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This paper examines the discourse produced by Sri Lankan President, Mahinda Rajapaksa, in six presidential speeches delivered across five years from 2008 to 2012. It draws on political discourse analysis (van Dijk, 1997), positioning theory (van Langenhove & Harré, 1999), and schema (van Dijk, 1998) to form a cross-disciplinary approach and traces President Rajapaksa’s portrayal of the ethnic conflict in speeches delivered during the latter stages of the war to post-war speeches. Throughout this paper, the importance of detailed linguistic analysis is highlighted, stressing its role in anchoring day-to-day language use to larger ideologies in the world. In order to trace patterns across the President’s discourse, this paper analyzes the positions he adopts a) towards the main parties involved in the conflict and b) through storylines issued to explain the conflict. Understanding the storylines issued as also indexing schema that the President draws on to perceive and discursively produce the ethnic conflict in a particular way, this paper also inquires whether there is a shift in positioning as the speeches progress from a war time context into a post-war setting which would reveal the President’s transition from ‘war schema’ to ‘reconciliation schema’. The study finds that the President’s positioning of the five main actors in his conflict narrative, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), the Tamil people, the Sri Lankan armed forces, the government, and the international community, remain the same across war time and post-war speeches. The discursive construction of narrative describes a storyline, and the President issues three main storylines to support his positioning of
these actors. His ‘historical lens’ narrative that compares the ethnic conflict to invasions of the country by Indian kings and Western colonizers subsumes and enhances his three storylines, thereby becoming a metanarrative through which the positions ascribed to the main actors of the conflict are interpreted. The paper also argues that analysis of the President’s discourse does not reveal a shift from ‘war schema’ into ‘reconciliation schema’ following the end of the war, and instead draws on existing discriminatory beliefs that uphold majority ethnic group ideologies.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Political discourse has been a rich subject for discourse analysis and studies within this field have used a critical discourse analytical approach to discuss issues of identity, racism, and power among many others. The tools of critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1993) encourage a deconstruction of data in relation to their context and linguistic construction which creates a space for understanding implications of the text under scrutiny. Political discourse benefits not only from a critical discourse analytical perspective (Wodak, 1989; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012) but also from studies that focus on metaphor (Chilton & Ilyin, 1993) as well as media representations of political discourse (Hodges, 2011; Fairclough, 1998).

With the exception of Wodak (2011), whose approach was ethnographic and studied the day-to-day lives of politicians, studies that employ a critical discourse analytical approach tend to concentrate their analysis on one or two speeches rather than trace patterns through several speeches. In other words, they lack the insight that a corpus of speeches could provide to strengthen their arguments. Secondly, while speeches form the backbone of these analyses, their context is also of vital importance in terms of whom they address (see Bell, 1984 for Audience Design). Therefore, when studies in political discourse focus on linking discrimination and power struggles denoted by a speech event to wider issues that are present in the world, their analysis is limited to the specific speech event that is being examined as the context of these speeches shape their content. Finally, the linguistic cues that produce wider connotations to the specifics of the speech event are often not given enough detailed, explicit analysis in these
studies, thereby making the tie between specific linguistic cues and more general discriminatory behavior weak.

Within this field of political discourse, this paper examines the discourse produced by the President of Sri Lanka, Mahinda Rajapaksa, in six speeches he delivered across the span of five years from 2008 to 2012. His discourse is studied primarily for his depiction of the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict that began in the early 1980s and spanned a period of almost thirty years. The war was waged against the Sri Lankan armed forces and government by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), a terrorist organization that claimed to be the sole representatives of the Sri Lankan Tamil people of the Northern and Eastern regions of the island and demanded a separate State for Tamils claiming discriminatory practices by the Sinhala majority government. Many date this discrimination against the Tamil minority to the Sinhala-Only language policy of 1956 (discussed in more detail in Section 3.1). The LTTE was formed in protest of such actions in the early 1980s and quickly gained military strength and controlled many parts of the North and East of the island. Although many Heads of State prior to President Rajapaksa had been unsuccessful in quelling the LTTE, which used guerilla warfare to engage the Sri Lankan armed forces, President Rajapaksa began a strong, forceful military operation against the LTTE resulting in the death of the LTTE’s leader, Vellupillai Prabhakaran and the defeat of the LTTE in May 2009. The military action taken by the government to end the war (also referred to as a ‘humanitarian operation’ by the government) was condemned by leaders of the international community and both the government and the LTTE faced allegations of war crimes and human rights violations as civilians remained trapped in cross-fire during the latter stages of the war. In 2011, an advisory panel of UN-commissioned experts found both the government and LTTE
guilty of war crimes. Resisting the international community’s call for an independent committee to investigate these allegations, the government headed by President Rajapaksa appointed an internal committee, the Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC), to probe into these accusations; the LLRC report was delivered in December 2011. The government’s inadequate action with regard to the LLRC recommendations, however, resulted in the adoption of a United Nations resolution on Sri Lanka in March 2012.

The speeches selected for analysis in this thesis were delivered by President Rajapaksa during Independence Day (February 4) celebrations in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 during which independence from British colonialism is commemorated annually, in addition to the speech delivered to Parliament on May 19, 2009 announcing the conclusion of the civil war. Independence Day speeches were selected because they were addressed to a national audience, in addition to being speeches whose occasion, the celebration of independence, remained constant over time, although the location and socio-political realities may have changed. In other words, the overall contexts of Independence Day speeches remain similar (i.e. national audience, celebration of independence), while their socio-political reality changes (i.e. different stages of war, victory and post-war), providing a data set that contains snapshots of discourse that prevailed over a period of time.

In terms of authorship, the President’s speeches are written by a speech-writer, which removes him from fulfilling the role of author in the participation framework proposed by Goffman. In his deconstruction of “speaker”, Goffman (1981) defines author as “someone who selects the sentiments there are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded”, the
animator as the person who vocalizes the words, and the principal as “someone whose positioning has been established…, whose beliefs have been told, … [and] who is committed to what the words say” (p. 144). By delivering the speech in addition to being the person who claims responsibility for its contents, however, the President continues to retain the role of animator and principal which establishes the President as being the authority behind his words.

Having established that the President takes on the role of principal in his speeches, it is also important to recognize his discourse as the Head of State’s discourse. This discourse, being issued from a place of authority, has the power to influence public perception on a situation like the ethnic conflict, thereby influencing the public’s stance on it. In examining the discourse of President Rajapaksa, I aim not only to point indirectly to the President’s influence on public perceptions of the conflict, but also to fill the void in discourse analytical research on the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict. Therefore, I examine Presidential discourse to elicit representations of the conflict and the groups involved in it through President Rajapaksa’s viewpoint. The research questions that this study aims to answer are two: first, ‘What positions and storylines are adopted by the President in order to position the main social actors within the conflict?’, and second, ‘Is there a shift from ‘war’ to ‘reconciliation’ as the President moves from war time to post-war speeches?’. In order to answer the first of these, I apply positioning theory (van Langenhove & Harré, 1999) to my data set to examine the discourse produced by the President during and following the war. I use this application to determine the positions he adopts a) towards parties involved in the conflict and b) through storylines he employs.
In order to answer the second question, as linguistic strategies that signal positioning could also be seen as indicating schemata (van Dijk, 1998a) that the President draws from to describe the conflict, I inquire if the President’s discourse shifts from ‘war schema’ into ‘reconciliation schema’ as the speeches progress from the latter stages of the war into a post-war context. Given international allegations against Sri Lanka as not taking adequate efforts towards reconciliation, by scrutinizing my data set for the presence of ‘reconciliation schema’, I examine whether or not the President’s discourse holds any strands of this schema. In order to create a framework for what ‘reconciliation schema’ could entail, in Section 2.4 of Chapter 2 I present studies that signal the aspects of reconciliation schemata against which the President’s post-war discourse could be analyzed.

This chapter laid out the research problem that is being addressed, in addition to providing brief introduction to the data set and framework that is used to analyze the data. Chapter 2 provides a detailed theoretical framework for the study while situating and justifying its goals within existing literature on the subject, and Chapter 3 provides background to the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict which will assist in not only locating the study in its socio-political reality but also aid a more contextually meaningful analysis. It also details the methods used to gather data, and analyze it. Chapter 4 contains analysis of Presidential speeches delivered during the latter stages of the war, examining both the President’s positioning of main social actors in the conflict as well as the storylines he issues to support his positioning of these actors. Chapter 5 examines discourse produced during the celebratory speech announcing the defeat of the LTTE and examines enhancements to the existing storylines that the President had presented in his previous speeches, while Chapter 6 examines post-war discourse, tracing the storylines delivered
by the President thus far into post-war context and examining its implications on reconciliation.

Chapter 7 offers a brief summary of the paper’s key findings and limitations in addition to providing the implications of this study.
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework

This chapter provides a theoretical framework which will serve to inform this study. Section 2.1 provides an overview of studies that examine political discourse through a discourse analytical perspective, followed by an introduction to positioning theory in Section 2.2, while Section 2.3 discusses the use of schema and cognition to comprehend political discourse. As will be examined in this chapter, studies that deal with political discourse analysis, positioning theory and schema point to a gap in the research; while all these concepts are discursively constructed, they are not seen as informing and complementing each other’s analysis. Moreover, with the exception of a few studies, there is a lack of detailed linguistic analysis of the discourse being used to cue positions and schema. This chapter highlights these gaps in research and contributes towards addressing them through this paper. Finally, drawing from studies on reconciliation discourse, this chapter also creates examples of ‘reconciliation schema’. These models of ‘reconciliation schema’ form a point of comparison to President Rajapaksa’s post-war speeches which will help determine whether or not the President shifts from ‘war schema’ into ‘reconciliation schema’ following the end of the war.

2.1. Discourse analysis of political discourse

Political discourse is not easy to define as anything that occurs in daily life could be political. However, for the purpose of dealing with discourse that emanates from a particular field and forms a specific genre, van Dijk (1997) proposes three predominant constraints to define political discourse. Firstly, it is defined by both its producers and its audience, such as politicians, political institutions and the public. This argument of producers and audience in a moment of interaction is reminiscent of Goffman’s (1981) ‘participant framework’ where the
discourse is co-constructed by its producers as well as by its recipients. Secondly, the nature of on-going activities constrains the definition of what political discourse is as actors need to be participating in political practices, “such as governing, ruling, legislating, protesting, dissenting or voting”, in order for the discourse that is being produced at that moment to be termed 'political discourse' (van Dijk, 1997, p. 14). Lastly, the context in which the discourse is produced deems it political (i.e. discourse generated by MPs chatting outside a Parliament session does not fall within the jurisdiction of political discourse while speeches given in Parliament do). Within this broad domain defined as 'political discourse', van Dijk points out several sub-genres (e.g. Parliamentary debates, political speeches, political campaigns etc.) which are classified by their discourse as well as the context within which they are enacted.

Chilton and Schäffner (2011) point out that the connection between political situations and discourse is mediated by “strategic functions [which] enable analysts… to focus on details that contribute to the phenomena which people intuitively understand as ‘political’” (p.3011). They categorize strategic functions as: coercion and resistance, legitimization and delegitimization, and representation and misrepresentation. While these functions render everyday situations ‘political’, they can also be applied to the particular type of political discourse being discussed by van Dijk (1997) as being produced by politicians’ use of discourse in political situations. Chilton and Schäffner state that these functions then inform the linguistic analysis of the political discourse being produced.

Most of the work done on political discourse has taken a critical discourse analytical viewpoint (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1993) as it is a field that allows ideologies which form and support the superstructures of discourse to be examined in the light of everyday language. In
other words, critical discourse analysis (CDA) aids the linking of ‘big D’ Discourse to ‘little d’ discourse which is realized and performed through the language used in everyday contexts (Gee, 1990). Coalescing the traditions of political discourse analysis with CDA, van Dijk (1997) defines critical-political discourse as dealing with “the reproduction of political power, power abuse, or domination through political discourse, including the various forms of resistance or counter-power against such forms of discursive dominance” (p. 11). It is within this field that the largest body of work on discourse analysis of political discourse falls. However, due to the rigorous microanalysis required by a political discourse analytical approach to connect micro-level discourse to macro-level structures, studies tend to focus on one or two speeches rather than studying several speeches or studying multiple speeches of one speaker to discover patterns of language use. Moreover, although discursively situated, critical political discourse analysis lacks the anchoring of concrete linguistic cues to critical interpretations of discourse. While Sections 2.2 and 2.3 elaborate on approaches that are conducive to linguistic analysis, these approaches too are still found to be lacking in their inclusion of linguistic detail. Additionally, when seen as distinct from each other, these approaches provide a limited insight on the data at hand. However, a combination of these different approaches (i.e. discourse analysis, positioning theory and schema) may be used to complement each other and provide greater insight on the data being examined.

2.2. Positioning theory and linguistic cues

Positioning theory, as introduced by Davies and Harré (1990), proposes the concept of ‘positioning’ as a fresh perspective on the concept of ‘role’ and the fixedness that is general associated with it. The authors argue for positioning as a fluid concept that is negotiated within a
speech act that is co-constructed by participants. They propose that “the social meaning of what has been said will be shown to depend upon the social positioning of interlocutors”, which is referred to by the authors as “discursive practices” (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 45). In discursive practices, self is produced through a “pronoun grammar”, in which ‘I’ is seen as “historically continuous and unitary” while others are positioned in relation to the self (p. 47).

In developing this approach further, van Langenhove and Harré (1999) define positioning as “the discursive construction of personal stories that make a person’s actions intelligible and relatively determinate as social acts within which the members of the conversation have specific locations” (p. 16). The authors propose that a “mutually determining triad”, as shown in Fig. 1 below, informs the positions that are taken up by the speakers towards social actors within a speech act.

![Fig. 1 Taken from van Langenhove & Harre' (1999)](image)

If the definition of positioning is mapped onto this triad, “position” situates participants within a conversation and “storyline” is the discursive construction of narrative which helps understand the action of social actors being positioned, while “social force of” may be seen as the speech act that is taking place. As the significance of positioning lies primarily in its fluidity, while positioning is achieved jointly by the three factors mentioned above, it does not remain static within a storyline or speech act. Instead it can shift, accommodate or transform into
different types of positioning within the same speech act or storyline. It is a framework within which an emergent analysis that follows the storyline can take place and can be applied to both a short turn-by-turn conversation as well as a longer narrative within which each social actor is discursively produced. Influenced by the speech act that takes place, van Langenhove and Harré suggest that positioning may take on one of two forms: tacit or intentional. Tacit positioning occurs when the narrator does not position her/himself consciously whereas intentional positioning occurs when the narrator deliberately positions her/himself and others discursively.

Moving from the basic tenets of positioning theory to understanding how it relates in concrete terms to ‘self’ and ‘other’ positioning, Tan and Moghaddam (1999) provide a framework to understand interpersonal relations. Firstly, they see ‘self’ as a member of a social group whereby the storylines that are constructed “include … *group* storylines, *group* myths, *group* histories etc. of the groups of which speakers are members and the outgroups with which they interact” (p. 183, their emphasis). Secondly, they point to positions as being linguistically signaled through narratives. As an example of ingroup-outgroup positioning, Slocum-Bradley (2008) examines the discourse of the Rwandan conflict and demonstrates how the use of storylines such as “Tutsi attack on Rwandan national sovereignty”, “the Hutu majority is fighting for democracy”, and “[the] Tutsi oppressed [the] Hutu and will do so again” use deliberate positioning to legitimize the actions of the ingroup (the Hutu) and de-legitimize those of the outgroup (the Tutsi). Finally, Tan and Moghaddam also present two types of intergroup positions that a narrator can adopt: representative or mediator. Mediators are impartial and facilitate intergroup harmony while the voice of representatives is seen as the voice of authority within the group and is also seen as speaking for the entire group. The authors point out that these positions
are allotted primarily by the ‘rights and duties’ that inform the position one occupies in her/his group.

Demonstrating how intergroup positioning is applied to political speeches, Konaev and Moghaddam (2010) set out the process of positioning an external threat during a time of political tension. They trace the following three storylines through the narratives of United States president George Bush and Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in an analysis of their narratives: 1) “The external enemy is real and highly dangerous”, 2) “We are freedom-loving and open, but our enemy hates freedom and relies on violence”, and 3) “I am a man of the people and speak for the people; my opponent does not” (p. 156). The authors’ findings indicate that while these storylines villainize the social actor perceived as an enemy, they also serve to create and maintain ingroup cohesion within their respective nations. Although positioning is cued primarily by the use of language and discourse, the recognition of patterns in linguistic construction that signal these positions receives little attention. While emphasizing the centrality of language to their framework, Konaev and Moghaddam (2010), Tan and Moghaddam (1999) and even van Langenhove and Harré (1999) avoid pointing to concrete linguistic strategies as signs of the different types of positioning they discuss; instead they tend to focus primarily on links between the positions cued and what they mean in terms of psycho-social implications.

Another framework for positioning presented by Bamberg (1997), relates positioning to narrative analysis specifically by proposing that positioning in narrative can take place on three levels that operate along two planes: the world in which the story is taking place and the world in which the story is being told. De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012) refer to these as the “told world” and the “telling world” respectively (p. 164). In Bamberg’s first level that looks at how
characters are positioned in relation to each other (e.g. the agent versus the victim), the analysis is limited to the story world. At the second level, the connection made between the narrator and the audience is observed and an attempt is made to understand how the narrator positions her/himself to her/his audience. The third level attempts to understand how narrators position themselves (of the told world) to themselves (of the telling world). This level bridges not only the told world and the telling world but moves beyond the two worlds to index more abstract and transcendental positions of ‘self’. While Bamberg’s model of positioning is sculpted to suit narrative analysis, similar to Davies and Harré (1990) and van Langenhove and Harré (1999) it does not elaborate on the linguistic devices that cue positions although these positions are indexed primarily through discourse.

Though focused on interpreting autobiographical narratives through positioning, Wortham (2000) is more forthcoming with listing linguistic devices that help see positions as discursive constructions within what he refers to as the “narrating” and “narrated” worlds (i.e. the telling world and the told world). He mentions denotative words and expressions, metapragmatic verbs, quoted speech, evaluative indexicals, and epistemic modalization as devices that anchor the analyst’s findings in linguistic cues (p. 172-173). Although not an exhaustive list, these devices could be used to index positions that are being cued within a speech event, thereby providing examples of how linguistic detail informs positioning theory. However, research on political discourse that adopts a positioning approach does not study linguistic detail to explicitly reveal how language usage indexes positioning.

In addition to these, other researchers have studied more specific linguistic cues and the role they play in positioning within narrative analysis. One specific cue is the use of pronouns.
Although not studied specifically for their role in positioning theory, pronoun research (Mühlhäusler & Harré, 1990; Brown & Gilman, 1960) enriches narrative analysis and contributes to the sources that inform narrative analysis. More specifically in narrative research, De Fina (2003) argues that by “manipulating pronouns speakers can convey subtle social meanings that relate to their social identities or their positions with respect to other interlocutors, both present and absent, and to the experiences and topics that are being discussed” (p. 52). In research that focuses on pronoun usage in political narratives, De Fina (1995) found that first person plural pronoun ‘we’ indexes group membership and group representation whereas the use of first person singular ‘I’ references authorship and individual commitment to the words being spoken. In a similar study of second person pronoun usage in Taiwanese politics, Kuo (2002) found that second person singular pronoun ‘you’ can be used to establish solidarity with the audience but can also be used as a confrontational device to voice opposition against opponents in debates. While both these studies emphasize the importance of contextual interpretation, their findings are also generalizable across similar contexts. This allows pronouns to be identified as linguistic cues that index certain groups and positions. However, pronominal research has tended to focus mainly on the function of pronouns within each speech event or narrative, rather than being recognized explicitly as linguistic cues that index positioning.

While a more comprehensive linguistic analysis utilizing in positioning theory is present in the field of narrative analysis, this analysis is limited to the study of narratives in political discourse. In other words, except for studies that focus on political narratives, more general studies of political discourse do not utilize the linguistic analysis offered by the field of narrative analysis. Even research on pronouns usage in political discourse, with the exception of De Fina
(1995) and Kuo (2002), tend not to anchor their findings in linguistic details. Moreover, positioning and schemata (to be discussed in Section 2.3), although discursively produced, are not seen as informing each other. More detailed linguistic analysis, therefore, is necessary to link positioning to discourse, thereby allowing a more fine-grained contextual analysis of discourse.

2.3. Political discourse analysis and schema

Although primarily CDA-based, a cognitive approach to political discourse can be traced through the field of political discourse analysis. This approach credits schema as playing a central role in both the comprehension and production of political discourse. Drawing from studies on cognition, van Dijk (1998a) notes that the knowledge an individual has regarding events, stories, people etc. are clustered into categories which form the schemata that s/he draws from when producing or comprehending discourse regarding an event, story or person. He argues that similar to the grammar of sentences, schematic structures may be denoted as “tree-like (directed) graphs, consisting of a top node, several edges and a number of lower-level nodes representing subordinate (included) categories” (p. 57). Tying in the effect schemata can have on the production or interpretation of discourse, according to the approach van Dijk adopts, mental models negotiate the connection. Mental models, as van Dijk defines them “are representations in personal memory of events or… of episodes” (p 79). When an individual talks about an event, these models help understand the structures or schemata that inform the discourse they produce. Therefore, a mental event model that comprises schemata based on an individual’s understanding of a particular event helps the discourse analyst recognize the model that is being signaled discursively.
Using the connection that he draws between schemata and discourse, van Dijk (2002) examines the speech delivered in the British House of Commons in 1989 by Sir John Stokes in support of stringent immigration policy restrictions which was perceived as a discriminatory speech. He argues that the discourse structures used by Stokes, when seen in the light of mental representations Stokes has of immigrants and which he draws from in his speech, helps explain how and why his speech was seen as being prejudiced. If the schemata that Stokes’ discourse indexes are examined more closely, van Dijk points out that his “negative propositions about immigrants from certain event models (e.g. recent ‘eruptions’ of Muslims) and general prejudices (‘birth rates’, etc.) obeys the overall constraint of negative other representation” (p. 229-230).

