to pay attention on the suffering of indigenous people. It could be clearly seen that the personal cognition shapes the speaker’s mind. He knows that his personal knowledge coming from the past experience. His experience has shaped his mind on the well government. This experience also leads him into the identity of Australia. The government, chosen by the people, should serve the people’s will. The society should place the stolen generation into the right place. They should notice any people placing the stolen generation into the object of study.

Datum 24 is “...If this commission operates well, I then propose that it work on the further task of constitutional recognition of the first Australians, consistent with the longstanding platform commitments of my party and the pre-election position of the opposition...”. The researcher found two types of textual analysis. Those are schematic structure and semantics. The speaker has already kept a promise on national apology speech. He convinces the listener that his party is right. His party and he collaborate to shape the consciousness of political rightness. The duty on apology is delivered therefore they want to push the legislative to go further on constitution. This tendency is called by the schematic structure. Moreover, there are some abstract phrases like “this commission”, “first Australians”, “longstanding platform commitments”, and “my party”. Those need to understand semantically. The first refers to the committee of indigenous people reconciliation. The second deals with the indigenous people of Aboriginal people and Torres-Strait Island. The third represents road map of the reconciliation. The later refers to the labour party (the speaker’s party). It could be clearly seen that the personal cognition shapes the speaker’s mind. He seems to be affected by the labour party’s ideology of democratic socialism.

Democratic socialism is the practice of democracy based on the principle of socialism like loan study or scholarship. This ideology wants to abolish all violence and non-social power. However, he tends to go further on the party's ideology. He interprets that they are not alone and they need the help of legislative power.

This study also found 6 ideologies in 24 data of the 2008 Australian Apology speech. Those are 13 data indicating the ideology of democracy; a datum showing the ideology of labour party that is democratic socialism; 3 data indicating the ideology of humanism; 4 data showing the ideology of historicism; 2 data indicating the ideology of hegemony; and a datum showing the ideology of cultural universalism.

It seems that democracy determines the mind of Rudd. He wants to develop his party's ideology of democratic socialism into the spirit of democracy (Hamid, 1999). In other words, he wants to return the political mistreatment as a logical consequence of the wrong practice of democracy into the spirit of democracy. Rudd seems to consider all voices of Australians regarding the apology speech of the past mistreatment. Rudd unconsciously uses one of the democratic spirits that is the general will. The general will is the concept proposed by the father of modern liberalism, Jean-Jacques Rousseau. According to Rousseau in Stone (2013), the sovereign is and can be only the citizenry as a whole, united by their expression of what he calls the general will. The Rousseau's idea of sovereignty should be viewed not as a justification for a despotic regime but as a lens through which citizens can alter their understanding of society and in so doing transform themselves into free beings and good citizens.

Whereas Hobbes and Locke had sought to find an appropriate balance between freedom and authority, Rousseau rejects the entire premise that a compromise between freedom and authority is legitimate. Thus the goal of *The Social Contract* is finding a form of association which defends and protects with all common forces the

person and goods of each associate, and by means of which each one, while uniting with all, nevertheless obeys only himself and remains as free as before. Freedom is inalienable and inviolable. No social agreement can legitimately do away with freedom. Therefore, in a legitimate society freedom remains unalienated and the individual can be understood to obey his own will when he serves the state. Rousseau calls the construction by which this is possible the general will. Legitimate sovereignty, according to Rousseau, is simply the exercise of the general will (Stone, 2013).

However, the prime minister tries to be able to bring the white people and those indigenous people in balance but there are some peculiarities in his thought. He tends to distinguish the white people and the indigenous people as seemed in, “we the parliament of Australia...that this apology be received in the spirit...” (Datum 9) and “we today take this first step by acknowledging the past...” (Datum 10). The word “we” represents the white people. He also uses the term of “indigenous people” in his end of the speech after raising the union of all Australians.

The ideology of historicism also leads Rudd to legitimate his position through the explanation of the past political mistreatment as in

“...but should there still be doubts as to why we must now act, let the parliament reflect for a moment on the following facts: that, between 1910 and 1970, between 10 and 30 per cent of Indigenous children were forcibly taken from their mothers and fathers; that, as a result, up to 50,000 children were forcibly taken from their families...”

Historicism is a mode of thinking that assigns major significance to a specific context such as historical period. This relates with the lesson learnt from the past. Rudd might learn from the political mistreatment and might chart the Australian future. He places

the human beings as a priority than the religion or the political importance to understand the world. This tendency is called humanism. Humanism refers to a perspective that affirms some notion of human freedom and progress. Rudd argues the humanistic perspective in “it is for these reasons, quite apart from concerns of fundamental human decency that the governments and parliaments of this nation must make this apology, because the laws that our parliaments enacted made the stolen generations possible”.

In addition, the ideology of hegemony shapes Rudd’s mind that he is the leader of the government as depicted in “I MOVE that today we honour the Indigenous peoples of this land, the oldest continuing cultures in human history...” The words “I MOVE” represents that he has a power to issue any policies based on the laws. Hegemony is firstly proposed by Antonio Gramsci. Hegemony is the idea that the ruling class can manipulate the value system and mores of a society therefore that their view becomes the world view. In this context, the ruling class is represented by the Australian labour party.