In his study of former Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar’s speech in a Parliamentary debate arguing in favor of USA’s war against Iraq, van Dijk (2007) shows how rhetorical devices, ‘self’ versus ‘other’ presentation and political implicatures are used by politicians when producing political discourse. “Defining the situation” by describing the situation at hand as a “crisis” that warrants immediate and decisive action portrayed as a global threat that is connected to a local one (local terrorism), Aznar sets the stage for his argument. Following this, van Dijk shows how Aznar manages his political tensions with ‘other’ local political parties by implying a “polarization according to which he associated himself with the Good Guys and those who oppose the war as supporting Saddam Hussein, the enemy” (p. 70). This discursive positioning, van Dijk argues, authenticates Aznar’s own stance while downplaying that of the Opposition’s. Using political implicature by mapping global event
models and relevant schemata (terrorism as a threat) onto local political conditions, Aznar
discursively constructs his argument for backing USA’s attack on Iraq.

Although Hodges (2011) situates his study within the theories of framing and
intertextuality, his work informs not only political discourse analysis but also intersects with
schemata as he identifies the use of metaphor in political discourse. His study undertakes an
analysis of the ‘War on Terror’ narrative employed by the Bush administration in post 9/11
context. He approaches the study from the perspective of ‘sound bites’ as being intertextual links
that are traced through Bush’s political speeches and picked up by the media. At the outset of his
study, Hodges points to how the ‘sound bites’ being used by Bush cue different frames. He finds
two overarching frames, war frame and crime frame, that he treats as metaphors that characterize
the situation, with each frame retaining its own lexical entities that function as descriptors of the
metaphor being signaled (e.g. ‘causalities’ are referred to in a ‘war frame’ whereas in a ‘crime
frame’ reference is made to ‘victims’). While Hodges refers to descriptors of the each frame as
“lexical correspondences”, he does not depict them as phrases and words that signal the use of a
particular type of schema to ‘make sense’ or interpret events. Additionally, Hodges’ understands
frames solely on a discursive level and as the focus of his study is intertextuality, he does not
discuss whether when triggered by a physical event, such as the conclusion of conflict, there is a
shift in schema dealing with the new event. In other words, though Hodges’ study examines the
discourse occasioned by a physical event (the 9/11 attack on the US), his data does not allow for
analysis to be made past the conclusion of the event itself as its repercussions are on-going.

In all the studies mentioned above (van Dijk 2002, 2007; Hodges, 2011), although there
are clear connections to the use of discourse as schemata that speakers draw from, securing these
analyses to linguistic cues and strategies such as sentence construction, pronoun usage, referrals etc. is still absent. By not recognizing linguistic cues as signaling schemata, the link between language use and cognition remains vague. Moreover, no mention has been made as to how positioning theory can be utilized to complement the connection between schemata and seeing how a speaker’s positioning of a character can also index the schemata s/he draws from. Such a connection, if recognized, paves the way for a complex, multifaceted analysis of discourse. Additionally, complementary analysis fills in the gaps that exist in each approach, thereby providing a holistic understanding of the discourse under scrutiny. Finally, the intersection of schemata, positioning theory and political discourse has not been discussed in detail, neither has a linguistic analysis informed the intersection of these concepts.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, this paper asks whether a reconciliation discourse is present within the President’s speeches. While war schemata, or what war schemata means within the context of President Rajapaksa’s discourse, will be examined in the analysis section through the use of positioning, in order to understand whether or not the President shifts into and draws from reconciliation schemata, there needs to be a framework for reconciliation discourse with which the President’s post-war discourse could be compared. As such, Section 2.4 will create a schematic framework that elaborates on studies of reconciliation discourse.

2.4. Creating schema for reconciliation discourse

For the purpose of identifying overarching patterns within reconciliation discourse and recognizing types of schema that it signals, this section will discuss research that analyzes reconciliation discourse. Seen in conjunction with each other, these studies form the framework
for reconciliation discourse, which signals the schemata that the President could draw from when engaging in reconciliation.

Cameron (2007, 2011), in her study of reconciliation talks between an IRA bomber and victim in Northern Ireland, notes how patterns of metaphor use are created discursively. In her study, Cameron illustrates how micro-level negotiations of metaphor form macro-level systems that can be traced over the course of several talks. Cameron’s (2011) findings indicate that the reconciliation process when traced along metaphors, is an emergent one, with metaphors being used as transformative agents to discursively co-construct reconciliation between two speakers. Drawing from previous literature, she defines conflict as “a process of dehumanizing [the Other] … in which the enemy becomes less than human, possessed with negative qualities that demand a violent response, or becomes simply a representative of a negatively evaluated group” (Cameron, 2011, p. 4). In contrast to this she argues that reconciliation is a process of developing empathy by rehumanizing the Other, and she sees metaphor use as aiding this process of transformation and transition.

Cameron argues that a phrase that forms a metaphor “is not just a linguistic metaphor but is part of the way of thinking and talking” that is developed to talk about the event or situation (Cameron, 2007, p. 200). She maintains that “[s]ystematic patterns of metaphor use are described by collecting together the individual linguistic metaphors used in discourse events and grouping them into larger semantically-connected domains, producing a kind of event-level ‘supermetaphor’ that can be given a label”, thus recreating the relationship that exists between schema and frames within the context of metaphor analysis (Cameron, 2007, p. 201). Although it
examines the construction of reconciliation discourse at ‘event-level metaphors’, this study still limits itself to discourse produced between two individuals and does not broaden its scope to include reconciliation discourse produced within institutional contexts.

Unlike Cameron’s study which is limited to an individual’s discursive production of reconciliation, Wilson (2001) studies the discourse produced within institutional contexts by different social actors who use divergent types of narratives to produce reconciliation discourse. In his scrutiny of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) initiatives in South Africa, Wilson uncovers three overarching themes for reconciliation narratives. He finds that a legal-procedural narrative arose from the TRC implementation of legal matters and fairness in dealing with gross human rights violations while the mandarin-intellectual narrative emerged from notions of nation-building and the nation as a collective, thus shifting away from the individual, and the religious-redemptive narrative was produced by ideas of reconciliation as “confession, forgiveness and redemption, and the exclusion of vengeance” on the individual level (p. 109). Although Wilson provides neither the linguistic detail of these narratives nor clear narrative analysis as he is more interested in the categorization of discourse and its function within the TRC, the type of data that he uses lends itself to linguistic analysis as classification of discourse patterns are linguistically signaled.

Similar to Cameron’s work but taking on discourse produced within an institutionally conditioned environment, Verdoolaege (2008) uses her analysis of the discourse that arose from the testimonies of Human Rights Violations (HRV) discussed within the scope of the TRC to construct what she refers to as reconciliation discourse. She mentions the following ten
discursive features within three broad layers: ideological, historic and identity. Ideological layering takes into account the mandate given to the TRC to promote reconciliation within South Africa and is therefore an institutional approach to reconciliation. Verdoolaege includes introducing reconciliation, stressing national unity and community spirit, respecting testifiers, and emphasizing emotional discourse as features of what she refers to as the ideological master narrative present at the TRC hearings. Features of historical layering include apartheid-talk, continuity between the past and the present, and audience as actor where the testifiers weave history into their testimonial narratives and use it as the locus for the point they are trying to carry across. Identity layering takes into consideration performances of certain identities in testimonies and Verdoolaege finds the construction of Afrikaner/white identity, victim-perpetrator identity, and political party identity in the testimonies she examines. Using her reference point for reconciliation, the author places ideal and non-ideal testifiers along a continuum, thus allowing reconciliation to function as a multilayered concept that can take many forms of discursive performance.

Although Verdoolaege’s study seems to bridge the gap between reconciliation discourse produced by institutions and individuals by examining individual narratives that are negotiated within institutional contexts to fit within institutional goals of reconciliation, her study still focuses on reconciliation discourse produced within individual testimonies (i.e. testimonies that speak of personal goals) rather than institutionally produced reconciliation discourse (i.e. discourse that is influenced by the goals of institutions or representatives of institutions). Additionally, while Cameron (2011, 2007), Wilson (2001) and Verdoolaege (2008) actively discuss the discursive performances of reconciliation, none of them compare or contrast
discourse that is generated when an event triggers a shift in the discourse (e.g. discourse used during conflict versus following the conclusion of conflict).

This chapter provided a theoretical framework that supports the data analyzed in this paper. It detailed the features of political discourse analysis, positioning theory, and schemata, suggesting that while these concepts are discursively cued, there has been little work that points to detailed linguistic analysis within research in these areas. It also pointed out that no research combines the above approaches to create an analysis that complements each approach’s analysis. Additionally, it also provided a framework for reconciliation discourse that will serve as a point of comparison to President Rajapaksa’s post-war speeches in order to understand whether there is a switch in the discourse he uses following the conclusion of the war.
Chapter 3: Background to the study and methods

This chapter provides a background to the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict (Section 3.1) that is necessary to understand the analysis that will be provided in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. It also provides a brief summary of some socio-political events of significance that took place when the speeches selected for analysis were delivered by President Rajapaksa. Finally, Section 3.2 provides a description of the data and methods used for analysis.

3.1. Background to the study

This study examines Presidential speeches immediately preceding and following the end of the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict that lasted for close to three decades. As such, this section provides a brief summary of Sri Lanka’s socio-political history in relation to the ethnic conflict as the President draws on the conflict’s history to make the discourse he uses relevant to his audience. Many date the root of the conflict back to the 1956 Sinhala-Only Act which decreed that Sinhala, which is the language of the ethnic majority, the Sinhalese, shall be the national language of the country. De Silva (1998) remarks that during the 1940s and 50s, “language became the primary political issue of the day… [and was] the very core of the ethnic conflicts that erupted… [when] nationalism itself took on a linguistic form” (p. 45-46). Protests against this Act, the Official Language Act No. 33 of 1956, resulted in the inclusion of Tamil through the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act No. 28 of 1958. However, as De Silva (1996) notes, this Act was implemented only in 1966, eight years after it was passed. Although the 1978 Constitution recognized Sinhala as the official language and Tamil as a national language which was a substantial modification to the earlier policy, rumblings of discontentment from the Tamil minority that were present even before the Sinhala-Only Act was brought in, continued.
In the wake of discrimination, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), an armed militant group who claimed to represent the Sri Lankan Tamil people, waged on-and-off attacks against the Sri Lanka armed forces beginning in the early 1980s. The killing of thirteen soldiers on July 23, 1983 by the LTTE resulted in one of the worst ethnic riots in Sri Lanka where mobs ransacked and burnt the homes of many Tamils in the South, killing many of them and triggering the emigration of many Tamils as asylum seekers. As time passed, the LTTE intensified its attacks on the armed forces and engaged them using guerilla-type warfare tactics which led to a civil war over the years. The LTTE’s main demand was a separate State for the Tamil people which consisted of a large portion of the land and coastal area along the North and East of the island. The LTTE also had control over a large part of the North and East of the country for most of the time they were in operation and had built up their own form of government with banks, courts and a police force too. The LTTE, also known as the Tigers, also had a history of using peace negotiations to regroup and solidify their bases before engaging the troops again, resulting in many failed efforts at several ceasefire agreements.

Many previous governments attempted to either wipe out or negotiate with the LTTE and failed. In late 2008, the current President of Sri Lanka, President Mahinda Rajapaksa launched a forceful onslaught against the LTTE which drew heavy criticism from the international community and local activists who brought up concern for human rights violations against civilians in the areas where air raids were being performed. Both the government and the LTTE were accused of using heavy artillery in areas occupied by civilians and in addition to the thousands of civilian casualties through the previous years, many lives were lost during the latter stages of the war. When the armed forces finally forced the LTTE into a small space of land, the
LTTE used civilians as human shields. The government was also accused of firing on No-Fire Zones where civilians were clustered. The government and the President referred to the latter part of the war as a humanitarian operation where their goal was to save the Tamil people who were positioned as victims of the LTTE. During the final stages of war, government troops captured the final LTTE stronghold on the following dates: Killinochchi on January 2, 2009, Elephant Pass on January 9, 2009 and the entire district of Mullaitivu on May 18, 2009.\(^1\) On May 18, 2009 it was announced that the leader of the LTTE, Vellupillai Prabhakaran, and the LTTE hierarchy were killed and the war was declared over. On May 19, 2009, the President addressed the Parliament officially, an address which was televised to national audiences.

Although the war concluded in 2009, internally displaced persons were held in guarded camps for over two to three years and allegations of war crimes continued to mount against the government. In April 2011, a report by the advisory panel of experts commissioned by the UN to investigate allegations of international human rights violations in Sri Lanka found both the government and the LTTE guilty of the above violations. In response to mounting pressure on the international front to investigate these matters, an internally-appointed Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Committee (LLRC) was formed and their report including recommendations was produced to the President on December 2011. In March 2012 a US-backed resolution against Sri Lanka was passed at the United Nations, calling for accountability and enactment of the recommendations proposed by the LLRC; the resolution was met with stiff resistance from the government and was portrayed to be invasive of a country’s autonomy.

The table below provides a brief summary of the political situation at the time of each speech being delivered. The dates on which the speeches were delivered have been highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Political situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 2007</td>
<td>Troops capture Thoppigala, an area surrounded by ancient ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 27, 2007</td>
<td>Troops capture Chettikulam, Mannar (North West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4th, 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>60th Independence Day celebrations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>The International Independent Group of Eminent Persons, an international panel brought in by the government to monitor alleged human rights abuses resigns claiming government obstruction of their duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 2008</td>
<td>The Holy Madhu shrine in Mannar place of importance to Catholics, was brought under the troops’ control (North West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2008</td>
<td>Last LTTE camp in Mannar (North West) falls under troops’ control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2009</td>
<td>A-9 highway (main road linking the North to the rest of the country) completely cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td>International concern for thousands of trapped civilians in the battle zone ensured temporary ceasefire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4th, 2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>61st Independence Day celebrations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2009</td>
<td>Troops enter Puthumathalan (final LTTE-controlled area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 19, 2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>LTTE leader Velupillai Prabhakaran and LTTE leadership killed; war was declared over</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>First post-war local elections in the North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>Mahinda Rajapaksa wins Presidential election by a large margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4th, 2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>62nd Independence Day celebrations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Former Army Commander who lead the onslaught against the LTTE, General Sarath Fonseka, who ran against Mahinda Rajapaksa in January 2012 elections is arrested on corruption charges; European Union suspends Sri Lanka’s preferential trade status because of concerns over its human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>President Rajapaksa’s ruling coalition wins landslide victory in Parliamentary elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>Parliament approves 13th Amendment to the Constitution allowing a President unlimited number of terms of appointment to office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4th, 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>63rd Independence Day celebrations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>United Nations calls for an international investigation into possible war crimes by the government and LTTE; Sri Lankan government claims it is biased and says it will appoint a local body to examine the charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2010</td>
<td>The Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC) appointed by President Rajapaksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>The LLRC present their report and recommendations to President Rajapaksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4th, 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>64th Independence Day celebrations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>United Nations Human Rights Council adopts a United States-backed resolution urging Sri Lanka to investigate war crimes committed during final stages of the war with the LTTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Date of speeches and corresponding political situation in Sri Lanka²

² Data for this table was obtained from the following websites:
http://www.army.lk/operations.php
http://pact.lk
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-12004081
3.2. Methodology

This section provides an overview of the data under analysis, followed by the methods used to analyze it. It contains the linguistic devices that were identified, the specifics that were highlighted (i.e. positioning of social actors, storylines, and schema) and the classification of speeches.

3.2.1. Data

The data set discussed in this paper consists of recordings of six speeches (highlighted above in Table 1) delivered by President Mahinda Rajapaksa. Five of them were delivered during celebrations of national Independence Day from 2008 through 2012 and one of them was delivered to the Sri Lankan Parliament in May 2009 declaring the end of the civil war. Independence Day speeches were chosen as data as they are delivered a year apart and are a good source for providing data that captures discourse generated over a range of five years.

All these speeches were delivered in Sinhala and telecast mainly to a national audience. While the data were analyzed based on the language speeches were delivered in, the official English translations found on the President’s website were used as working translations which were modified to reflect Sinhala language structures more accurately in English (i.e. tense, pronouns, etc.). This modified translation is used to provide examples in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. All materials used, including recordings of speeches and English translations of President Rajapaksa’s speeches, are publicly available on the web.

http://www.tiki-toki.com/timeline/entry/51354/LLRC-Implementation#vars!date=2010-05-16_23:00:31
http://www.insightonconflict.org/conflicts/sri-lanka/conflict-profile/conflict-timeline/
3.2.2. Methods of analysis

Although speeches are performances, they are examined primarily as texts within this paper. In other words, their performative qualities, such as intonation, emphasis, pauses, embodied action etc. will not be analyzed. The verbal content of these speeches is the sole focus of this paper and the discourse produced is analyzed based on its linguistic construction. Pronouns were identified within the speeches as indicators of the positioning taken up by the President towards ingroups and outgroups. The speeches were also examined for use of referrals, which are described as “communicative attempts by a speaker to evoke a referent (the idea a speaker has of something in the world) through a referring expression (a linguistic expression that can represent and evoke an entity)” (Schiffrin, 2006, p. 36). These referrals are understood as links between language and the external world.

Additionally, adjectives/descriptors/lexicon, types of verbs, figurative language/metaphors and agentive/non-agentive constructions were identified and examined as constructing not only positions but also informing the schemata that the President draws from to create storylines. Finally, the use of narrative to advance a particular stance or signal a certain alignment with the social actor being described was also noted and was traced across speeches. I use these features as linguistic devices that describe a particular storyline advanced by the President or signal the position he takes up in relation to other social actors. These devices also index the schema that the President is drawing from in referring to the situation in the country and the ethnic conflict. Due to the large amount of data present, however, only the most significant and pertinent sections of the speeches that lend insight into positioning and schemata are discussed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6; that said, all utterances in which the main social actors
where mentioned or alluded to were tabulated. The entire collection of these excerpts may be found in the appendices, categorized according to the reference (i.e. the main social actors) in the conflict.

The speeches in the data set are categorized in the following manner depending on whether they were delivered during wartime or thereafter:

- **War time speeches**: Speeches delivered during Independence Day celebrations in 2008 and 2009
- **War time and beginning of post-war**: Speech delivered in May 2009 announcing the conclusion of the war
- **Post-war speeches**: Speeches delivered at Independence Days in 2010, 2011 and 2012

Following this classification, Chapter 4 deals with the positioning the President adopts towards the main social actors within the conflict during the latter stages of the war. Chapter 5 details the positioning that occurs during the celebratory speech delivered in May 2009 and Chapter 6 examines post-war positioning. These chapters examine not only the positioning of social actors but also the storylines that the President constructs during different periods of time. The conclusion of the war in May 2009 acts as the boundary that segments war time speeches from those delivered in a post-war situation which ideally signals a time of reconciliation. Drawings from the linguistic cues that signal positioning and point to the schema that the President draws from, the speeches are also analyzed to see if there is a shift in the discourse produced as the speeches transition from war to reconciliation. In other words, as the speeches
move from war to post-war chronologically, the data is analyzed to identify not only the different positions ascribed to characters, but also inquire if there is a shift in the discourse being employed and the characterization of actors.

This chapter provided a sociopolitical background to the present study by detailing the causes that spurred the conflict, the rise of the LTTE, their defeat at the hand of the Mahinda Rajapaksa regime and subsequent post-war issues involving the government and the international community. It also characterized the data set and methods used to analyze the data. By providing this study’s background and methodology, this chapter functions as the methodological structure on which the subsequent chapters’ analysis is based.
Chapter 4: Positioning during the latter stages of the war

The analysis of my data set revealed the presence of the following main social actors pertaining to the conflict: the LTTE, the Tamils (those from the North and East), the Sri Lankan armed forces, the government and the international community. Drawing from Independence Day speeches delivered by President Mahinda Rajapaksa on February 4, 2008 and 2009 in this chapter, the ways in which these characters are positioned by the President (Section 4.1) as well as the storylines adopted for this purpose (Section 4.2) during the latter stages of the war is discussed.

4.1. Positions adopted by speaker towards other social actors during the latter stages of the war

In this section I discuss the positioning of the main social actors, namely the LTTE (Section 4.1.1), the Tamils (Section 4.1.2), the armed forces (Section 4.1.3), the government (Section 4.1.4) and the international community (Section 4.1.4). As mentioned in Section 3.2.2, while all utterances in which these social actors were mentioned were tabulated, I was cautious to make selections discussed in the analysis representative of the entire corpus. The entire corpus of excerpts from the February 4, 2008 and February 4, 2009 speeches in which the President mentioned or alluded to social actors may be found in Appendix A.

4.1.1. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)

In his description of the LTTE, the President describes not only the organization but also terrorism itself. While the LTTE was accepted in many countries as a terrorist organization, by
harnessing the acts attached to terrorism the President reinforces the LTTE’s identity as a terrorist group, thereby eliminating any other identity that they might have claimed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>itha:me dharunu ke:dhawa:chakayak wunu, pililayak wunu thrasthawa:dhayathekka (23)</td>
<td>with the most ruthless, tragic, cancerous terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>Adha e: ekema ratakata nidhahasah dhina:ganna satan kela weerawaryo hitiya:nam e: kauruth LTTE sangwidha:naye: thuwakkuwata biliwenawa (55)</td>
<td>If there were such heroes who fought for the independence of one country today, they would have fallen victim to LTTE guns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>ape: ma:ththruboomiya bedha: wennkireemata weradharana bedhungwa:dhii: thrasthawa:dhii deshapalanayak-e upatha (14)</td>
<td>our motherland saw the birth of separatist/divisive and terrorist politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Lowa balawaththa:ma thrasthawa:dhii sanwidha:naye: (29)</td>
<td>the strongest terrorist organization in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>thrasthawa:dhin thama aramuna, e: kiyanne: me: rata bedhala: Dhemala Eelam rajjyak bihi keregaenee:me: aramuna , isthakeragaenee:me: a:sanna mohethaka-mohotha onna menna kiyala thibunu bawa oba dhannawa (30)</td>
<td>You know that the terrorists had come to the verge of achieving their goal, that is, the goal of dividing the country and establishing a separate state of Tamil Eelam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Ma:ththruboomiya dheketa kele, kaebeli kireemath samaga udha: wena thrasthawa:dhaye: (31)</td>
<td>terrorism that dawns with the division the of the motherland into two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Boomiye: balaya, ahase: balaya pamanak nemei, muhudhe: balaya, mara:gena maerena thrasthawa:dhinge: balayadha sahitha thrasthawa:dhii sangwidha:naya-k (32)</td>
<td>a terrorist organization that had power not only on land, but in the sea, air and held the power of terrorist suicide killers/bombers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>mulu mahath ja:thiya dhasaka ganana:wak this:se: be:thiyen mosapathth kele: biyagulu thrasthawa:dhaya (49)</td>
<td>the cowardly forces of terror that had wrapped our entire nation in fear for several decades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>thrasthawa:dhaye: andhuru sewanaella (51)</td>
<td>the dark shadow of terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Lo: dharunuma thrasthawa:dhii sangwidha:naya lese handhunwana ladha LTTE sangwidha:naya (57)</td>
<td>the LTTE that was known as the most ruthless terrorist organization in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>aethamun para:jaya kera nohaekiyaei punapuna: kiyapu bedhungwa:dhii thrasthawa:dhaya (82)</td>
<td>divisive/separatist terrorism that was repeatedly called invincible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>bedhumwa:dhii: thrasthawa:dhaya (119)</td>
<td>divisive/separatist terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Description of the LTTE and terrorism before the end of the war

As seen in Table 2 above, terrorism is described in referrals such as “cancerous”, “divisive” or “separatist”, “cowardly” and “ruthless”. By referring to the LTTE in words described above, the President uses referrals and referring expressions to connect with his audience and provide them with ‘something in the world’ to ‘make sense’ of his perspective of the LTTE. He also portrays terrorism as a “dark shadow” and an act that engulfed the nation “in
fear”. Additionally, the LTTE is described as being “the strongest terrorist organization in the world” as well as “the most ruthless terrorist organization in the world” that was “repeatedly called invincible”, further solidifying the threat they present in terms of not only the country but the global community too. The organization is also positioned as being dangerous to the leaders of the very people they claim to represent, the Tamils, as the President states that “if there were such heroes (i.e. Tamil leaders during the time of independence from the British) who fought for the independence of one country today, they would have fallen victim to LTTE guns”. The following excerpt provides a closer look at the President’s description of the LTTE’s acts in terms of the details he uses to characterize the LTTE’s actions.

Transliteration
2. Jaya Sri Maha Bodhiya asaladhi Bauddha b-baethimathun samooha washayen wedi thaba: gathnaya keruna:.
5. Ahinsaka minisun samoohawashen vividhe stha:nawaladhi ga:thanaya kerena laebuwa:.
10. Mulu ratama beethiyen aelali: giya:., obata mathaka aethi.

(February 4, 2009)

Free translation
1. Due to terrorist attacks, the Sinhala and Muslim people who lived in the North were compelled to flee from their homes/land.
2. Buddhist worshippers near the Jaya Sri Maha Bodhi at Anuradhapura were all gunned down.
3. Muslims were killed in their mosque at Kaththankudi.
4. There were attacks on the pinnacle of Buddhist worship, the Temple of the Sacred Tooth Relic in Kandy.
5. Innocent people were collectively massacred in various places.
6. That is not all, for the first time in the history of our land the Tiger terrorists carried out ethnic warfare.
7. They sought to establish a fascist state in which the Sinhala and Muslim people, as well as the Tamil people who were not prepared to bow before them, would not live.
8. Many democratic leaders of the Tamil people were killed by the terrorists.
9. Similarly, many of leaders who gave leadership to our nation were assassinated by the terrorists.
10. You would remember that the entire country lived in fear.

In the excerpt above, the President uses details to describe the destructive acts of the LTTE. Tannen (2010), in presenting the importance of details and imagery when creating conversational involvement, argues that mutual sense-making is made possible through the use of details and imagery. She shows that in conversations speakers use details to create an image for the listeners to engage with and thus participate in the interaction. She identifies listing and naming as some of the strategies used to present details. In the first section of this excerpt, the President uses details to reveal the acts of terror that the LTTE undertook towards specific ethnic communities i.e. the Muslims and the Sinhalese. By listing and naming details to describe these terrorist acts (Line 2: “Buddhist worshippers near the Jaya Sri Maha Bodhi at Anuradhapura”, Line 3: “Muslims… in their mosque at Kaththankudi”, Line 4: “the Temple of the Sacred Tooth Relic in Kandy”) the President sets the stage to position the LTTE as being strongly opposed to ethnic diversity, leading up to the climax of his argument in which he depicts the conflict as the pinnacle of the LTTE’s opposition to diversity (Line 6: “for the first time in the history of our land the Tiger terrorists carried out ethnic warfare”). In other words, by using the strategy of naming and listing detailed acts of terror against ethnic groups, the President positions the LTTE as being the instigator of ethnic violence.³

³ Ethnic tensions between Sinhalese (ethnic majority) and Tamils (a minority group) were also ascribed to the Sinhala-Only language policy of 1956 which was brought in by an earlier government headed by the same party that Mahinda Rajapaksa belongs to. This move was identified as being discriminatory towards other ethnic groups.
In addition to positioning the LTTE as motivated by ethnic separatist ideologies, the President also reveals how their actions affected not only ethnic groups that were different to the Tamils but also Tamils who opposed them (Line 7: “the Tamil people who were not prepared to bow before them, would not live”). This creates an ingroup versus outgroup positioning (Tan & Moghaddam, 1999) in which the President positions the LTTE as an outgroup. In opposition to the LTTE, he includes not only the Muslims and Sinhalese in the ingroup but also the Tamils who oppose the LTTE. He also positions the LTTE as opposing democracy by using the adjective “democratic” to describe the Tamil leaders whom the LTTE killed (Line 8: “many democratic leaders of the Tamil people were killed by the terrorists”). By presenting the LTTE as striving towards ethnic separation from Sinhalese and Muslims, following it by their opposition of Tamil leaders and Tamils who did not support them, and finally revealing their impact on national leadership (Line 9: “many of leaders who gave leadership to our nation were assassinated by the terrorists”), the President uses listing to discursively build up the atrocity of the LTTE’s actions on the entire nation.

In addressing his audience directly through the use of the pronoun ‘you’ (Line 10: “you would remember”) the President uses audience design (Bell, 1984) to refer to his audience, the Sri Lankan people, thereby directly engaging the audience in his characterization of the LTTE. In doing so, he involves the whole nation as being affected by the LTTE (Line 10: “the entire country lived in fear”), the final climax to his villainization of the LTTE. The President seems to

and was later amended but it was recognized as the government’s step towards discriminating against minorities, the largest of which was the Tamils whom the LTTE claimed to represent.
be using the same strategy as pointed out by Konaev and Moghaddam (2010), radicalization, in
describing the LTTE. Therefore, the President’s description of the LTTE as villains coupled with
his appeal to his audience to recognize the fear invoked by the LTTE portrays the LTTE as a
threat to the nation and as ‘radicals’ who must be eliminated.

Through the referring expressions used to describe the LTTE and terrorism, the President
positions the LTTE as an evil force that stood against democracy and threatened the entire
country. His positioning of the organization in this particular way not only sets them up as
dangerous but also complements the positioning of other social actors in his speech such as the
government, the Sri Lankan armed forces and the Tamil people. In their discussion of positioning
theory van Langenhove and Harré (1999) state that in conversations, “each of the participants
always positions the other while simultaneously positioning him or herself” (p. 22). When this
concept is extrapolated out of conversations and used in contexts where a monologue is
delivered, positioning not only includes the audience but the characters within the storyline too.
In other words, a speaker not only positions him/herself to his/her audience but also positions
characters in relation to each other within his/her storyline (also Bamberg, 1997). Therefore, the
President’s positioning of LTTE does not function in a vacuum but within the context of the
storyline and the other actors within that storyline. As such, firstly, the positioning of the LTTE
achieves meaning in the President’s speeches only when seen in reference to the government,
armed forces and Tamils. Secondly, the positioning of the LTTE validates and is validated by the
positioning of other characters in the President’s speech which results in a simultaneous
meaning-making process. This two-way process will be uncovered as descriptions of other social
characters are analyzed in the following sections.
4.1.2. The Tamil people

Before the end of the war the President refers to the Tamils as people who have not only been affected by the conflict but also as those who need the help of other sectors of the Sri Lankan population to return to their regular life. Table 3 lists some of the descriptions assigned to Tamils in the President’s speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09 ahinsaka Dhemala janatha:wata hirihaerawi:mata ida nothaba: (60)</td>
<td>…not causing harassment to innocent Tamil people…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the excerpts in Table 3, the President uses referrals (Schiffrin, 2006) such as “innocent Tamil people” and people “who suffered under the grip of terrorism for many years” in reference to the Tamils. This depiction, when seen in line with the description of the LTTE, positions the Tamil people as victims who needed to be rescued from the LTTE. The use of third person pronoun “them” to refer to the Tamils in an imperative statement to listeners (“come forward to bestow them with kindness, friendship and prosperity…””) reveals that ‘them’ (the Tamils) are removed from the audience that is being addressed by this speech. In the prior sentence,


---

4 Although there are large pockets of Tamils who live in the South and the Hill Country, the North and the East of the nation are known to be ‘Tamil’ regions and were the regions out of which the LTTE operated.
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however, the President uses “let us” and “entire nation” to indicate that the audience he is addressing consists of the nation. By using a third person pronoun to refer to the Tamils and referring to “the people of the North and the East” as a community separated from the “entire nation” or “us” that he is addressing, the President engages in an ‘othering’ process. As Pennycook (1994) argues, pronouns “are always involved in struggles over representation” (p. 175). He also posits that when ‘we’ is used, it encompasses both solidarity and rejection as it defines not only an ‘us’ but also implies a ‘them’ in opposition to ‘us’, thereby creating a contrastive relationship where one defines the other. The President creates and maintains this dichotomous relationship when he describes the Tamil people in the above manner by isolating the Tamils from his reference to the entire nation or ‘us’. The strategic use of pronouns, combined with the missive that the President issues to his audience to help those of the North and East to “once again step towards life, happiness and independence/freedom” and show “kindness, friendship and prosperity in both word and deed” results in the positioning of the Tamil community of the North and East as a group that requires charity. Not only does this positioning of the Tamils solidify the President’s positioning of the LTTE as an oppressive force, it also positions the government and armed forces as rescuers.

In the excerpt below, the President continues to position the Tamils of the North and East as victims and reveals how the government and those from the South⁵ are positioned in relation to the Tamils.

____________________

⁵ Southern Sri Lanka is largely populated by the Sinhalese, the ethnic majority of Sri Lanka.
**Free translation**

1. However friends, this victory **cannot only be** a Southern people’s victory.
2. **While** this is a victory of the Southern people, we **must** make it an even greater victory for the Northern people.
3. **When** the Southern people experience relief through the defeat of terrorism, the Northern people **should** feel a sense of comfort.
4. We are already **making arrangements to provide** democratic rights for the people of the Eastern region (who we) rescued from terrorism.
5. We are expeditiously (making arrangements) **to hold elections** to ensure that the people who opened their mouths only to consume food and brush (their) teeth will be able to exercise democratic rights by electing their own representatives.
6. Additionally, we are rapidly **taking towards development** that region which was under extortion by the terrorists.
7. You know that today the Eastern region **is being developed** at a faster rate than the rate at which terrorist strongholds are falling.
8. (We are) accelerating the provision of electricity, water, housing, roads and schools.
9. We want to make the people of the North and East victorious.

The President acknowledges the divide between the North/East and the South when he states that “**while** this is a victory of the Southern people, we **must make it** an even greater victory for the Northern people” (Line 2). His recognition that a victory against the LTTE is implicitly a
victory for those of the South is seen through his use of linguistic strategy in statements such as “cannot only be a Southern people’s victory” (Line 1), “while this is a victory of the Southern people” (Line 2) and “when the Southern people experience relief” (Line 3). The phrases he uses when referring to the Southern people’s reaction to the LTTE’s impending defeat reveal surety and not obligation, compulsion or condition. However, when referring to the Northern people’s reaction he states “the Northern people should feel a sense of comfort” (Line 3). The use of the modal should in this instance make the reaction of the Northern people an expectation which is obligatory. Similarly, stating that “we (the government) must make it an even greater victory for the Northern people” (Line 2), although shifting the obligation to the government, allows no agency for the Northern people. The phrasing and linguistic choices that are made in this excerpt, therefore, reveal the stance that the President adopts towards the Northerners: there is an expectation that they should partake in celebrating the imminent downfall of the LTTE. The reason for this expectation may be ascribed to the government’s efforts to ‘free’ those from the North and East from the LTTE.

Tamils from the North and East continue to be positioned as victims of terrorism and helpless in their state of oppression (Line 5: “the people who opened their mouths only to consume food and brush (their) teeth”), a state of silence in which they were not allowed to voice their own opinions but are only able to attend to their basic needs. The President also points to the efforts his government undertook to rescue and set free the people from the LTTE. The repeated flagging of the government as the agent of action through the use of “we” accompanied by action verbs “making arrangements” (Line 4), “to provide” (Line 4), “to hold… elections” (Line 5), “taking towards development” (Line 6) and “is being developed” (Line 7) indicates the
President’s highlighting of the government’s active involvement in the North and East. The use of the present tense denoted by “we are” also indicates that the agency of the government is current and ongoing, not belonging to the past. The use of “rescued” (Line 4) and “will be able to exercise democratic rights by electing their own representatives” (Line 5) also reveal how the President continues to position the Tamils as victims while depicting the government as playing an agentive role in uplifting the life of the Tamils.

4.1.3. The Sri Lankan armed forces

The President uses adjectives such as “sacrifice” and “dedication” in addition to detailing traits such as perseverance and bravery (“At a time when their fellow soldiers were dying from enemy attacks, did our troops abandon the battle for fear of their lives? No”) to describe the actions of the Sri Lankan armed forces in the speeches delivered prior to the end of the war (see Appendix A Table 1.1 for complete list of descriptions). In the excerpt below, he reveals his positioning of the troops in relation to both the LTTE as well as the Tamil people.

Transliteration


(February 4, 2009)
The dignity of our forces’ heroism of the past has been protected and handed over to the future. It was no easy task to destroy the threat to the unity and independence of the country from the LTTE that was known as the most ruthless terrorist organization in the world. They are creating for us the opportunity to see the dawn of an honorable peace for the motherland. They have sacrificed not only their eyes, hair, flesh, blood but also their very life to bring the dawn of this great historic opportunity to our motherland. Our troops were able to carry forward the battle solely against terrorism with great care so as not to cause harassment to the innocent Tamil people. The dignified peace that is now dawning becomes more unique to us than the peace enjoyed by the people of any other country because it is built on the immeasurable sacrifice of these troops.

In referring to the Sri Lankan troops’ bravery, the President highlights the danger they faced by describing the LTTE as “the most ruthless terrorist organization in the world” (Line 2). By positioning the LTTE as not only ruthless, but also the worst “in the world”, the President implicitly positions the troops as being courageous, fearless and willing to take on the challenge of losing their lives to bring down the threat that the LTTE had posed to the troops’ country. The armed forces’ actions are seen in light of the “unity”, “independence” and “peace” it promises to the country (Line 2: “destroy the threat to the unity and independence of the country”, Line 3: “they are creating for us the opportunity to see the dawn of an honorable peace for the motherland”). Their actions are mentioned as being “no easy task” (Line 3) that require the sacrifice of their “flesh and blood” as well as their “very life” (Line 4). By positioning the LTTE as a threat to the nation’s independence (Line 2: “the threat to the unity and independence of the country from the LTTE”) and the Tamil people as “innocent” victims of the LTTE’s oppressive regime, the President frames the troops as not only heroic and patriotic but sensitive to the Tamil population too (Line 5: “our troops were able to carry forward the battle… with great care so as not to cause harassment to the innocent Tamil people”).

---

6 Sinhala jargon that roughly translates to ‘flesh and blood’ in English.
as not only brave but also sensitive to the Tamil people places them in the role of heroes and enriches the characterization they are given in the President’s storyline, unlike the President’s description of the LTTE and the Tamils which are one-dimensional. The troops’ being likened to historical heroes, an aspect which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5, does not allow for them to be questioned or critiqued as they are situated as safeguarding the sovereignty of the nation.

4.1.4. The government

The President’s representation of his government, similar to depiction of the Sri Lankan armed forces, is presented in a positive light. Multiple references to the government reveal the presence of *we + action verb* constructions such as “we will liberate”, “we will provide”, “we give”, “we chose”, and “we have made” (see Appendix A Table 1.2 for a complete list). Although the tense used in each utterance varies due to the fact that the speeches under analysis were delivered during different periods of time, the *pronoun + action verb* sentence construction highlights active involvement. By utilizing this particular linguistic construction, the President distances his government from the position of an observer and chooses instead to situate them as an agent of action, positioning his government as the agent of political change (“*we will liberate* the North from terrorism and *we will also provide* a political solution, political freedom to the people of that region”), the agent who initiated the defeat of terrorism (“…nobody believed that the terrorists could be defeated. During the past two years *we have made* all this (a) reality in the motherland”) as well as the agent of protecting the nation’s independence (“*we have been able to … safeguard* the unity of our nation”). This move speaks of deliberate self-positioning (van
Langenhove & Harré, 1999) which is achieved here through accentuating the government’s agency.

Pronoun usage is a feature that the President employs strategically in his speeches when referring to the government. Contextual analysis revealed the usage of the following three main recurring types of variations of first person plural *we* (*apa/api*) including *our* (*ape:/apage*), *as our* (*apata*) in speeches:

- *We* the Sri Lankan nation/people
- *We* the government
- Collective *we* blurring the distinction between government and people

Contextual analysis also reveals that in most sections of speech where actions that were taken to lead the nation are mentioned, such as defeating the LTTE or initiating national projects or development, the President uses *we* to refer to his government. This translates into taking credit for actions that were carried out and also implicitly lays the foundation for trust in the government to lead the nation in the future too. In the excerpt below, however, the strategic use of collective *we* when addressing a national audience demonstrates the shared responsibility the President assigns to both the government and the Sri Lankan people in nation-building.

Transliteration
2. Rataka yahapatha naethiyam sangwardhanaya manina minumdhadu atharata methek nowaetuna waedhagath dharshakayak **api** mathukeragena thibenawa:.
5. We, who as a nation are taking steps to make freedom meaningful, have brought forth a very important, decisive factor during the last two years.

6. Our competition should not be among the parties to which we give leadership.

7. Our struggle should not be between the Sinhala, Tamil and Muslim communities.

8. Our disagreements should not be among religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity or Islam.

9. Friends, our battle should be between the past and the future; between wrong and right; between hate and love/kindness.

Free translation

1. **We, who as a nation are taking steps to make freedom meaningful**, have brought forth a very important, decisive factor during the last two years.

2. **We** have brought forth an indicator that has so far never been used to measure a country’s well-being or development.

3. Just as the oil reserves that will in the future be used from the sea off Mannar, and the electricity that will be generated from the Norochcholai and Upper Kotmale power projects, it will have great importance for Sri Lanka in the future.

4. This is none other than the patriotism and love for the country that has emerged among the people of this nation today.

5. **We** must accept as our biggest challenge the need to continue the love that this nation’s people have for the country without allowing it to be subjugated by political party differences, and political interests and continue to be true to the country.

6. **Our** competition should not be among the parties to which we give leadership.

7. **Our** struggle should not be between the Sinhala, Tamil and Muslim communities.

8. **Our** disagreements should not be among religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity or Islam.

9. Friends, **our** battle should be between the past and the future; between wrong and right; between hate and love/kindness.