However, he tries to argue that there was no choice to have a religious freedom as in:

“A few years later, government policy changed. Now the children would be handed over to the missions to be cared for by the churches. But which church would care for them? The kids were simply told to line up in three lines. Nanna Fejo and her sister stood in the middle line, her older brother and cousin on her left. Those on the left were told that they had become Catholics, those in the middle Methodists and those on the right Church of England”.

In those sentences, the government issues a similar policy as the choice of white Australian children. They ignore any belief of aboriginal society. In this sense, Rudd

realizes the cultural universalism. The past policy wanted to create the same system between the white Australian people and the aboriginal society. Cultural Universalism implies the existence of over-arching principles, such as human rights, that are applicable cross-culturally and therefore, could be used to determine the rightness or wrongness of specific cultural beliefs and practices.

CONCLUSION

The researcher reveals that in the 24 data indicating ideological expression, two types of ideological construction of personal cognition and social cognition are found. In addition, six ideologies of democracy, democratic socialism, humanism, historicism, hegemony, and cultural universalism are also found. This speech tends to return Australian politics into the spirit of democracy. However, the speaker does not ignore his power but Australian democracy needs a process to be an ideal structure. Indonesia society should learn from them. We could learn how to shape a democratic society. We should learn how to forgive the criminals and their descents of the bloody tragedy of 1965 before going further. We are blaming each other and ironically we do not know who the criminal is and who the victim is. The government should aware of this issue. They should heal people's suffering today by issuing the national apology speech. The government should be based on the people. Therefore, they should hear all voices without any alignments. To short, the basic value of democracy is only pursuing the right without ignoring the obligation. It is useful to build the civil society and moreover the democratic country.

REFERENCES

- Aborigin Memulai Pemilu. 2007. *Harian Kompas*. 27 November 2007.
Aborigin Akan Disejahterakan. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 14 February 2008.
Australia's Apology 2008. *America Press Inc*. 3 March 2008.
Blatz, C. W., Schumann, K., & Ross, M. (2009). Government Apologies for Historical Injustices. *Political Psychology*, 30(2), 219-241.
Chandler, D. 2007. *Semiotics: The Basic*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Dahl, Robert. (n.d.). *The Concept of Power*. Available at http://www.unc.edu/~fbaumteaching/articles/Dahl_Power_1957.pdf. (accessed in 12 November 2014).
- Dipaksa Minum Susu agar Kulit Putih. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 17 February 2008.
- Fairclough, N. 2001. *Language and Power*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. 1997. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. Longman & New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. 1992. Intertextuality in Critical Analysis. *Linguistics and Education* 4: 269-293.
- Fairclough, N. 2009. Language, Reality, and Power. Available at https://www.academia.edu/3809602/Language_reality_and_power_2009. (accessed in 12 November 2014).
- Generasi Terampas Menuntut Kompensasi. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 16 February 2008.
- Hamid, Z. 1999. *Sistem Politik Australia*. Bandung: LIP-FISIP-UI & Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Hastie, B. and Augoustinos, M. 2012. Rudd's Apology to the Stolen Generations: Challenging Self-Sufficient Arguments in 'Race' Discourse. *Australian Psychologist*. Vol. 47, No. 2: 118-126.
- Howarth, D. and Stavrakakis, Y. 2000. Introducing Discourse Theory and Political Analysis. D. Howarth, et.al (Eds). *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies, and Social Changes*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Jangan Ambil Tanah Kami. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 17 February 2008.
- Jones, J. and Peccei, J.C. 1999. Language and Politics. I. Singh & J.S Peccei (Eds). *Language, Society, and Power*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Manne, R. 2004. Child Removal and The Question of Genocide 1900-1940. A.D. Moses (Ed). 2004. *Genocide and Settler Society: Frontier Violence and Stolen Indigenous Children in Australian History*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.
- McCarthy, M. and Carter, R. 1994. *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Permintaan Maaf Australia. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 14 February 2008.
- Philpot, C., et al. 2013. Making Meaning from Collective Apologies: Australia's Apology to its Indigenous People. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*. Vol.19, No 1: 34-50.
- PM Kevin Rudd Minta Maaf Pada Warga Aborigin. 2007. *Harian Kompas*. 27 November 2007.
- PM Kevin Rudd Minta Maaf Pada Aborigin. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 31 January 2008.
- Rudd, K. *The Apology*. A Speech delivered on 13 February 2008 at Parliament House, Canberra, Australia.
- Rudd Minta Maaf. 2008. *Harian Kompas*. 13 February 2008.
- Spivak, G. (n.d.). *Can the Subaltern Speak?*. available at http://www.mcgill.ca/files/crlaw-discourse/Can_the_subaltern_speak.pdf (accessed in 12 November 2014).
- Stone, R. 2013. Rousseau's *General Will*: Totalitarian Perception of a Virtuous Ideal. *Ephemeris the Journal of Philosophy*. (2013): 81-105.
- Van Dijk, T. 2006. Ideology and Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. Vol.11 No.2, 115-140.

Wareing, S. What is Language and What Does it Do?. Ishtla Singh & Jean S. Peccei (Eds). 1999. *Language, Society, and Power*. London and New York: Routledge.