The President begins to blur the demarcation between **we the Sri Lankan nation** and **we the government** when he makes reference to **we** as the nation (Line 1: “we, who as a nation”) but indexes the government’s action during the last two years (Line 1: “are taking steps to make freedom meaningful, have brought forth a very important, decisive factor during the last two years”). By distorting the demarcation between **we the Sri Lankan nation** and **we the government**, the President shapes another category of **we** in which he makes a collective reference to both the government and the people. This **we** is used strategically in his speeches when the President

---

7 **Mathriya** is a concept from Buddhism that roughly translates to *loving kindness*. 
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shares political successes of the government with the common man (Line 2: “we have brought forth an indicator that has so far never been used to measure a country’s well-being or development”). However, this we usage also divorces from the government the responsibility for future nation-building action and distributes it to the public (Line 5: “we must accept as our biggest challenge…”, Line 6: “our competition should not be among the parties…”, Line 7: “our struggle should not be between… communities”, Line 8: “our disagreements should not be among religions”, Line 9: “our battle should be between the past and the future; between wrong and right; between hate and love/kindness”). Additionally, by shifting towards more general topics such as harmony between ethnic and religious groups which is a concern for not only the government but the people of Sri Lanka too, and thus shifting away from issues directly pertaining to the government’s role such as national development, the President is able to successfully shift responsibility of action to the collective we instead of the government we.

Fetzer and Bull (2008), in discussing pronoun usage during political interviews, argue that shifting self-reference from I to we is a “strategy of over-inclusion” which “shift[s] responsibilities in context, thereby deflecting self’s responsibility to that of a more anonymous, larger group” (p. 281). They also argue, however, that we can index multiple groups. It is interesting to note, therefore, that the President deflects responsibility not from self but from one group (the government) to another (the collective). In other words, in situations where the President speaks of actions his government has taken, the collective we is not used. Instead it is when referring to plans for the future that he blurs the boundary between the government and the Sri Lankan nation to create a sense of shared responsibility. The shifting of duty from the government to the collective community including the Sri Lankan people discloses the diffusion
of accountability for future plans from the government alone and by doing so, allows a loophole for the government to remain blameless if plans fail to be accomplished. The indexing of a collective we, although not as frequently employed as we the people or we the government is utilized mostly when discussing national challenges and nation-building that will be encountered in the future.

4.1.5. The international community

The President’s stance towards the international community during war time speeches is not openly stated, but is revealed in the way he refers to solutions proposed by the international community to the country’s state of crisis. In his speech on February 4, 2009 he states how “various foreign forces attempted to persuade us to accept that the path to achieving peace was to be subjugated by a terrorist organization that had power not only on land, but in the sea, air and held the power of terrorist suicide killers/bombers”. By detailing the strength of the LTTE (“had power not only on land, but in the sea, air and held the power of terrorist suicide killers/bombers”) and defining them as a “terrorist organization” that is a threat to national sovereignty, the President reveals his negative stance towards the advice of international organizations. Contrastive phrases within the same sentence, “accept that the path to achieving peace was to be subjugated by a terrorist organization”, paint two contrastive images: freedom versus domination. By using these contrastive images the President represents the request as being irrational and unreasonable, thereby resisting the international community’s counsel.

At a time when international relations, especially those with Western countries, were strained, the President also positions the international community as having the opportunity to ‘learn’ from Sri Lanka. In the excerpt below, the President positions the nation and subsequently
the international community, thereby revealing his stance on the counsel proposed by international organizations and other countries.

Transliteration

(February 4, 2008)

Free translation
1. Today the civilized world accepts that Sri Lanka is putting a full-stop to world terrorism.
2. The defeat of the most ruthless terrorists in the world in Sri Lanka is also a victory for the developed world, which is also a victim of terrorism.
3. We are also fully committed to carry on this battle while safeguarding human rights.

Making a distinction between “civilized world” (Line 1) and the rest of the world, the President positions only those who are able accept the government’s current efforts to defeat terrorism as belonging to the “civilized world”. The subsequent positioning of the LTTE as a “ruthless terrorist organization” (Line 2) feeds into the image he creates as he positions the LTTE as being savage, barbaric and uncivilized in opposition to the “civilized world” that accepts the nation’s decision to move forward with the war. The President also harnesses global events such as the ‘War on Terror’ campaign underway at the time this speech was delivered to reinforce the idea that the impending defeat of terrorism in Sri Lanka was a victory for other countries too. He also uses the statement “the developed world, which is also a victim of terrorism” (Line 2) to point out that ironically, he and his government were achieving a victory that eluded even the powerful nations of the world. His final statement, “we are also fully committed to carry on this battle while safeguarding human rights” (Line 3), comes in light of
the critiques leveled against the President’s actions which came from many international organizations that were based in the West while reinforcing the idea that the battle against the LTTE will continue (“fully committed to carry on this battle”).

In the section that contains the above excerpt, taken from the speech delivered on February 4, 2008, the President not only positions the international community but also argues for a local solution (see Appendix A Table 1.3 for the entire section from which these lines were extracted). In the sixteen (16) sentences contained within that section, the President uses variations of first person plural pronoun we a total of sixteen (16) times. This is the most concentrated use of we in the entire speech and is significant because of the topic he is speaking on (i.e. foreign ‘interference’ in local issues). The questions brought up by the international community regarding the upholding of human rights fuels the display of national identity in the section where the President speaks of the international community, exhibiting not only a frame that protects and rationalizes the government’s decisions but also sets the international community as an outsider or ‘they’ to ‘us’ (see Pennycook, 1994). Although third person plural ‘they’ is not used to set up this distinction, the intensive use of ‘we’ shown by the number of times ‘we’ is used in this section, indicates that a national identity is set up in opposition to the international community, revealing the subtle resistance posed by the President to the international community regarding their recommendations on the ethnic conflict.

The President’s positioning of the international community before the end of the war is both accepting and distancing at the same time. While grateful for international aid and support, he is tentative in accepting political solutions proposed by international bodies and insists on a local solution, thus maintaining a distance between ‘them’ and the nation ‘us’. Additionally, he
sees the solutions proposed by international organizations as threatening the sovereignty of the nation, a characteristic that will be discussed in Chapter 5 where the metanarrative that the President adopts in dealing with the conflict is analyzed.

4.2. Storylines used to position social actors during the latter stages of the war

Storylines employed by participants can be negotiated throughout the conversation, resulting in the presence of an array of storylines that evolve as actors are positioned in relation to each other in a conversation. Although the speeches under scrutiny may be studied for several storylines, the main narrative being proposed, or the metanarrative being issued is the focus of study in this paper. While analysts have looked at how metanarratives may be traced across conversations, creating intertextual references across conversational boundaries (Schiffrin, 2006; Georgakopolou, 2006; Castillo Ayometzi, 2003) others have also looked at how stories in, for example the media, can be traced to ‘big D’ Discourses (Gee, 1990) that are present in society (van Dijk 1991, 1998b; Blommaert & Verschueren, 1991; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). It is along the lines of the latter that the storyline being studied in this paper falls. Although the complete metanarrative that is being constructed will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5 as it unfolds only in the victory speech delivered on May 19, 2009, using the positioning of social actors that the President has employed, the strands that form this metanarrative are gleaned through war time speeches. It is these components that will be discussed in this section.

Fig. 2 illustrates the storylines pursued by the President in his war time speeches in 2008 and 2009. It illustrates the different storylines pursued in relation to the main social actors and is discussed below.
As discussed in Section 4.1.1 and illustrated above, the President’s positioning of the LTTE, which is presented as a ruthless terrorist organization as well as an oppressive force that quelled Tamil leadership, victimized the Tamil community, and created a culture of terror and fear in the entire country, when seen in conjunction with descriptions of the Tamil community, a suppressed, victimized community that was silenced by the LTTE’s claim of being their sole representative, creates an *oppressor-victim* storyline. The Sri Lankan armed forces, while being referred to as brave and heroic, are also positioned as selflessly sacrificing their lives to rescue the people of the North and East while the government is positioned as not only caring for the well-being of the entire nation including those in the North and East but also as firm in its decision to end terrorism that is described as a separatist phenomenon that challenges national unity. In addition to the *oppressor-victim* storyline, by positioning the government and the troops in the above manner the President also introduces a *rescuer-rescued* storyline that depicts the government and the troops as rescuers of the Tamils from the North and East. The President’s positioning of the international community as aiding the nation while also questioning the government’s decision to proceed with military action against the LTTE and suggesting solutions that are received by the government as ‘foreign’ and non-local, allows the President to issue a
local sovereignty-foreign influence storyline that reveals the President’s perception of the international community’s involvement and suggestions as going against the nation’s independence. While the oppressor-victim, rescuer-rescued and local sovereignty-foreign influence storylines help in making sense of the manner in which each actor is positioned by the President, the ‘historical lens’ metanarrative described in Chapter 5 encompasses all these threads thereby making one overarching, explanatory narrative that can be seen as the schema (van Dijk, 1998a) the President draws from in perceiving and discursively producing the conflict. This schema incorporates not only the President’s descriptions of the main social actors but also the storylines he issues to trace the actors’ relationship to each other.

This chapter detailed the positions the President adopted towards the main social actors in his description of the ethnic conflict during the latter stages of the war. By examining his speeches on February 4, 2008 and February 4, 2009, I described the way in which the President positioned the LTTE, the Tamils, the Sri Lankan armed forces, the government and the international community in relation to each other. I also described the storylines that the President issued to anchor his positioning of social actors, noting that in Chapter 5 these storylines merge to form one metanarrative. This chapter, therefore, forms the ‘war schema’ that the President draws from; in Chapters 5 and 6 I will investigate whether there is a continuation of this schema by examining the President’s positioning of the same social actors as well as the storylines he adopts.
Chapter 5: Announcing the end of the war: the ‘historical lens’ storyline

In this chapter I discuss the metanarrative that informs the President’s victory speech delivered on May 19, 2009 as a storyline with which the President’s positioning of the main social actors will be interpreted. As such, following the discussion of this metanarrative, I reveal the positions that social actors are given in Section 5.1, followed by a brief discussion in Section 5.2 of how this metanarrative encompasses the storylines traced through the President’s speeches in Chapter 4. Section 5.3 briefly discusses dominant metaphors and imagery the President presents in this speech, examining which ones are taken up for continuation. The chapter closes with a discussion of the solution to national socio-cultural issues proposed by the President in Section 5.4. In a close analysis of the President’s presentation of a ‘local’ solution, this section inquires whether the President’s solution speaks to reconciliation or whether it draws on discriminatory discourse.

The speech announcing the end of the war on May 19, 2009 was delivered to an immediate audience that comprised Ministers of Parliament as it was delivered at the Parliament. However, being the official ‘end of war’ announcement by the President, the speech was telecast live on national television, extending the listenership to incorporate the Sri Lankan nation. The President issues a short storyline-argument towards the beginning of his speech remembering ancient Sri Lankan history and this reminiscence provides a lens through which the content of his speech may be interpreted. His argument is as follows:

Transliteration
1. Kathaanayakathumani, loke ithamathma dharunuma thrasthawa:dhin paraajaya-kerja membandgu abimanawath jayagrahanayak laba-gaththe kohomada kiyanakaaranaya me aithihaasika dinaye vimasaabaelieeyuthuwa-thibbenewa.
2. Api(ta) dheerga ithihaasayak thibenne (unclear).
3. Rajawaru ekasiya asu: dhekak (182) rajakela warsha dhedha:s pansiyakatath (2,500) wadaa
  anagibawaneewaya raajjya pawathawaagane giye ratak.
4. Dhutugamunu, Walagamba, Vijayabahu weni rajawarun sathuru aakramana abibawa
  swaadheenathwaya thahawurukara ratak.
5. Datiya, Pitiya, Palayamara, Siva, Elara veni aakramnikayanta erehiwa atheetheye satan-kelaathmen,
  lowa adhirajjya godanangwo Prathugeesita, Lanndhe:sinta, Engreesinta erehiwa satanwedwa purudhu
  raajjyak.
6. Mayadunne palaweni Rajasinghe, Wimaladharmasuriya weni rajawarun waagama Weera Keppetipola,
   Weera Purannappu weni weerawarayan adhiraajjawaadhin-tee erehiwa kere satan ma: sshipath-
   kelayuthuwa-thibenawa.
7. Me anagibawaneeyabawa raekagath itihaasaya pilibandawa soya baeleemedee apata pennena podhu
   karunak thibenawa.
8. Enam, upambime janathaawa eksathwa sitine-thak kall kisidhu baahira sathurekuta me rata yatath-kera
   gatha nohaakiweema.
10. Esesa, kisidu melechcha ho ekadhipathi palanayak me bime sthaapitha-kireemata nohaekibawa
    apata paeminena anek podhu saadhakayai.
11. Ma:ge maaththru boomiya itihaaseyee kisidhuwitate aththuno:mathika ho: melechcha paalanayakata
    idak nodhee aparajithawa satanweda thibenawa.
12. Adhata pamanak novei mathu-mathuth embendu melechche aakramnikayanta erehiwa satan-wadineta
    apata awashiyaa shakthiya edibala labaadhun e atheetha weeruwanta me mohothey mage pranaamaya
    pudhakela-yuthui.
13. LTTE thrasthawadhin 1975-dhi Yapanaye nagaraadhipathiwarayaawa maraadhaala: rata dhekata-
    kireeme gamana aaramba kela.

(May 19, 2009)

Free translation
1. Honorable Speaker, on this historic day the issue of how the most ruthless terrorist group in the world
   was defeated and such a proud victory was obtained must be inquired into.
2. We have a long history.
3. Ruled by a hundred and eighty two (182) kings, it was a country that was reigned majestically for
   more than two thousand five hundred (2,500) years.
4. A country where kings such as Dutugemunu, Walagamba and Vijayabahu overcame enemy invasions
   and ensured independence.
5. As (it) fought against invaders such as Datiya, Pitiya, Palayamara, Siva and Elara in ancient times, it
   is a kingdom that is used to fighting against (those who) built world empires like the Portuguese,
   Dutch and British.
6. I must remember the battles waged against the colonizers (by) kings such as Rajasinghe I of
   Mayadunne and Wimaladharmasuriya as well as heroes like Weera Keppetipola and Weera Purannappu.
7. When this history that was protected majestically is searched, there is a common factor that we see.
8. That is, as long as the birth-land’s people stand united, (the fact that) no external enemy can subdue
   this land.
9. That is common truth.

8 Weera translated to hero in English.
10. Similarly, another common factor that we derive is that no barbaric/savage or dictatorship government can be established on this land.

11. My motherland has never in history allowed arbitrary or barbaric/savage rule and has fought undefeated (against these).

12. I must express my gratitude to those ancient heroes who gave us the strength, bravery to fight against such barbaric/savage invaders not only today but repeatedly.

13. In 1975, the LTTE terrorists killed the mayor of Jaffna and began their journey to divide the land into two.

The President introduces the ‘historical lens’ storyline as one that explains the defeat of the LTTE (Line 1: “the issue of how the most ruthless terrorist group in the world was defeated… must be inquired into”) which is immediately followed by launching into the country’s history (Line 2: “we have a long history”) that is celebrated and venerated in his narrative. The details used to describe the country’s historical leadership (Line 3: “a hundred and eighty two kings”, Line 3: “reigned… for more than two thousand five hundred years”) aid in setting up the length of the tradition the President is leading up to in his speech. By referring to the length of the country’s leadership, its historical value and reinforcing it with numerical and named detail, the President seems to establish an interesting argument: he positions his argument as historically-based and irrefutable. Framing it as historic also implicitly validates it as authentic and national, in spite of the construction of this history being made by the speaker himself. It is also noteworthy that the President establishes his storyline as historically-based and therefore true prior to delivering it, thereby choosing to annul any questions of credibility that might arise beforehand.

The President uses two fundamental people groups to issue his storyline: national leaders of the past, including kings of ancient Sri Lanka as well as heroes who fought against colonialism, and the invaders, Indian invaders of ancient Sri Lanka and the colonizers from the West. The reference to “invasion” and “invaders” reveals that these characters are positioned as
threats to national sovereignty and the unity of the country. Those who fought against the invaders, be it ancient kings who fought against Indian invaders (Line 4-5: “kings such as Dutugemunu, Walagamba and Vijayabahu overcame enemy invasions and ensured independence… [and] fought against invaders such as Datiya, Pitiya, Palayamara, Siva and Elara”) or national leaders who fought against the colonizers (Line 6: “kings such as Rajasinghe I of Mayadunne and Wimaladharmasuriya as well as heroes like Weera Keppetipola and Weera Purannappu”), are positioned in both history and the President’s speech as protectors of the “motherland”. Throughout the story, the President positions the “land” as being the focal point of assuring national independence. From the beginning of the storyline, he highlights the land as the fighting force that wards off invaders (Line 3: “… it was a country that was reigned…”, Line 4: “a country where kings such… overcame enemy invasions and ensured independence”, Line 5: “it is a kingdom that is used to fighting against…”). Therefore, the land takes on its own identity in repelling repeated invasions and ancient kings and national heroes are seen as protecting this identity of the land. As ancient Sri Lanka was an agrarian community with kings being remembered for their contribution to agriculture and religion, the symbolic identity of the land that the President draws on is linked to the importance of land to ancient Sri Lanka. The President’s closing arguments prove the centrality of the land to his narrative (i.e. Line 8: “… no external enemy can subdue this land”, Line 11: “my motherland has never in history allowed…”), ensuring that the land continues to take primary position throughout his storyline. Additionally, those who attempt to invade the land are described as “barbaric/savage” and establishing a “dictatorship” and “arbitrary” rule. This argument forms a metanarrative that not only encompasses previous storylines but also acts as the overarching narrative which dictates the positioning of social actors of the ethnic conflict (i.e. the LTTE, the Tamils, the government,
the armed forces, and the international community) as mirroring the positioning of the metanarrative’s social actors (i.e. ancient kings, national leaders, invaders and colonizers).

Speaking as a representative is one way in which Tan and Moghaddam (1999) argue that a speaker connects his voice with the voice of the group. They also state that by taking on the voice of a representative, s/he speaks on behalf of the group. The President, by speaking as Head of State, speaks on behalf of the Parliament and the people of Sri Lanka. Therefore, when he constructs an ingroup (ancient rulers, national heroes, the current government and the armed forces) and an outgroup (Indian invaders, colonizers and the LTTE), the President speaks not only for himself but also as a representative of the Sri Lankan people. In other words, his position as representative of the Sri Lankan people allows him to signal these positions by comparing an existing group narrative (Sri Lankan history) to an on-going narrative (the conflict). The President’s position as representative also strengthens the comparison he makes between history and the present, reiterating that he ‘speaks for the group’, thereby presenting his viewpoint as the perspective of the group.

5.1. Positioning social actors immediately following the end of the war

In this section, I examine the President’s positioning of the LTTE, the Tamil people, the armed forces, the government and the international community during his victory speech immediately following the end of the war. While this section contains only brief excerpts from the speech, Appendix B holds all the excerpts in which these social actors are referred to. This section also takes into consideration the way in which the President positioned these social actors in relation to each other in Chapter 4 which dealt with positioning during the latter stages of the
war. In light of the discussion in Chapter 4, this section asks whether there is a shift in positioning or whether the construction of the ‘historical lens’ narrative only serves to strengthen existing positions.

5.1.1. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam

The President links the metanarrative he established to more recent political history by immediately following up his story with a reference to the beginning of the LTTE’s journey to power (Line 13 of metanarrative excerpt: “In 1975, the LTTE terrorists killed the mayor of Jaffna and began their journey to divide the land into two”). The metanarrative analyzed above gives perspective to this statement, allowing the President to implicitly position the LTTE as invaders of the land by pointing to the beginning of their ascent to power as a “journey to divide the land into two”. Additionally, the positioning of “us”, indicating the current government and the armed forces it commands, as having learnt from forefathers to repel invasions (Line 12 of metanarrative excerpt: “those ancient heroes who gave us the strength, bravery to fight against such barbaric/savage invaders not only today but repeatedly”), depicts the government and the armed forces as mirroring the actions of ancient kings and heroes who fought to protect the motherland. In other words, by issuing a storyline that implicitly casts the LTTE as invaders and the government and armed forces as ancient heroes, the President frames the conflict, specifically the latter stages of the conflict, as a war to protect the land. Although the President lists the activities of the LTTE that position them as a terrorist organization, he states that the most dangerous aspect of their demands was the claim for a separate State (“The most fearful thing was the separation and writing of a huge portion of this country, this land through a deed to this destructive terrorist organization”, “The terrorists marked the area that should
belong to them on the map of Sri Lanka and worked continuously to establish the Eelam state’), an act that implicitly allows them to be positioned as invaders who claimed the land for their own, calling for a battle to drive them away and protect the country (see Appendix B Table 2.1 for complete list of descriptions). This statement further solidifies their position as invaders who not only claimed a section of the country but had also accumulated wealth and power (‘I don’t know if there is anyone who is able to measure their assets even today’) and had become a threat to the nation due to their aim of creating a divided State (‘… there were Tiger police, there were Tiger courts, there were Tiger banks in the North and East. What was missing was only a Tiger Parliament’), thereby validating the action that the President took against them in the form of a military operation.

5.1.2. The Tamil people

The President continues to position the Tamils of the North and East as “helpless” and “innocent” but also as being opposed to violence (“The Tamil people were never a people who placed (their) faith in weapons”). By using a series of rhetorical questions (“When did it happen in the history of the Tamil people that the Tamil people who have a great history are today in a very helpless and tragic state due to the terrorists of the LTTE and parents forced their young daughters to get pregnant to save them from being dragged into war? Who was it that dragged Tamil children who are protected by the Goddess Pattini to this state?”) the President reveals the oppression that the Tamils have undergone at the hands of the LTTE while also positioning the LTTE as suppressing the very people whom they claim to represent. Therefore, the positioning that the President adopts towards the Tamil people, like the LTTE, remains the same as the positioning he adopted towards them during the war.
A more prominent feature in the positioning taken up by the President towards the Tamils is the exhaustive portrayal of them through the government’s perspective. The excerpts below, which are taken from different sections of the speech, provide some examples of this perspective.

Transliteration


3. Apeta uwamana:, upadhes pamanak nowei me: janatha:wata yahapath jeewithayak laba:dhenga awarsha sahagogeyai.


Free translation
1. Similarly, when we see the faces of the innocent Tamil people who are fleeing from the Puthumaththalan area, we realize that a document offered on a tray as a political solution is not a final solution. Therefore, after freeing the Tamil people from the LTTE’s terrorism we accept a responsibility that no government in the history of Sri Lanka has accepted.

2. I request you to compare the life of the people in the East three years ago with (their) life today.

3. We need not only advice but cooperation to bring a good life to these people.

4. In the past several decades those people did not have a right to a meaningful life; the right to freedom; the right to development. I shall give all of that to those people. We accept that responsibility.

In the excerpts above the President is performing the identity of Head of State as the speech from which these excerpts are drawn is delivered in the Parliament primarily to a Parliamentary audience which creates the context for this identity to take precedence. As such, while the President speaks for himself, he also speaks for his government. In all these examples,
the President uses the Tamil people to exemplify the noteworthy actions that his government has taken and requests support for their actions (Excerpt 1: “after freeing the Tamil people from the LTTE’s terrorism we accept a responsibility that no government in the history of Sri Lanka has accepted”, Excerpt 2: “compare the life of the people in the East three years ago with (their) life today”, Excerpt 3: “we need … cooperation to bring a good life to these people”). Additionally, his pronominal reference to the Tamil people shifts to “those/these people” and not “our” people. In the final excerpt a tone of condescension is maintained as the President depicts the life of the Tamils as a life of loss (Excerpt 4: “… did not have a right to a meaningful life; the right to freedom; the right to development”) and portrays himself as the ‘giver’ or ‘restorer’ of the Tamils’ lives (Excerpt 4: “I shall give all of that to those people”). In this excerpt, the distance created by the President’s pronominal choice (those people versus I/we) in addition to the portrayal of the Tamils’ loss in juxtaposition to the President’s acceptance of responsibility to make their lives ‘better’ marks this statement as one of condescension. It also successfully positions the Tamils as helpless, vulnerable victims who are looking to be rescued while positioning the President and his government as benevolent, gracious patrons. This intentional other positioning (van Langenhove & Harré, 1999) of the Tamil people as victims continues to position them as non-agentive, successfully removing any opinions they might have on their circumstances.

5.1.3. The Sri Lankan armed forces

While the President continues to honor the sacrifices made by the Sri Lankan armed forces, in light of the metanarrative delivered at the beginning of the speech under analysis, their actions obtain greater significance in being seen as contributing to the struggle for independence.
The troops continue to be positioned as brave and courageous but the military operation they undertook is referred to as “freedom struggle” as well as “humanitarian operation”, both of which fit within the President’s historic storyline of a battle for independence. The reference to the military operation that concluded in May 2009 as a battle for freedom aligns the troops with the kings and heroes of early Sri Lankan history, painting them not only as rescuers of the Tamils in the North but also as defenders of independence.

5.1.4. The government

The government (see Appendix B Table 2.4 for a list of descriptions), similar to the armed forces, is described as the rescuers who won the hearts of the Tamils (“Their hearts have been won by us who liberated them from that slavery”), and compassionate (“even the terrorist leaders who were killed yesterday, until yesterday, ate and drank the food and drink supplied through the government”). However, the President continues to depict the Tamil people as being provided for by the government. The government is also positioned as taking up a challenge and fulfilling it (“Therefore, (what we) took over in 2005 was a country with grave challenges”, “after freeing the Tamil people from the LTTE’s terrorism we accept a responsibility that no government in the history of Sri Lanka has accepted”), traits that the President uses to highlight the dependability and strength of the government. He uses this positioning to further indicate that the government is able to fulfill the challenge of re-building and developing the country (“Time has raised a new challenge before us. It is the challenge of building the motherland … Just as I accepted this (earlier) challenge, I also accept that (new) challenge”). In light of the ‘historical lens’ metanarrative provided by the President, the government is directly likened to King Dutugemunu (“According to the prior tradition established by kings such as King Dutugemunu,
we should honor even the enemy that has surrendered or been killed. That is a quality of greatness that is found not only in the government, but also in the people of this country”). This comparison of the government with ancient kings aligns with the argument made previously that the President positions not only the troops but also the government as shadowing the actions and motivations of historic figures who fought against foreign invasions.

5.1.5. The international community

When analyzed in line with the metanarrative that the President adopts in this speech, his positioning of the international community becomes more apparent (see Appendix B Table 2.5 for complete list of descriptions). The international community is described as having been fearful of the LTTE (“Even the powerful countries of the world showed helplessness before the terrorists; some countries shook and fell on their knees before (the) terrorists”), and the suggestions they make are seen contemptuously by the President (“They ask us to look after our own Tamil people well”, “We … do not need advice regarding how we treat our helpless people”). The rejection of the international community’s advice is based on a we-them dichotomy that presupposes that ‘they’ (the outsiders) are not entitled to a say in the matter that deals with ‘us’. This perception reinforces the President’s idea that the international community is an outsider who threatens the sovereignty of the country. In light of the President’s metanarrative, the international community is also seen as an invading force that needs to be guarded against. As most of the advice that the President refers to in this speech arose from Western nations, it may be argued that in his storyline the President continues to see the international community as a shadow of the colonizers who invaded the nation and ruled over it for more than three hundred years. The resistance to the international community’s counsel
therefore seems to arise from the President’s perception of them as colonial powers and himself and his government as the nation’s historical heroes who fought for independence.

5.2. Storylines used to position social actors immediately following the end of the war

The President’s use of a metanarrative in this speech subsumes his earlier use of the three rescuer-rescued, oppressor-victim and local sovereignty-international influence storylines. In other words, the President’s “historical lens” narrative not only encompasses all these storylines but reiterates the positions that it supports. Fig. 3 illustrates the original storylines illustrated in Chapter 4 overlaid by the storyline and actors of the metanarrative.

As shown by the grey-shaded areas which indicate the metanarrative that the President delivers in the speech under scrutiny in this chapter, the “historic lens” narrative serves to emphasize and reiterate the storylines presented in Chapter 4. It is also interesting to note that except for the Tamil people, the President provides shadow characters for all other social actors, thereby making his metanarrative illustrative of the ethnic conflict. By referring to the Indian invaders, the President draws from general beliefs that the Tamil ethnic group does not have a
legitimate claim to the land due to its Indian roots. Although the President does not depict the Tamil people as invaders, he depicts the LTTE, which claimed it was the sole representative of the Tamil people, as invaders. The international community, which is considered as being West-centric, is likened to the empires that colonized Sri Lanka. Similarly, the government is likened to ancient kings and rulers while the armed forces are compared to national heroes. These characterizations form the invader-protector storyline that not only highlights the “historical lens” metanarrative but also enhances the storylines already present, giving them renewed meaning through national history. In other words, the President’s metanarrative serves to parallel his narrative of the conflict to other acclaimed historical events while maintaining the storylines that prevailed during his war time speeches.

Having established that the metanarrative delivered by the President encompasses and emphasizes his previous storylines, Section 5.3 discusses imagery and metaphor present in the President’s victory speech. This section briefly points to the President’s use of metaphor to complement his metanarrative before examining the ‘local’ solution proposed by the President in Section 5.4. In that section the President’s discourse is examined for inclusion and accommodation of minority groups in his rhetoric, which, if present, would signal the presence of reconciliation discourse.

5.3. Imagery and metaphor

Metaphor, according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (p.5, their emphasis). Using linguistic expression as a tool, the source domain is mapped onto the target domain, thereby reshaping one concept onto another. Using linguistic cues, Hodges (2011) points to “terrorism is war” and “terrorism is
crime” as two metaphors in President Bush’s post-9/11 speeches. In President Rajapaksa’s May 19, 2009 speech which was discussed at length in the previous sections of this chapter, the image of the conflict as a struggle for national independence is suggested through the President’s use of the ‘historical lens’ argument made at the beginning of the speech. Another closely related image that the President uses in the same speech is the image of the LTTE’s actions as subjugation and slavery. The President positions the war against the LTTE as a struggle against slavery and a war for freedom, an image that he creates with the use of phrases such as “LTTE had gained control over”, “fell on their knees before (the) terrorists”, “being dragged into war”, “liberated them from that slavery”, and “people who were under the LTTE”. These phrases elicit schemata (van Dijk, 1998a) of slavery that the President uses to create the image of war against the LTTE as a struggle for freedom from slavery.

Terrorism is also likened to “a venomous serpent that combines the most dangerous qualities from politics, economics, science and all subjects in the world”. “Venomous serpent” triggers an image of death and danger. Therefore, using this image to depict terrorism as deathly and dangerous in addition to seeing it as a combination of the “dangerous qualities” of the world’s disciplines creates a terrorizing image. The image of a serpent also evokes an image of an unexpected threat and one that somebody never knows when it will strike, an image that maps well onto the LTTE’s guerrilla-type attacks on unsuspecting targets. Of these two types of metaphors, the President’s use of ‘war is freedom/independence’ is most prevalent throughout his February 2008, February 2009 and May 2009 speeches, indicating that the President’s positioning of social actors continues past the latter stages of the war at least into the immediate
post-war speech celebrating victory. Discussion of whether or not this phenomenon is carried into post-war speech of February 2010, 2011 and 2012 will be presented in Chapter 6.

5.4. The local solution: is it inclusive?

In this section, I discuss the President’s ‘local’ solution, analyzing it for discourse that translates into inclusion of ethnic communities. I understand the presence of such discourse as signaling openness which would index reconciliation discourse. This speech (May 19, 2009) is analyzed for inclusive discourse as it is the speech bridging war and post-war contexts, and could, therefore, present the beginnings of ‘reconciliation schema’. An analysis of the solution that the President proposes in light of his ‘historical lens’ metanarrative, however, reveals hidden aspects of ethnic tension that provides a deeper insight into the storyline itself. The excerpt below is taken from the President’s speech discussing the ‘local’ solution that he proposes.

Transliteration
2. Ese:ma owunnta awarsha dheshapa:lana wisandhuma apa wisin ikmaninma laba:dheeyuthuwa thibenawa:.
3. E:th , eya pita ratin laba: ganna wisandhumak nowei.
5. Ema nisa:, ape:mawoo dhesaye wisandhumak apa laba:dheeyuthuwa thibenawa:.(applause)
10. Apeta eya puluwang.
Free translation
1. Honorable Speaker, we need to give these people the democratic freedom that is the right of people in all other parts of this country.
2. Similarly, we need to swiftly provide the political solution they need.
3. However, it cannot be an imported/foreign solution.
4. We do not have the time to experiment with the solutions suggested by other countries.
5. Therefore, we must provide our own nation’s solution. (applause)
6. It should be a solution that is acceptable to all sections of the people.
7. We expect support from the foreign countries, not impediments.
8. Should the international community doubt our capability and dedication to find this solution, when we have successfully overcome a challenge that no one was able to?
9. No.
10. We can do it.
11. I strongly believe that we who own the valued qualities of mettha, karuna, muditha and upeksha\(^9\) of Buddhist philosophy can present a solution based on these that will be both a relief and an example to the world. (applause)

This excerpt begins with the President alerting his listeners to the need for “democratic freedom” for the Tamils who are referred to with a distancing third person pronoun (Line 1: “these people”, Line 2: “they”). He then stresses the need for a local solution as opposed to a ‘foreign’ one, thereby rejecting the international community’s counsel and proposed solutions (Line 4: “We do not have the time to experiment with the solutions suggested by other countries”), a statement that is greeted by applause from the audience which signals that those in Parliament are in agreement with the President.

In Line 11, the President proposes that the local solution that he speaks of is influenced by the “valued qualities of mettha, karuna, muditha and upeksha of Buddhist philosophy”. Buddhism, which is generally considered the religion of the Sinhalese majority in Sri Lanka, has enjoyed State support since the time of early history and is commonly considered to be the State

\(^9\) Mettha may be translated as loving kindness, karuna as compassion, muditha as rejoicing in others’ joy and upeksha as equanimity.
religion of Sri Lanka. Additionally, it is also to this religious group that a majority of the government belong. The mention of Buddhist philosophy in the President’s speech as a local solution only becomes significant when seen in light of Sri Lanka’s ethno-religious culture. The LTTE proclaimed a strongly Tamil-Hindu identity, while ‘the West’ which is seen as comprising a large part of the international community given the nation’s colonial baggage, is identified as being Anglo-Christian. The President’s decision to highlight a local solution as being a Buddhist solution, thereby disregarding Hinduism, Islam and Christianity that are practiced by minority communities in Sri Lanka, points to his alignment with majoritarian ideology. Additionally, the President’s positioning of the LTTE as invaders feeds into common discriminatory beliefs that the Tamils are invaders who settled on Lankan soil. Although the President positions only the LTTE as invaders and not the Tamils, the ideology his solution supports seems to speak otherwise. Likewise, his depiction of the international community’s solution as a threat to national sovereignty reinforces the idea that the President sees them as a colonial force in his storyline.

As pointed out by De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012), in analyzing media discourse “journalists present events within largely implicit mental models… that usually reflect tacit assumptions about, and shared understandings of, the world… [that] contribute to the perpetuation of ideological assumptions and values that have become naturalized” (p. 144). While not being media discourse, as seen from the excerpt above, the President also produces the same discourse of discrimination and exclusion through his speeches. In a study that looked at

---

10 Article 9 of the Sri Lankan constitution states that “The Republic of Sri Lanka shall give to Buddhism the foremost place and accordingly it shall be the duty of the State to protect and foster the Buddha Sasana, while assuring to all religions the rights granted by Articles 10 and 14(l)[e]”.

69
the legitimization of inequalities between indigenous and non-indigenous people groups in Australia, Augostinos, LeCouteur and Soyland (2002) found that common-sense arguments that are used in society are also used to legitimize discriminatory practices at government-level. Similarly, van Dijk (1987) reveals that discrimination in everyday talk and political rhetoric influences each other’s arguments. Likewise, although the President uses inclusive discourse to appear non-discriminatory, by fronting a Buddhist solution as a local resolution, he implicitly undercuts his own argument and draws from everyday talk to establish a majoritarian solution to the crisis that excludes and denies the input of minority communities.

In this chapter I examined the metanarrative presented by the President and in light of this, discussed the positioning of the main social actors in the President’s speech that was delivered immediately following the conclusion of the war. The metanarrative revealed the President’s use of historical figures as shadow figures for his positioning of actors in the ethnic conflict, thereby reiterating the ingroup-outgroup distinction of the ethnic conflict’s actors. I found that this served to enhance the positions of social actors and emphasized the storylines present in war time speeches. Additionally, I found that there was a lack of reconciliation discourse in this speech, which coupled with the President’s positioning of social actors, suggests that he continues to draw from ‘war schema’ in this speech too. Using these findings, Chapter 6 will inquire whether there is a shift in the President’s positioning of social actors as well as in the storylines and metanarrative he pursues. Moreover, it will also inquire whether a shift in positioning leads to a transition from ‘war schema’ into ‘reconciliation schema’.
Chapter 6: Post-war discourse

The end of the civil war marked the end of an era in Sri Lankan history and in this section the analysis continues to focus on the President’s speeches during Independence days in 2010, 2011 and 2012, a three year period following the end of conflict. Section 6.1 will examine the President’s positioning of the main social actors described thus far (i.e. the LTTE, the Tamils, the Sri Lankan armed forces, the government and the international community) in comparison to the President’s positioning of the same actors during war time speeches and in his immediate post-war celebratory speech. Section 6.2 examines the President’s storylines in post-war context and Section 6.3 will examine how the ‘historical lens’ metanarrative is transformed into the claiming of a royal identity by the President, followed by a discussion in Section 6.4 on reconciliation discourses present in these post-war speeches.

6.1. Positions adopted: is there any change in positioning social actors?

In this section I discuss the ways in which the President portrays the LTTE, the Tamils, the armed forces, the government and the international community in his post-war speeches. As I found that the characterization of these actors remained the same as their depiction in speeches delivered during the latter stages of the war (February 4, 2008 and February 4, 2009) and the victory speech of May 19, 2009, the discussions in this section will be brief.

6.1.1. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam

The President’s positioning of the LTTE remains constant across his speeches and overflows into his post-conflict speeches too. Although the LTTE and terrorism are mentioned fewer times in his post-war speeches, whenever terrorism is mentioned it continues to be
depicted as fear-inducing ("My people were constantly alert for thirty years because of terrorism") and a threat to the people of the country ("… the lives lost to the nation during thirty years of terrorism"), the end of which is seen as relief (see Appendix C Table 3.1 for a list of references to the LTTE in post-war speeches). However, the President’s alignment of some local and international groups as ‘destabilizing’ national unity alongside the LTTE is an interesting aspect that will be detailed in Section 6.1.5 when references to the international community are discussed. While it was known that the LTTE received funding and support from diaspora and supporters living abroad, this clustering of local and international organizations that disagree with the government’s and President’s efforts towards nation-building with terrorism conforms to the President’s ‘historical lens’ storyline in associating all who disagree with the government as invaders who seek to destroy the nation’s unity.

6.1.2. The Tamil people

The President’s positioning of the Tamils, like the LTTE, remain similar in post-war speeches (see complete list of descriptions in Appendix C Table 3.2). As seen in the excerpt below, the President positions their life as a ‘life of loss’ from which the government freed them.

Transliteration
1. Wasara thihak thisse: pajathanthrawa:dhaya ahimi woowa Uthura saha Naegenahira janatha:wa dhukwindha bhawa oba dhannawa:.
2. Owunta pajathanthrawa:dhaya laba: dhenna apita puluwan wuna:.

(February 4, 2010)

Free translation
1. You know that the people of the North and East suffered for thirty years without democracy.
2. We were able to grant them democracy.
3. That is the greatest victory we have achieved in the recent past.
Those from the North and East are described as having “suffered for thirty years without democracy” (Line 1) with the verb “suffered” marking the continuation of the rescuer-rescued storyline that was present in the President’s war time speeches. The phrase “without democracy” also indicates the opposition of the LTTE to the upholding of a democratic government. However, it is the following sentence that fully uncovers the President’s positioning of the Tamils in relation to himself and his government. By stating that “we were able to grant them democracy” (Line 2), the President continues to position the government taking on an agentive role while the Tamils are subsequently positioned as receivers or non-agents, a characteristic that also falls in line with the position of victim that the President ascribes to the Tamils. Stating that ‘freeing’ the Tamils was “the greatest victory we have achieved in the past” (Line 3), the President shifts his focus away from the Tamils and towards the victory that “we”, the government, achieved, thereby centralizing the government rather than the Tamils.

In each of the speeches delivered on February 4, 2009, May 19, 2009 and February 4, 2010, the President directly addresses the Tamil-speaking community of Sri Lanka in a short section where he code-switched from Sinhala to Tamil. His code-switch marks the Tamil people as his audience. Except for these utterances, the President does not accommodate or take on the voice of the Tamil community anywhere else in his speeches. Even in the short sections in which the President code-switches to Tamil, he used inclusive discourse signaled by the use of ‘we the Sri Lankan people’. Moreover, the pronoun “we” and phrase “all of us” were used at a higher rate in the Tamil sections than in the rest of his speech delivered in Sinhala. This overuse of inclusive discourse when addressing the Tamil-speaking community, as well as the fact that a majority of the speeches are delivered in Sinhala, reiterates that the President’s audience
excludes Tamil-speaking communities, thereby indicating the implicit differentiation of one community over another, a trait that speaks against the ‘one nation’ concept that the President would want to create in post-war Sri Lanka.

6.1.3. The Sri Lankan armed forces

The Sri Lankan armed forces, although mentioned a fewer number of times than in other speeches, continue to be portrayed as national heroes (See complete list of descriptions in Appendix C Table 3.3). Referring expressions such as “soldiers who sacrificed their eyes, hair, flesh and blood as well as (their) lives for freedom” and “soldiers who dedicated themselves unto death to drive away terrorism” are some of the descriptions given to the troops in post-war speeches. Keeping in line with the President’s positioning of them during the latter stages of the war it reveals that the armed forces continue to be depicted as heroes who fought for the independence of the nation, just as the early heroes who resisted foreign invasions.

6.1.4. The government

The portrayal of the government too retains the heroic characteristics that the ‘historical lens’ storyline presents it in (a complete list of descriptions are found in Appendix C Table 3.4). Although not related directly to the conflict, the excerpt below signals the continuation of role in post-conflict development and reiterates the positioning the President uses when speaking of the government. In this excerpt, the President continues to position the government as the agent of action.

Transliteration
1. Through sixty years since attaining independence the per capita income had been raised only to USD 1030.
2. That is, from the time of independence upto 2005.
3. Yet in the past five years we were able to raise the per capita income upto USD 2400.
4. We expanded electricity, water supply, and irrigation network throughout the country.
5. We improved education and healthcare services.

11 All the underlined verbs in this sentence connect to this phrase to make a pronoun + verb construction. This phrase translates to were able to in English. Therefore the verbs in these sentences are not counted as separate action verbs that occur without their pronominal counterpart.
6. We strengthened public service.
7. We built an economic environment necessary to expand private business.
8. (We were) able to bring the rate of unemployment to a low status. We brought it.
9. We took the necessary steps to resettle hundreds of displaced persons and build up the lives of people in all areas.
10. Similarly, (we) built massive bridges such as the Sangupitti bridge, the Kinniya bridge, the Manampitiya bridge, the Mannar bridge, the Katugastota bridge, and the flyovers in Colombo.
11. (We) also built a bridge in this area that goes to Buttala.
12. We created a massive development of roads throughout the country.
13. (We) expanded electricity facilities to all areas.
14. Not only the development of irrigation projects such as Moragahakanda, Uma Oya, Deduru Oya, Weheragala and Rambukan Oya but we restored a large number of ancient irrigation tanks and we took steps to develop the dry zones.
15. That is not all.
16. (We) expanded hospital and school systems, and university facilities.
17. The first Nena Sala established at Kiri Vehera with the blessings of the Kataragama deity has now spread throughout the country.
18. We brought computer literacy to a high level within five years.
19. That is not all.
20. (We) built sports stadiums of international standard at Diyagama, Pallekale, and Suriyawewa for our children.
21. We were able to rebuild our national assets as well as protect them.
22. Accordingly, we were able to introduce a new airline, Mihin Lanka, reclaim ownership for the nation of the national airline that had been sold out, reclaim ownership of the Gas Company and reclaim ownership of the insurance company.
23. Our nation can therefore, be proud of the past five years as being the most meaningful era since independence in moving forward with peace and development.

The above excerpt contains sentences that detail the government’s efforts towards development and restoration in post-war Sri Lanka. In listing these efforts, the President uses thirteen (13) instances of we + action verb constructions which are underlined in the text. He also uses ten (10) action verbs minus pronominal reference constructions (indicated by a dashed underline in the text) and although pronouns are dropped in these constructions they imply a first person pronoun as their subject. Although linguistically different, this second type too, may be counted as indexing the same analysis as a we + action verb construction does. As analyzed earlier in Section 4.1.4, this pattern indicates that the President positions the government not only

---

12 See previous footnote for explanation of not counting reclaim as action verb in this sentence.
as an active participant but also as an agent of action. In other words, the President’s portrayal of the government situates it as the catalyst of national development. The extensive, specific listing and naming of details (Tannen, 2010) regarding the government’s accomplishments validates its efforts towards development and more importantly, highlights the significance of the post-war years in relation to national independence (Line 23: “Our nation can … be proud of the past five years as being the most meaningful era since independence”). The link that the President establishes between the post-war era and Independence reinforces the ‘historical lens’ metanarrative that portrays current political situations in relation to ancient Sri Lankan history, thereby positioning the current government as mirroring the actions of ancient kings and heroes who not only established national sovereignty but also developed the country.

Agentive and epistemic stances are significant to this section, as the President uses an interesting strategy to bridge the two. Schiffrin (1996), who examined the performance of two mothers’ identities, showed the use of their agentive and epistemic selves to position themselves within the narrative they issued. She argues that “the agentive and epistemic selves that we display linguistically… provide a sensitive index to our ongoing relationships with others in that story world” (p.196). Heritage (2012) notes that “epistemic stance … concerns the moment-by-moment expression of … relationships … expressed through different grammatical realizations of propositional content” (p. 6). In the excerpt discussed above, the President’s use of agentive constructions (i.e. *we + action verb* constructions), culminate in the construction of an epistemic stance: the “past five years” of the nation “as being the most meaningful era since independence”. In fronting this stance, the President’s sentence construction (“Our nation can therefore, be proud of the past five years *as being* the most meaningful era since independence in
moving forward with peace and development”) and his use of “as being” reveals certainty in his assertion. By refraining from using suggestive or conditional statements such as ‘may/might be seen as’ or even ‘could be seen as’ and using “as being” to assert his claim that the past five years have been the “most meaningful era since independence”, the President’s epistemic stance expresses certainty grammatically. This epistemic stance is also informed by the turn-by-turn listing of agentive self-presentation indicated by we + action verb constructions, allowing the President to claim the authority to take an epistemic stance that assures surety. In other words, the President’s agentive self-presentation climaxes in an epistemic stance that is constructed as a sure claim.

6.1.5. The international community

In the President’s post-war speeches, the international community continues to be mentioned in sections that deal with national decision-making processes (see Appendix C Table 3.5 for full list of descriptions). In stating “I always implore separatists as well as local and international forces not to underestimate our motherland and the people of this nation” the President advances the positioning of the international community as being opposed to national interests. Additionally, he also says “In foreign policy, I have done what was in the interest of the people of my country”, implying that the interests of the people are not in line with the interests of the international community. This idea is also presented in the President’s speech on May 19, 2009 where he states that “Although we were able to listen to all those requests [i.e. from the international community], we were unable to implement all of them. That is because I was bound to carry out the expectations I offered and the mandate given to me in the 2005 Presidential elections. Likewise, it was because I considered my life second to the motherland’s freedom and
sovereignty” (found in Appendix B Table 2.5). The reason the President gives as to why he was unable to follow the advice of the international community divorces responsibility from him and places it on the expectations of the country, thereby absolving him from being the principal decision-maker. Additionally, the President also depicts the certain international groups as aiding dissent in the country, thereby positioning them in opposition to the government. This stance is advanced in the excerpt below.

Transliteration

(Feb ruary 4, 2012)

Free translation
1. You know that there is no end to the conspiracies and massive campaigns of lies that the terrorists make against Sri Lanka from foreign countries.
2. When that happens there, groups here – some groups here – do various things to destabilize the motherland.
3. I feel that these people hope to make things that happen in certain countries of the world take place in Sri Lanka too.
4. Both these groups are the same.
5. It is not a secret that that for the struggle that happens in Sri Lanka, fuel and water are provided from separatism that operates abroad.

In this excerpt, the President depicts what comes from foreign countries as “conspiracies and massive campaigns of lies” that come from “the terrorists” and are aimed “against” the country (Line 1). He also refers to “separatism that operates abroad” (Line 5). The use of descriptors such as “conspiracies” (Line 1), “lies” (Line 1) and “separatism” (Line 5) as well as preposition “against Sri Lanka” (Line 1) suggests a threat against the Sri Lankan nation, a
national identity which he takes up with regard to the international community in this section. He also situates local and foreign groups that “destabilize the motherland” (Line 2) in the same position. In other words, he sets up one group (Sri Lankans) against another (foreigners, and locals supported by foreigners, who are supporters of separatism like the LTTE), thereby continuing his positioning of certain international forces as dangerous to the country’s post-war stability. While the above example may not be a critique of the entire international community, it reveals that when it comes to the topic of nation-building, the President continues to view the advice and action of the international community as a threat to national sovereignty.

6.2. Is there any change in the storylines issued?

As discussed above in Section 6.1, the positions of social actors and storyline following the end of the war remains similar to the storyline and positions the President assigns to them during the latter stages of the war and immediately following the end of the war in May 2009. The positioning of actors continues to fall within the premise of the ‘historical lens’ narrative that the President outlines in his speech delivered in May 2009 and the oppressor-victim (LTTE-Tamils/nation), rescuer-rescued (Tamils-government) and local sovereignty-foreign influence (Sri Lankan nation-other countries) storylines continue to be contained within that metanarrative. While the President’s discourse shows that his positioning of the government and armed forces mirrors the identity of ancient Sri Lankan royalty and heroes, the President himself also actively takes on this identity in post-war speeches, a feature that will be discussed in Section 6.3. This phenomenon leads to the President’s portrayal of himself as the supreme rescuer of not only the Tamils but the nation itself, thereby creating a new aspect of self-positioning that was not as
prominent in the ‘historical lens’ storyline delivered in speeches before the conclusion of the war.

6.3. Self-positioning: Claiming ownership of a royal identity

Towards the end of the speech delivered on February 4, 2010, the President directly establishes a royal identity for himself following references to the actions he has taken towards national progress. In the following excerpt, the President uses strategic phrasing to take on this identity.

Transliteration

Free translation
We did not ask you to crown (us). However, I must remind you at this occasion that I have placed the crown of freedom, prosperity and heroism on the heads of you and your children. (applause)

The President’s use of pronouns is the most significant aspect of this excerpt. A royal “we” is used by the President when he states “we did not ask…” as he refers to himself although he uses a first person plural pronoun to do so. In their exploration of the uses of “we” pronouns, Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990) point out that “we” is “heavily self-centered and only secondarily group indexical” (p. 176). The royal “we”, according to the framework proposed by the authors, excludes the hearer as well as group identity and references only the self. They also argue that when “we” is used to denote self or single participants, it imitates the use of vous forms of address in the tu-vous dichotomy presented by Brown and Gilman (1960). Brown and Gilman argued that power and solidarity govern the semantics of pronoun usage and that the use of one over the other, depending on the relationship between the speaker and receiver, the context of the
utterance, and the status of the speaker, can be used to denote either one of the two dimensions. As Mühlhäusler and Harré argue, if the same dynamic is present in the use of royal “we”, the President not only performs a royal identity, but also seems to invoke a power dynamic through his use of the royal “we” pronoun. However, he seems to attempt to resist positioning himself as royalty by transferring agency to “you”, his audience which comprises the people of Sri Lanka, as being playing an active part in situating him within this position (“We did not ask you to crown [us]”). The phrase “did not ask” seems to reveal modesty, while the following sentence which begins with a qualifier (“however”) signals a reason that justifies this positioning of the President as ‘king’. Through his use of “I”, the President claims agency for ‘freeing’ the people (“I have placed the the crown of freedom, prosperity and heroism on the heads of you and your children”). In doing so the President indexes his royal identity. Additionally, the verb “crown” clearly indicates that the President positions himself as king who has been crowned by the people. In other words, although the President states that the people ‘crowned’ him, he justifies the identity he takes on by referring to his action of providing freedom to the people.

In another reference to royalty, the President reveals similarities between the actions of ancient King Dutugemunu and himself during the speech given on February 4, 2011. The following excerpt reveals the President’s reasoning.

Transliteration

13 King Dutugemunu is a celebrated Sinhalese king in Sri Lankan history. He is remembered as the king who killed Elara, a Tamil prince from the Chola empire of South India who is described in history as a usurper of the throne. Following Elara’s defeat Dutugemunu brought almost the entire nation under his reign.
Friends, that day King Dutugemunu commenced his journey to unite the motherland with the blessings of the Kataragama deities.

The freedom struggles that were won in history also received blessings from this sacred land, our dear priests.

Through those blessings I, the leader of a mature democratic nation, direct with firm responsibility and confidence, the task of this era (that is) to align you as a rising nation of Asia.

The President begins the alignment of his identity with ancient Sri Lankan royalty with the mention of King Dutugemunu. The mention of this king brings with it its historic baggage, as Dutugemunu is remembered for defeating Tamil prince Elara who is portrayed in history as an invader and a usurper of the throne that belonged to Sinhala royalty. Dutugemunu is also remembered for uniting the different kingdoms of the nation and being supreme ruler of the nation. The mention of Dutugemunu invites the audience to draw connections to Sri Lanka’s current situations including the recent victory against the LTTE, a Tamil terrorist organization that the President positions as invaders due to their demand for a separate State. In other words, in addition to positioning the LTTE as invaders who claimed a section of the nation’s land much like Elara did, by referring to Dutugemunu the President guides his audience towards symbolic similarities between the two eras in Sri Lankan history in which the nation was united. Although the direct commonality and line of reasoning that the President follows is the blessing of the Kataragama deities that were bestowed on Dutugemunu, as well as during subsequent struggles for freedom and current efforts to re-build the country, the use of words such as “Dutugemunu”,

14 Address term that is used to acknowledge and respect Buddhist clergy present at a gathering.
“unite the motherland”, “freedom struggles” evoke event schemata (van Dijk, 1998a) that draw on commonalities between Dutugemunu’s battle against Tamil prince and invader, Elara, the defeat of Elara at the hands of Dutugemunu and the ultimate unity of the ancient kingdom, and Mahinda Rajapaksa’s war against the Tamil armed militant group, the defeat of the LTTE, and Rajapaksa’s restoration of the nation’s sovereignty. By doing so, the President positions himself as a shadow of Dutugemunu, thereby also equating himself to royalty.

In addition to positioning himself as a king, the President’s usage of first person singular and first person plural pronouns are interesting as they are traced across war time to post-war speeches. All tokens of first person pronouns were counted and if there were two pronouns in a single sentence, they were counted as two tokens of pronouns. Table 4 accounts for the total percentage of first person singular and first person plural used in the relation to the total number of sentences articulated by the President. For the purpose of tracing the significant drop in pronouns from war time to post-war speeches, I selected the last speech during war time (February 4, 2009), the victory speech (May 19, 2009) and the first post-war speech (February 4, 2010). The initial address of the gathering was discarded in the count of sentences as the number of groups the President named in his opening address differs across speeches and would skew the count of the data. In his initial address the President does not use pronouns and only acknowledges the presence of groups (i.e. Dear priests, Ministers of Parliament, Heads of the armed forces, etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of First Person Singular</th>
<th>Frequency of First Person Singular (as % of sentences per speech)</th>
<th>No. of First Person Plural</th>
<th>Frequency of First Person Plural (we) (as % of sentences per speech)</th>
<th>Total no. of sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.36%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>70.72%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38.62%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4 First Person pronoun occurrences per speech from war to post-war context*

During the February 2009 and May 2009 speeches, the President uses a significantly higher percentage of first person plural pronouns (70.72% and 50% respectively) than first person singular pronouns (14.36% and 19.23% respectively). However, there is a significant rise in the President’s use of first person singular pronouns (38.62%) in his February 2010 speech and a slight decrease in his use of first person plural (42.76%). Other than the May 2009 speech that was delivered immediately following the end of the war, this is the first post-war speech in the data set that the President delivered. It is also noteworthy that in this speech the President
outlines the efforts undertaken by him to stabilize and rebuild the nation following the conflict. It is also the first speech in which the President deliberately and openly adopts the identity of a king. In this light the President seems to want to assert his own voice and agency, setting himself apart from any other group identity that he could adopt. In other words, in this speech not only does he claim credit for efforts that were undertaken in national development, he also sets himself up as the chief decision maker, thereby strengthening his identity as a ‘king’. While the President continues to use more first person plural pronouns than first person singular, his increased use of ‘I’ in the February 2010 speech denotes his attempt at creating an identity for himself apart from the group identities that he can index (i.e. government identity, Sri Lankan identity).

Both excerpts that were discussed earlier in this section reveal that in his post-war speeches the President positions himself as emulating the ancient kings of Sri Lanka. He does so primarily by recreating the ethnic conflict in terms of invasions of the country, and equating himself and his role in the ethnic conflict to early historic figures and their roles. Secondly, he deliberately uses words and phrases that act as triggers to schemata that his audience could use (i.e. history of Sri Lanka) to locate him in the position of ancient Sri Lankan royalty. Finally, there is an increase in the number of first person references he makes which ties in with the identity he adopts. Harnessing these strategies, the President discursively positions himself as a king in post-war speeches.
6.4. Reconciliation discourses: are there any in post-conflict speeches?

Reconciliation discourse is diverse and can be used in different ways to increase understanding of conflict situations and the reasons for their emergence in the first place. In this section, the President’s post-war speeches will be examined for reconciliation discourse, or any shift in discourse that might recognize the need for a resolution, tolerance, forgiveness and apology. As Cameron (2007) points out, a key feature of reconciliation is ‘rehumanizing’ the Other, and I will also seek the presence of this feature in excerpts discussed in this section. I will first analyze at the President’s use of inclusive discourse and critically discuss its placement and content within the body of the speech. I will then look at the President’s treatment of reconciliation and development projects in terms of those who were affected by the war, discussing the manner in which the President articulates and represents these projects.

6.4.1. Inclusive discourse

While studies on reconciliation discourse have focused mainly on individuals’ production of reconciliation within institution contexts (Verdoolaege, 2008; Wilson 2001; Cameron, 2007) a feature of reconciliation that these studies recognize is the complex nature of reconciliation discourse. In other words, connotations of reconciliation differ from person to person. This viewpoint is offered by Verdoolaege (2008) whose analysis of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission testimonies presents complex productions of reconciliation discourse, thereby allowing for varied interpretations of the term ‘reconciliation’. Mahinda Rajapaksa’s production of reconciliation discourse is different from individual testifiers’ discourse examined by the studies mentioned above as it speaks for and from an institutional perspective. I recognize, however, that reconciliation discourse produced from spokespersons of institutions, such as the
President of a country, is not devoid of prejudice and could exacerbate existing social, ethnic, religious or political issues by using discriminatory discourse.

The President’s use of inclusive discourse is a feature of reconciliation. By inclusive discourse I mean discourse that attempts to include all ethnic groups into a Sri Lankan national identity. The excerpts below are examples of such discourse in the President’s speeches during and following the war.

Transliteration


Free translation
1. Look at the children of our motherland, Sinhala, Tamil, Muslim, Burgher, Malay and of all other communities, spread throughout the land, living happily, devoid of divisive thoughts.

2. We removed the word minorities from our vocabulary three years ago. No longer are the Tamils, Muslims, Burghers, Malays or any others minorities in this country. (applause) Now there are only two communities in this country. One is a community that love the country, the other is a small group that
has no love for their birth-land. (applause) Those who do not love the country have now become a minority group.

3. This is the time to receive the results of unifying the nation. Since the war has ended, don’t only think that it is the nation’s saving from the huge cost of the war. In an international research magazine that was released recently it was reported that Sri Lanka is already foremost among the thirty one best countries in the world to tour.

4. (Addressing the younger generation) I have seen many of today’s youth of this country going to pansala\textsuperscript{15}, kovil\textsuperscript{16} and church wearing the national flag on their chest. I know that your heart has become a place filled with patriotism and love for the country. That feeling of loving the country must now be channeled towards the supreme task of building a land that everyone in this country can live united in.

The President’s referrals to inclusive discourse include different ethnic communities (“Sinhala, Tamil, Muslim, Burgher, Malay”), in addition to “living happily”, “devoid of divisive thoughts”, “unifying the nation”, “going to pansala, kovil and church wearing the national flag on their chest” and “a land that everyone in this country can live united in”. This discourse of unity is prevalent throughout the President’s speeches and is similar to the “mandarin-intellectual narrative” described by Wilson (2001) who ascertains this to be one of the narratives present in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s discourse. Wilson argues that “[t]he mandarin-intellectual approach explicitly rejected an individually-oriented notion of reconciliation and leant towards a more abstract focus on the nation”, which acted on the premise that the entity being reconciled was the collective ‘nation’ rather than the individual ‘people’ that made up the nation (p. 107). He argues that this narrative presupposed a ‘collective [national] memory’ that is removed from individuals’ feeling and emotions. President Mahinda Rajapaksa’s use of this type of inclusive discourse signals that he too may be subscribing to the

\textsuperscript{15} Pansala is a Buddhist place of worship.
\textsuperscript{16} Kovil is a Hindu place of worship.
same ideology of one ‘national’ memory that includes but transcends individual and communal differences.

A closer analysis of the strategies used by the President to signal this type of inclusive discourse proves the problematic nature of this narrative. Excerpt 2 reveals the President’s argument for discarding the use of “minority” and collapsing the nation into two groups, those who love the country and those who don’t, in which the latter becomes a minority group. The removal of minority ethnic communities’ identity (“No longer are the Tamils, Muslims, Burghers, Malays or any others minorities in this country”) also implies the erasure of issues faced by minority communities in Sri Lanka, of which the ethnic conflict was a manifestation. Additionally, the President assigns the word ‘minority’ to “those who do not love the country”, thereby placing the measurement of ‘minority’ on ‘love for the country’, a feature that cannot be accurately demonstrated. In Excerpt 3, the President lists increased tourism (“Sri Lanka is already foremost among the thirty one best countries in the world to tour”) as one of “the results of unifying the nation”. He thereafter continues to list the development that has taken place since the end of the war. The mentioning of development projects and hope for the future is interesting in the light of what the President refrains from talking about. He avoids listing any plans for reconciling communities and people groups, choosing instead to only engage in inclusive discourse that depicts the nation as one entity. The listing of what has been done in terms of development in the country (discussed in Section 6.1.4), while avoiding the mention of reconciliation efforts made towards communities, may be another result of the President’s problematic ‘one nation, one collective memory’ stance as it assumes the collapsing of all communities into one national unit.
The use of this ‘one nation, one collective memory’ type of discourse, while certainly recognizable as a category of reconciliation discourse, as revealed in the analysis above, erases communities’ local and individual identities. As Gal and Irvine (1995) argue, “[e]rasure, is the process in which ideology, in simplifying the field of linguistic practices, practices, renders some persons or activities or sociolinguistic phenomena invisible” (p. 974, their emphasis). In merging different ethnic groups’ identities into a collective ‘Sri Lankan’ memory, the President’s discursive practices deny local group identities a voice. This is problematic as the denial of communities’ and people groups’ identities refuses to acknowledge that the Sri Lankan conflict was entrenched in ethnocentric ideologies. The President also does exactly this by portraying the conflict as invasion and a war over land (discussed in Chapter 5) and collapses ethno-religious group identities into a larger ‘Sri Lankan’ identity that does not acknowledge divergent ideas. These ideological underpinnings of discrimination highlight the fact that the President, although using inclusive discourse in his speeches, also propagates discriminatory ideologies that deny the diversity and thereby the different ideas of the communities that together construct the Sri Lankan nation.

6.4.2. Discourse dealing with reconciliation efforts

The President mentions development efforts in all six of his speeches. However, in all four of his post-war speeches including his May 19, 2009 speech, only one effort towards reconciliation, the report of the Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC), is mentioned. This effort too, is mentioned only once. The excerpt below reveals the discourse that surrounds the President’s brief reference to the LLRC report.
Free translation

1. Friends, (they) say that there is a problem here.
2. The Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission that we appointed has stated that all these people-everyone should take responsibility for this problem.
3. However, I believe that those who work against (their) conscience should be mindful of this statement.
4. That is why we have already started implementing the commission’s recommendations systematically.
5. This I think this report was presented to Parliament on December 17th.
6. In the short span of six weeks since then, that is, until today it has been six weeks.
7. Thus far we have implemented a huge amount of work.
8. These people worked (on it) even on vacation time, even at Christmas time.

In order to understand the implications of the above excerpt it is also important to view it in relation to the text that surrounds it. Prior to the reference the President makes regarding the LLRC report, he refers to people who obtain foreign aid and speak against national interests as destabilizing the country. He also refers to them as working towards dividing the country. Following the above excerpt, the President defends Parliament as being an institution that upholds democracy in addition to depicting Sri Lanka as one of Asia’s oldest democracies and thereby a nation that is governed by democratic values. The above excerpt, is therefore, cushioned by the President’s defense against the international community.

The President’s introduction to the LLRC’s report in his speech is telling of his attitude towards it. By stating that “(they) say there is a problem here” (Line 1), although the President
does not use a third person plural pronoun in Sinhala, by distancing himself from the sentence he implies that he is not connected to the statement that “there is a problem”. Following it with “the Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission has stated…” (Line 2) the President continues to distance himself from the LLRC’s recommendations while claiming credit for the appointment of the LLRC (Line 2: “Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission that we appointed”). In other words, although the President claims credit for the appointment of the LLRC as a mechanism that aids reconciliation, he does not take responsibility for the LLRC’s recommendations. The President also implies that “everyone should take responsibility for the problem” (Line 2) is a statement by the LLRC and not the President himself. Thus far, the President removes himself from the position of agency and ascribes authority to a third party, the LLRC.

When the President expresses his opinion by stating “I believe”, he argues that “those who work against (their) conscience should be mindful of this statement” (Line 3), still maintaining distance from taking on any concrete agency in this matter. The President goes on to state that “we have already started implementing the commission’s recommendations systematically” (Line 4), qualifying it with the statement that the government worked on the recommendations “even at Christmas time” (Line 8) to reveal the commitment of the government. However, unlike the naming and listing of details when describing the government’s efforts in development, the President refrains from providing specific examples and details of the LLRC recommendations’ implementation. Additionally, at the end of this particular speech delivered on February 4, 2012, the President continues to espouse a solution that draws from Buddhism (the implications of which were discussed in Section 5.4). This,
together with the distance that the President maintains when discussing the LLRC recommendations by refraining from using an I/we + action verb construction, and the lack of detail in his discussion of how the Commission’s recommendations are being implemented indicate that although the President speaks of nation-building and development, his perception towards reconciliation as revealed through the discourse he employs, has not shifted since the latter stages of the war.

6.4.3. A discussion of the schemata that inform the President’s perspectives

Schemata, according to van Dijk (1998a) support both the production as well as the interpretation of discourse. As such, a speaker’s discursive acts index the schema he draws from, providing an insight into the mental representations or knowledge structures that trigger a particular schema. When this schema is discursively produced, an analysis of the individual’s discourse helps the analyst comprehend what schema is being signaled to ‘make sense’ of something in the world. In other words, I understand schema as not only helping an individual organize her/his knowledge, but also helping an analyst recognize the interpretive lens through which an individual sees the world. Analysis of an individual’s discursive actions, therefore, indexes the schema that s/he draws from. As referrals, adjectives, pronoun choice, imagery and metaphor are able to highlight schemata that the speaker draws from, they are features that aid in reconstructing the speaker’s perception of issues. While the President’s storylines as well as his positioning of social actors within each storyline was discussed at length in this paper, this section will provide an overview of the schemata that the President draws on, discussing whether or not a change in schemata or the inclusion of different schemata is seen. I discuss the President’s schemata primarily in terms of the storylines he issues to support the positions he
assigns to main social actors in the conflict, as it is these narratives that highlight the interpretive lens used by the President to help his audience ‘make sense’ of the conflict.

During the latter stages of the war the President’s positioning of the LTTE, the Tamils, the Sri Lankan armed forces, the government and the international community provided strands of ideas that formed the oppressor-victim, rescuer-rescued and local sovereignty-foreign influence storylines. These storylines reveal the schemata that the President uses to perceive and describe the conflict, which indicates that he perceives the Tamils as victims and the LTTE as their oppressors, the government and the armed forces as saviors of the Tamils who are helpless, and the international community as a threat to maintaining Sri Lanka’s sovereignty. The ‘historical lens’ narrative incorporates these threads to form an overarching schema that the President reveals through the argument he presents at the beginning of the speech he delivered on May 19, 2009 (discussed in detail in Chapter 5). Clusters of knowledge that he draws from to ‘make sense’ of his argument include historical knowledge which he uses to represent the conflict between the LTTE and the government over the LTTE’s demand for a separate State for the Tamils as a struggle against invasion that early kings and national leaders had to face when threatened by Indian invaders and colonizers. The President also draws from schemata that depict the conflict as a struggle for freedom and sovereignty for the land. Influenced by the collection of storylines and metanarrative that the President issues in his war time speeches and victory speech, these schemata form what I refer to as the President’s ‘war schema’.

Following the conclusion of the war, the President continues to use these schemata to present national development. Additionally, the President makes self-references that signal ‘kingship’ schema, thereby revealing that he sees himself as an ancient ‘king’ or ‘hero’ who has
led the nation into victory by defeating the threat posed by the LTTE, an ‘invading’ force that claimed a section of the land for themselves. Close analysis of the President post-war speeches also reveal that although the President uses inclusive discourse he sees the nation as one collective entity, thereby erasing the issues that may arise with communities that have diverse needs and problems (discussed in Section 6.4.1). His distance, non-agentive stance and lack of detailed references in relation to reconciliation efforts also reveal that the President does not consider the divergent aspects of reconciliation (see Section 6.4.2 for discussion). Analysis revealed that there is no shift in the way the President positions social actors in his post-war speeches, thereby indicating that although the war had concluded, the President’s discourse does not shift from indexing war schema to drawing from reconciliatory schema.

This chapter provided an analysis of President Rajapaksa’s post-war discourse by examining the speeches he delivered on February 4, 2010, February 4, 2011 and February 4, 2012. It examined how the President’s positioning of social actors was a continuation of the positions he ascribed to social actors during the war and immediately following its conclusion. A significant addition to these positions was the President’s positioning of himself as royalty. This became a prominent feature of the President’s post-war discourse and fit into existent positions within the ‘historical lens’ metanarrative. Finally, the President’s post-war speeches were studied for reconciliation discourse. Although the President seemed to use strategies that signaled reconciliation (i.e. discourse of inclusion), it was found that the President denied a voice to minority groups and subsumed local identities in a collective ‘national’ identity, thereby erasing local group voices and fronting one ‘united’ voice. Additionally, in his sole discussion of reconciliation efforts (i.e. the LLRC recommendations), he distanced himself from
implementation plans and avoided providing details of exactly these plans will be implemented.

An analysis of the schemata the President drew from, as seen through the storylines and
metanarrative he issues, also revealed that there was no shift from ‘war schema’ to
‘reconciliation schema’ in the President’s post-war discourse.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1. Overview

This paper discussed Presidential discourse produced by Sri Lankan President Mahinda Rajapaksa in six speeches across the years 2008 to 2012. It examined the speaker’s discourse during the latter stages of and following the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict to determine the positioning of major social actors in the conflict in relation to firstly, how the President positioned social actors towards himself and each other, and secondly, the storylines he issued to support these positions. Additionally, the paper also inquired if there was a shift in the positioning adopted during post-war speeches which would signal a shift from war schema into reconciliation schema.

7.2. Key findings

It was found that in positioning social actors in relation to himself, the President also positioned them in relation to other social actors within the storyline. In speeches delivered on February 4, 2008 and February 4, 2009 when the war was in its latter stages, the President depicted the LTTE as separatist, ruthless, fearsome and also as the strongest terrorist organization in the world. By detailing the acts that the terrorists committed the President villainized them and presented them as a threat to the entire nation. The Tamils, specifically those in the North and East of the country, were depicted as innocent, trapped and victimized by the LTTE. Close analysis of the discourse that references Tamils suggested that the President also engaged in an ‘othering’ process when discussing the Tamils, thereby taking on a ‘rescue’ operation towards them. In depicting the Sri Lankan armed forces, their sacrifices, bravery and dedication were repeatedly referenced, positioning them as heroes. The government was
positioned as the agent of action and similar to the armed forces, the President also positioned the government in a positive light in terms of the conflict. The President’s positioning of the international community was nuanced and while he welcomed their aid and support, the discourse he used to discuss any counsel they might offer revealed that he saw their advice as a potential threat to national sovereignty. With the purpose of supporting these positions, the President constructed several storylines (e.g. oppressor-victim, rescuer-rescued and local sovereignty-foreign influence) that appeared throughout the speeches delivered during the latter stages of the war.

The analysis of speeches delivered during post-war context, which includes speeches from May 19, 2009, February 4, 2010, February 4, 2011 and February 4, 2012, reveal that the President continued to position the main characters of his speech in the way he positioned them during the war. However, in the speech delivered on May 19, 2009 to celebrate the defeat of the LTTE, the President introduced a ‘historical lens’ storyline that depicted the government’s and the troops’ battle against the LTTE as indexing early Sri Lankan rulers’ battles against Indian invaders and colonial forces. This storyline allowed the earlier positioning of social actors to gain additional meaning and allowed for the President to position himself as ‘king’ which he did in later post-war speeches. Additionally, it was found that ethnocentric and discriminatory discourse pervaded the President’s speeches (e.g. the fronting of a Buddhist solution as a ‘local’ solution rejected all other religions discussed in Section 5.4, the depiction of a ‘collective’ national identity erased local group identities in Section 6.4.1, and the positioning of Tamil people as ‘victims’ denied them a voice in the President’s rhetoric Sections 4.1.2, 5.1.2 and 6.1.2). The continuation of war time positioning of social actors into post-war contexts revealed
not only that the President continued to draw from his ‘war schema’ but also that he refrained from shifting from ‘war schema’ into ‘reconciliation schema’ in post-war context.

7.3. Limitations

One of the main limitations of this paper is a limitation that is implicit to discourse studies that deal with translation. Although effort was made to most closely match the grammatical structure of the source code (Sinhala) to the target code (English) for the purpose of writing this paper, sometimes the sentence or phrase was adjusted to better suit the production of that same discourse in English. Additionally, some Sinhala phrases that have meaning beyond the mere word structure (i.e. jargon, proverbs, metaphor) had to be matched not only for grammatical correctness in English but also for carrying a similar meaning. In such instances the connotation of the English translation was significantly lacking in comparison to its Sinhala counterpart.

The data set for this paper was a larger than the one or two speeches typical of political discourse analysis studies, as the paper attempted to trace patterns across several speeches delivered during different periods of time. As such, microanalysis of topic flow and the implications of one topic’s relationship to the next were unable to be carried out. Additionally, only the character-groups that pertain to the conflict were discussed in this paper and other characters including individuals who were named in the President’s speeches have been overlooked. Another limitation of this paper is that although it took into consideration the general political context during which each speech was delivered, the more detailed specifics of the context were overlooked. The location in which the speeches were delivered, especially
speeches delivered during Independence Day celebrations, which could also have an impact on
the content of the speeches, were not discussed in the paper.

7.4. Implications

President Mahinda Rajapaksa’s use of political discourse and linguistic strategies
conveys the way in which he was able to use positioning and storylines to present the conflict in
different terms to the government and the nation’s people. This study, however, speaks to the
national discourse produced by the Head of State and finds continued discrimination towards
non-majority communities that could be problematic in future years. The absence of
reconciliation discourse and the lack of motivation towards incorporating it into speeches in
addition to the President’s gravitation towards continuing to defend himself and his government
using the storyline of local sovereignty-foreign influence may result not only in isolation from
the international community but a serious loss of accountability and transparency between the
government and the people of the country. An in-depth analysis of the complete list of speeches
delivered by Mahinda Rakapaksa will have to be undertaken, however, to determine if this trend
of moving away from reconciliation discourse persists across all his speeches.

In conclusion, this paper combined political discourse analysis, positioning theory, and
schema to inform and complement the analysis that emerged from each approach. Most
importantly, it also revealed how detailed linguistic analysis highlights the construction and
maintenance of specific positions and storylines in President Rajapaksa’s speech, thereby
illustrating how a close linguistic analysis is able to enhance the features of positioning theory.
Moreover, positioning theory’s storyline and schema were seen as complementary aspects of
analysis, revealing the advantage of cross-disciplinary perspective in informing each other’s analysis and providing supplementary insight into the data being studied. Finally, this paper also reveals that exhaustive linguistic analysis is an important feature of discourse analysis which can aid the process of tracing patterns across multiple lengthy pieces of discourse.
### Appendix A

**Descriptions of social actors in speeches delivered prior to the end of the war**
*(February 4, 2008 and February 4, 2009)*

#### Table 1.1: Description of the Sri Lankan Armed Forces prior to the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Date</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>Me: abima:nawathbawa sa: me: pratha:pawath bawa Shri La:nkika ja:thiya lese api laba:ganu laebuwe:, wathman wiruwan wage:ma i:thiha:sya pura:ma apa muthunmi:ththan wisin keranu laebu: apprama:na kaepakireem nisa:when bawa ma: obata pawasanawa (3)</td>
<td>I say to you that we achieved this pride and majesty as the Sri Lankan nation through the immense sacrifices of today’s heroes as well as (those) of our forefathers’ throughout history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>muththama lesa kaepakireem kele weerawarayinnta (5)</td>
<td>heroes who sacrificed immensely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>Ithiha: se kisi dawasaka nolabapu jayaggrahanayak thrasthawa:dhayata erehiwa ape: a: rakshaka hamudha: laba: ganiming innawa (33)</td>
<td>Today our security forces are achieving an unprecedented victory against terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>dhe:shayaka ja:thika nidhahas dhinaya saem ari:mata ape: wi:ro:dha: ra ranawiruwan apata awastha:wa himi kera la dheela thiyenawa: (51)</td>
<td>our heroic troops have given us the opportunity to celebrate a/the nation’s national Independence day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Ape: hamudha:we: atheetha weeraththwe: gaurawaya itha: ihaling a: rakshaka kera ana: gathayata ba: radhi: thibenawa (56)</td>
<td>The dignity of our forces’ heroism of the past has been protected and handed over to the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Ma: ththruboomiyata gaurawa: nmitha sa: maya udha: kela haeki awastha: wa nirma: naya kera dhemin owun innawa (58)</td>
<td>They are creating for us the opportunity to see the dawn of an honourable peace for the motherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Me: wishishta athiha: sika awastha: wa siya ma: ththruboomiyata udha: kera dheema wenuweng owun thama aes, his, mas, le: pamanak newei, siya jeewithaya pawa: maubima wenuwen pariththya: ga kerali thiyenawa: (59)</td>
<td>They have sacrificed not only their eyes, hair, flesh, blood but also their very life to bring the dawn of this great historic opportunity to our motherland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Aihinsaka Dhemala janatha: wata hirihae: awi: mata ida nothaha: itha: ma parissaming thrasthawa: dhayata erehiwa pamanak satana pereta genaya: mata ape: ranawiruwan samathwuna: (60)</td>
<td>Our troops were able to carry forward the battle solely against terrorism with great care so as not to cause harassment to the innocent Tamil people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>ranawiruwange aparamitha pariththya: geyan (61)</td>
<td>the immeasurable sacrifice of (the/our) troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Ape: hamudha: wa me: jayaggrahanaya laba: dhunne: thamanng: ma gna: nyen kisima widhe: shika wishe: shagnya sahayak laba: gaane naethuwa (70)</td>
<td>Our troops gave (us) this victory through their own knowledge, without obtaining any foreign experts’ assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>E: wage: ma ape: hamudha: kela yam hamudha: wa thula yam wishe: shaththwayak thiyenawa: E: thamai owun &quot;apata bae: &quot; apata bae: kiyala koi wela: wakawath kiuwwe: naehae: (71-72)</td>
<td>Similarly, our forces had a specialty of their own. That is, at no time did they say “We cannot, we cannot”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Ape: ranawiruwan thama saho: dhara ranawiruwan sathuru preha: rayantta lakwa miyae: dhenawita jeewitha awadhama: awadhama: namata biyeng me:</td>
<td>At a time when their fellow soldiers were dying from enemy attacks, did our troops abandon the battle for fear of their lives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2: Description of the government prior to the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Date</th>
<th>Speech Transliteration</th>
<th>Free Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>api Uthuruth thrasthawa:dhayen nidhahaskeragannawa: wage:ma e: paradhe:sh: inne janatha:wata dheshapa:lana nisandhumak, dheshapa:lana nidhahasak api laba:dhenawa. Ehema keelho ithitha edha: nidhahas satanedh: ratagaema hithapu weerayo: weni weerayo Uthurin, Naegenahirin bihiwenne (56-57)</td>
<td>we will liberate the North from terrorism and we will also provide a political solution, political freedom to the people of that region. It is only if (we) do so that (we will) see leaders emerging from the North and the East who think about the country like those heroes who participated in the struggle for freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>api dhenu-dhene wisandhuma me: rate: kriya:thmaka kelehaeki wisandhumak wenna o:ne. Athhdahada balanda wisandhum dhenna apita bae. Le:th halala, dhasa dhahas ganang jeeithath naethiwna thiyenakota, apita wisandhum aththada balamin inne baehae. E: nisai api me: rate: kriya:thmaka keranna puluwang, apita athdhaekeem thibene wisandhumak thor:ragathth:. Ape wiwasthara:ra:muwa thula pala:ththmaka pa:lanaya janatha:wata sameepa kireemaya e: pra:y:gi:ka wisandhumai. (60-64)</td>
<td>The solution we give (is one that) can be implemented in this country. We cannot offer solutions that are experiments. We cannot experiment with solutions when blood has been shed and tens of thousands of lives have been lost. That is why we chose a solution which can be implemented and about which we have experience. This practical solution is to bring provincial administration closer to the people within our constitutional framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-08</td>
<td>Kotinnma, meeta wasara dhekeketa pero thrasthawa:dhin para:dha keranna puluwang bawa kauruth wiswa:sa kele: nae. Nomuth me: siyalla pasugiya dhewasarakh thula api ma:ththru boomiye: yatha:rthhak wawata pathkerela thiyenawa. (89-90)</td>
<td>In short, two years ago, nobody believed that the terrorists could be defeated. However, during the past two years we have made all this (a) reality in the motherland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Mea:tha ithiha:se:, loke: boho: rata wela kriya:thmaka woo thrasthawa:dhinPara:dha keranna puluwang bawa kauruth wiswa:sa kele: nae. Nomuth me: siyalla pasugiya dhewasarakh thula api ma:ththru boomiye: yatha:rthhak wawata pathkerela thiyenawa. (76-77)</td>
<td>In recent history, in many countries where terrorist organizations have been active, in almost all (of those countries) they have achieved victory. However, in Sri Lanka we have been able to defeat terrorism and separatism and safeguard the unity of our nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Para:jaya kela nohaeki dhe: -yaei boho:dheneku apata ugaenoo: bedhuma:dhin Para:jaya paththkireemata samththwo apata, e: wenas maubima, wenas ana:gathaya bihikireene: aseeru wanne: nae: kiyana ekai ma: wishwa:sa keranne (119)</td>
<td>I believe that, for us who were able to defeat separatist terrorism that many said was invincible, it cannot difficult to build a different/new motherland, a different/new future in our motherland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Dheshaya goda naengweeme ja:thika punaruwdha yugayata apa aep: dheshaya raagena yanne:. (124)</td>
<td>We are taking our nation towards an era of reawakening of national development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Ape: a:ra:kshaka le: kamthuma: , yudha hamudha: paththum: mara: gene ma:rena thrasthawa pahara welata mu:nadh:ith: e: awadhama: awadh: namata baye: thama wagakeema aththaeryiye: nae. Sesu hamudha: patthiarun e: paththhwaya hamuwwe: biyata paththwu: da? Na. Ape: shre: shtathma aemathiwaru dhedhenukuge: jeewitha me: ka:laya thuladhi thrasthawa: dhin biligathth: E: jeewitha awadh: namata muhuna dhenna api adhairrayawune nae. Ape: ranawiruwan thama saho: dhara ranawiruwan sathuru preha: rayannta lakwa miyae: dhewanita jeewitha awadhama: awadh: namata</td>
<td>Having even faced terror attacks from suicide killers, our Defence Secretary and the Commander of our Army did not abandon their responsibilities in fear. In that circumstance did the other Commanders of armed forces become fearful? No. During this period the terrorists preyed on the lives two of our most senior Ministers. However, we were not discouraged to face that risk of the loss of life. At a time when their fellow soldiers were dying from enemy attacks,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
did our troops abandon the battle for fear of their lives? No.

We are now building a country where people will not die through terrorism.

(Let us) extend the cooperation of the entire nation to the people of the North and the East who suffered under the grip of terrorism for many years, to once again step towards life, happiness and independence/freedom.

Table 1.3: Description of the international community prior to the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Feb-08 api dhenu-dhene wisandhuma me: rate: kriya:thmaka kelehaeki wisandhumak wenna o:ne. Athhadha balanda wisandhum dhenna apita bae. Le:th halala, dhasa dhahas ganang jeewithath naethiwela thiyenakota, apita wisandhum athhada balamin inne baehae. E: nisai api me: rate: kriya:thmaka keranna puluwang, apita athdhaekeem thibene wisandhumak tho:ragaththe:. Ape wiwastha:ra:muwa thula pala;ththmaka pa:lanaya janatha:wata sameepa kireemaya e: pra:yo:gi<-ka wisandhumai. Miththrawaruni, apita me: ka:raneya<-di lokayata a:dharshayak weeme: mahangu awastha:wak himiwa thibenawa:. Batahira ratawal moosthe:ra:mo:sthare:ta asuru kireeme: prathipaththiyak api langa nae. E: ratawal samaga apa pawaththwanne: aviya:ja saebae sambandhatha:wayak. E: ratawal samaga apa pawaththwanne: aviya:ja saebae sambandhatha:wayak. Api asalwaesi ra:jjyan Ara:bi ra:jjyan, Bauddha ra:jjyan samaga nawa sambandhatha: godanaga:gena thiyenawa . Asalwaesi ra:jjye:ta api wiswa:sakeranawa, apa mahunadhenna:woo prasna, gaetalu, owunntath gaetalu bawa. Ja:thiyanthara praja:wa ape kerehi thaba: thibene wiswa:saya bindhakin aduwela nae. Mo:sthare:ta wage: a:rtihika la:hayata ja:thiyanthara sambandhatha: pawathwana udhewiya mage: rata janatha:wata monawa: kiwwath apita pasugiya ka:la wala laebunu a:dhra:rawela, sahayé:. kisima aduwath wela: nae. Ape e:-e: a:dhara ganangawa:le: nogene, ape: rate: sangwardhanaya thithakera paridhi, laba:ganna: (laba:ganna) samathwela: thiyenawa:. Loka thrasthawa:dhaya Laka:we:dhi naewatheeme: thithak waetena bawa sista sampanna lokaya:ma adha piliyannawa. Lokaye: dharunuma thrasthawa:dhin Laka:we:dhi para:jaya wenawa:ye: kiyanne:. thrasthawa:dhayen baetakana dhiwunu lokaye: jayaggrahanayak. E: wage:ma ma:nawa aithiwa:sikam raekagena me: satana kerannath api poornawashayen kaepawela: innawa. Yatha:ra:thha | The solution we give (is one that) can be implemented in this country. We cannot offer solutions that are experiments. We cannot experiment with solutions when blood has been shed and tens of thousands of lives have been lost. That is why we chose a solution which can be implemented and about which we have experience. This practical solution is to bring provincial administration closer to the people within our constitutional framework. Friends, we have a great opportunity in this instance to become an example to the world. We do not have a policy of associating with the western countries as a fashion statement. We maintain true and real relations with those countries. We have built new relations with our neighboring States, Arab States, and Buddhist States. We trust that the problems and issues we face are also problems to neighboring States. The confidence placed in us by the international community has not diminished one iota. Whatever is said by those who make an economic profit and show of their international connections, there has been no reduction whatsoever in the aid and support received by us in the past. Instead of obtaining aid for the sake of it, we have been able to obtain aid that is beneficial to the development of our country. Today the civilized world accepts that Sri Lanka is putting a full-stop to world terrorism. The defeat of the most ruthless terrorists in the world in Sri Lanka is also a victory for the developed world, which is also a victim of terrorism. We are also fully committed to carry on this battle while safeguarding human rights. That is reality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sri Lankan Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>Boomiye: balaya, ahase: balaya pamanak nemei, muhudhe: balaya, mara:gena maerena thristhawa:dhinge: balayadha sahitha thristhawa:dhi sangwidha:naya-k hamuwe: yatathweema sa:maya dhina:gaeneeme: margayak washayen piliganneyaei vividha widhe:sha balawe:ga pawa: apata he:thu gannannta uthsa:ha kele bawa oba dhannawa (32)</td>
<td>You know that various foreign forces attempted to persuade us to accept that the path to achieving peace was to be subjugated by a terrorist organization that had power not only on land, but in the sea, air and held the power of terrorist suicide killers/bombers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-09</td>
<td>aethaem anthar ja:th- anthar ja:thika a:yathana ape: rate: asamath- ape: rata asamath ra:jjyak bawata paththwela kiyenawa kiyala pennwa:dheemata patanggaththu nisa (33)</td>
<td>some international institutions sought to show our country as a failed State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Descriptions of social actors in speech delivered immediately following the end of the war
(May 19, 2009)

Table 2.1: Description of the LTTE immediately following the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>minimaru thrasthawa:dhayen (c)</td>
<td>from murderous terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>bedhumvadhi thrasnavadhi-grahanayan (3)</td>
<td>From separatist/divisive terrorist attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Uthur: ha Naegenahira palathaye Koti poleesi thibuna.; Koti adhikarana thibunaa, Koti banku thibunaa, nothibuney Koti parlimenthiwak pamanai (7)</td>
<td>there were Tiger police, there were Tiger courts, there were Tiger banks in the North and East. What was missing was only a Tiger parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>lokey ithaamathma dharunuma thrasthav:adhin (23)</td>
<td>The world’s most ruthless terrorists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>LTTE thrasthawadhin 1975-dhi Yapanaye nagaraadhipathiwarayawa maraadhaala: rata dhekata-kireeme gamana aaramba kela. E: gamana aaramba keradhdhi, thrasthawadhinta Uthuru Naegenahere eka bing analakwath yatathwa thibune nae. Mata me rata ape janathaawa baaradhena kota LTTE-ya me boomiyen 15, 000 km² welata waedi pramaanayak e: kiyanne ape boomi pramaanayeng ¼ pamanawoo pramaanayakuth, mohudu theerayan 2/3 kuth, owunge paalanayata mathukeragenathibuna. E: kaalaya atharathura nathiwune boomiya witharaka noe; dhasa-dhabas ganang jeewitha dhe:polapawa: ja:thiyata ahimiwuna. Siyaganang a:gamika uthumaanan wagema R. Premadasa, Rajiv Gandhi weni raajya nayakiunuth Lakshman Kadirgamar, Gamini Dissanayake, Jeyaraj Fernandopulle wagema A. H. M. Ashroff weni shreshtha aemathiwurunuth apita ahimiwuna. Pasugiya janaadhithiwaranayawa-wanawita thrasthav:adhinapa kisiwektath hithanta baritharam dhura-gos thibuna. Daewantha thrasthav:adhisangwidhaanayak haetiyeta lokaye kisima thrasthawa:dhi sangwidhaanayakata naethi thanaenk himikeregena thibuna. Naew, gung-ya:ne, submarine wagemalowa diwunuma gini-awi owun atpathakeragena thibuna. Paripalaana nagara, jaathiyanthara jaawaaram, banku, web-ade, guwan-widuli:se:va:, mudhal le:kana:thiyath nikathkera thibuna. Unge wathkam adhatath maninna puluwang keneku innawa:dheiplama dhanne naehae. Lokaya methek eweni dhawaanawa thrasnawa:di sangwidha:naayak dhaeke thibune nae. Bayaanakama de: mam, me winaashakaari thrastha sangwidha:nayata me rata, me rate boomiyen wishaala kotasak oppuwaking liyaa wenkara thibeemai. (35-46)</td>
<td>In 1975, the LTTE terrorists killed the mayor of Jaffna and began their journey to divide the land into two. When (their) journey began, the terrorists did not have a single inch of land in the North and East under (them). When our people handed over this country to me the LTTE had gained control over 15,000 squared kilometers, that is one-fourth of the territory of our country, and two-thirds of its coastline. During that period it was not only land that we lost; tens of thousands of lives and property were lost to the nation. Hundreds of religious dignitaries, as well as national leaders such as R. Premadasa and Rajiv Gandhi, and senior ministers such as Lakshman Kadirgamar, Gamini Dissanayake, Jeyaraj Fernandopulle and A.H.M. Ashroff were lost to us. By the last Presidential election (the) terrorists had gone the distance that any of us had not thought possible. As a massive terrorist organization, (they) had acquired the position that no other terrorist organization in the world had. They had acquired ships, aircrafts, submarines, and the most advanced weaponry in the world. They controlled administrative cities, international scams, banks, web sites and radio channels, and had also issued currency. I don’t know if there is anyone who is able to measure their assets even today. The word had not seen such a massive terrorist organization so far. The most fearful thing was the separation and writing off of a huge portion of this country, this land through a deed to this destructive terrorist organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>thrasthaw:adhinge bayaaneka sewenaella (48)</td>
<td>the fearsome shadow of (the) terrorists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19-May-09 Thrasthawa:dhin Lanka sithiyame thamanta ayathweeyuthu pradhesha aendela Eelam raajya godanagagaeneemata nirantharayenma katayuthu kera. (53) The terrorists marked the area that should belong to them on the map of Sri Lanka and worked continuously to establish the Eelam state.

19-May-09 neethia:nuku:lawa vivastha:wak thula thah awaru kele e:keeya raajya sangkalpayata garu kireemata pawa aethimun biyawanawiti:thathwayak thrasthawa:dhin aethikera thibuna. (54) (the) terrorists had created a situation under which there was fear to even respect the principle of a unitary state that had been established legally and constitutionally.

19-May-09 Lokaye balawath ratawal pawa thrasthawaadhin idhiriye asarana bawak pennuwa. Samahara ratawal thrasthawa:dhi idhiriye saeluna, dhana naemuwa. (55-56) Even the powerful countries of the world showed helplessness before the terrorists; some countries shook and fell on their knees before (the) terrorists.

19-May-09 Thrasthawa:dhaya kiyanne dheshapalanayeth , aarthikayawith wagema lowa thiyena saema wishayakama thiyena bayaanakama dhe: ekathuwoo visha-sahitha sarpayek wage. Thrasthawa:dhaya dheshapaya:laneyang ukahaganne jaathiwaadhiya; aarthikaya godanaganne maddhravyayen avii jaaawaaram waling saha kappang waling. Thaakkshanayen ganne pupurana dhraveya. (58-60) Terrorism is like a venomous serpent that combines most dangerous qualities from politics, economics, science and all subjects in the world. What terrorism draws from politics is racism; it builds an economy through drug and arms trafficking and bribes; from technology it obtains explosives.

19-May-09 lokeye dharunuma thrasthawa:di sangwidha:naya (61) the world’s most ruthless terrorist organization

19-May-09 LTTE thrasthaw:adhin yodha:ghana melechche yuddha upa-upakramawalata mahanadeeyaa haeki yuddha shilpayak loke thibune nae. Bimbomba, claymore, maragena maerena kudaa naavika yaaththra, radar paddhathiwalata asunomana saehellu guwanyanaa, maragena maerena bomba jackettu vaage dheowel-dheowelata mahanadhena shilpayak loke pragunagenna thibune nae. (70-71) There was no art of war in the world that could face the barbaric/savage military strategies used by the LTTE terrorists. The world had not mastered the skill of facing things such as land mines, claymore mines, small suicide vessels, light aircraft that can evade radar, and suicide killer jackets.

19-May-09 Loke dharunuthama thrasthawa:dhin (75) the world’s most ruthless terrorists

19-May-09 loke dharunuma thrasthawa:dhin (77) the world’s most ruthless terrorists

19-May-09 lokayath asarana kera lowa dharunuma thrasthawa:dhin (224) the world’s most ruthless terrorists who made even the world helpless

Table 2.2: Description of the Tamil people immediately following the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When did it happen in the history of the Tamil people that the Tamil people who have a great history are today in a very helpless and tragic state due to the terrorists of the LTTE and parents forced their young daughters to get pregnant to save them from being dragged into war? Who was it that dragged Tamil children who are protected by the Goddess Pattini to this state? Who was it that abandoned/orphaned in tents the Tamil people who worshipped the Deity Ganesh at Kataragama, and cared for their health with saffron water and margosa leaves? Honorable Speaker, it is the LTTE that has dragged the Tamil community to (their) lowest position in history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>The day is not far when the cry that rose in the hearts of the mothers and daughters who have been rendered helpless becomes the collective conscience of the Tamil people. Their hearts have been won by us who liberated them from that slavery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>The defeat of the LTTE and the breakdown of their armed strength will never be the defeat of the Tamil people of this country. From the gun that was used to assassinate Duraiyappah to the armed tanks used to attack the helpless Tamil people who were fleeing Pudumathalan, and the weapons that the LTTE brought in, what have the Tamil people inherited? What was the LTTE able to win from the strength of (its) weapons? The complete defeat of the LTTE is an even greater victory for the Tamil people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>The Tamil people were never a people who placed (their) faith in weapons. To prove so, I think it would be sufficient to hear of one incident that took place when the LTTE was powerful. One clause in the Indo-Lanka Accord was that the LTTE should hand over its weapons to the army. When the LTTE announced to the people of Jaffna that (they) would be handing over their weapons, the people at that day’s meeting received it [the announcement] with a resounding cheer and applause. Even the LTTE was surprised by that incident/response. Therefore the Tamil people proved to all of us that (they) are not a people who like to bear arms.</td>
<td>Similarly, when we see the faces of the innocent Tamil people who are fleeing from the Puthumathalan area, we realize that a document offered on a tray as a political solution is not a final solution. Therefore, after freeing the Tamil people from the LTTE’s terrorism we accept a responsibility that no government in the history of Sri Lanka has accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>I request you to compare the life of the people in the East three years ago with (their) life today.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>We need not only advice but cooperation to bring a good life to these people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>I must specially mention that this wave of national revival will be raised with the goal of raising the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lives of the Tamil people who live in the North and East of our land, too. In the past several decades those people did not have a right to a meaningful life; the right to freedom; the right to development. I shall give all of that to those people. We accept that responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Athaka thuwakkuwak, athaka maanawahirikam prathnapthiyak, urahise: praana apakaruwan hadhawathey dhuru senehasath dharaagenai ape sebalu me maanushika meheyumata ?? pitathwune (64)</td>
<td>Our soldiers went into this humanitarian operation carrying a gun in one hand, the Human Rights Charter in the other, hostages on their shoulders, and the love of their children in their hearts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>E: gamana hamudha ithiha:se asama samana gamanak. Civil janatha:wa minis bombabawata path kala yuddha bimata gihing e: janathawage le solawanne naethiwa satan kireema ha:skamak . Mosam warusawata, maha gang wathirata uruththi demin adiyak pasu nod-nobhama(nodhama) siteema viskamak . Sulu avi pamanak yodhaagena kaala thuwakku yuddha tanki paeredhweemath viswakarma kriyaawak. (66-69)</td>
<td>That journey was an incomparable journey in the history of armed forces. It is a miracle to go to a battlefield where civilians have been turned into human bombs and carry on the battle without shedding those people’s (i.e. the civilians’) blood. It is an amazing skill to face monsoon rains and major floods and hold (your) place by not retreating a single step. It is an act of amazement to defeat battle tanks and artillery with small arms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Wasara thihak thisse siyallata mahunadhena krama saha widhi soya:ganna ape a:rakshaka hamudaawantama siddhawunaa. E gamana pura:ma lokeye thibena vinegaru garukama dhaksathama hamudhaavak bawata Lankaave thrividha-thrividha hamudhaava pathwuna: . (72-73)</td>
<td>For thirty years our security forces of Sri Lanka had to find ways and means to face all this. Throughout this journey the (three) security forces of Sri Lanka had become the most disciplined and ingenious military in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Loke dharunuthama thrasthawa:dhin paraadhekerja ape thrividha hamudhavanta haekiwooye ema vinayagarukabawath kaepaweemath, nir-nirmaanakaathwa yudhepprakeme praganakala nisai (75)</td>
<td>Our security forces were able to defeat the most ruthless terrorists in the world because of that discipline, commitment, and creative use of military strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Me: rate: tharuna dharuwo: aes, his, mas, le: dhan dheela be:ragaththu ratak me:ka. Me: rate: dha:s gananik tharuna dharuwan thamange: hisata shell-wedilak payata bhimbo:mbayak, hadhawathata wediunndayak wadhiddhi thama jeewitha pooja:kerala. (175-176)</td>
<td>This country was saved by the sacrifice of young people’s eyes, hair, flesh and blood. Thousands of our youth sacrificed their lives in this country while facing shells on their heads, land mines at their feet, and bullets to their hearts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>1980 indhang jeewitha pooja: kela ranawiruwan dhahas gananak ape: ma:thruboomiyeye: mehidhang kera thibenawa. Me: sialu ranawiruwan gaurawayan sihipath keranawa. Owunta ape: prathiguna pennwa:-pennwanawa:. (183-185)</td>
<td>From 1980 onward, there are thousands of troops who sacrificed their lives and are buried in our motherland. We remember all these troops with respect. We show them our gratitude.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4: Description of government immediately following the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 (referring to terrorism) Dhang api e siylla sadhahatama awasan kera thibenewa. (8)</td>
<td>Now we have finished all that forever.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 E nisa: 2005 dhee baara gathhe ithama barapathala abiyoga sahiltha ratak. (47)</td>
<td>Therefore, (what we) took over in 2005 was a country with grave challenges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 E wage:ma e: asarena bawata pathwuna dhiyianiyan dhiyianiwarunge mauvarunge hadhawatthe: naegapu-naegunu wila:paya samastha Dhemala janatha:wage hardhasa:khishyawan wihina wadi ae:thak nce: E: hadhawath dhina:gena thibenne: owunta(wa) e: wahalbawin mudha:gatthha api. (86-87)</td>
<td>The day is not far when the cry that rose in the hearts of the mothers and daughters who have been rendered helpless became the collective conscience of the Tamil people. Their hearts have been won by us who liberated them from that slavery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 E nisa: LTTE -ya thrasthrawa:dhayan Dhemala janatha:wa nihdasah kerasagameen pasu api ba:raganne Shri Lanka ithiha:se monama rajayakwath ba:ra nogath tharam wakakeenin. (102)</td>
<td>Therefore, after freeing the Tamil people from the LTTE’s terrorism we accept a responsibility that no government in the history of Sri Lanka has accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 me: rate: Devundara thuduwe indhang Peduru thuduwa dhakka: siyaluma janatha:wa ape. Mage: Thrasthawa:dhin wisin yatathkaragena siti janatha:watath rajaye wagakeema nopirihala: itukeranna api wagabala:gatthha: Kotinma, i:ye ga:thanaya wunu thrasthawa: dhi nayakayoth i:ye wenethuru kae:ve biuwe rajaya magin yae wae:ma: bi:ma. (106-108)</td>
<td>All the people in this country from Dondra Head to Point Pedro are ours. Mine. The government saw to it that we did not shirk our responsibilities even towards the people who were under the LTTE. In short, even the terrorist leaders who were killed yesterday, until yesterday, ate and drank the food and drink supplied through the government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 Dutugemunu rajathuma: weni rajawarun pawathwa:gena perasiritha anuwa yatathwu:- anuwa yatathwu:th miyagiya sathura:tath apa gaurawa kelayuthui. Eya a:nduwe: pamanak nowei, me: rate: maha janatha:wa thulath thibena shreshta guna:nggeyak. (112-113)</td>
<td>According to the prior tradition established by kings such as King Dutugemunu, we should honor even the enemy that has surrendered or been killed. That is a quality of greatness that is found not only in the government, but also in the people of this country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 Me: maithriya, karuna:wa purudhukala Baud dha, Hindhu, Muslim, Christhina:ni dharmayange-gen poshanaya wunu apeta asaranawu: ape janatha:wata salakana a:ka:re pilibandha upadhes uwamana: nae. (116)</td>
<td>We who are nutured in the Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim and Christian tradition of loving kindness and compassion, do not need advice regarding how we treat our helpless people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 Wasara thunaketa kaling Nagenahira janatha:wage jeewithathath adha jeewithathath sansardhanaya keranne:yai ma: obeng illa: sitinawa. Thrasthawa:dhaya parajaya kireemata dhavaentha satanaka api yedhunath, eya rate: sangwardhanaya ha: subhas:dhanya athapasu kireemata he:thuwalk keragaththe: nce. Rata pura: awurudhu thihak nosalaka: haera siti sangwardhana viyapruthi api a:ramba kela. Raekiya: aethi kela. E:wa: Dakhunata seema: keleth nce. Uthure, Vanni-ye:, Nagenahire: dhavaentha ma:nushike meheyuma keradhdhith, e: pradheshwa wela sangwardhana kattyouthu sandhaha avatheerna wuna: Nagenahire pradhesheyeth Mannarama pradhe:shayeth dhaenata sidhawan sangwardhana kattyouthu nidhasasin pasu kawardha:kkwath kera nce. Vanniya ha Uthireth sangwardhana katiyuthu ikmang keranda</td>
<td>I request you to compare the life of the people in the East three years ago with (their) life today. Although we engaged in a massive battle to defeat terrorism, we did not make that a reason to delay (the) nation’s development and welfare. We began development projects that had been disregarded throughout the country for 30 years. (We) created employment. And they were not confined to the South. Even while carrying out massive humanitarian operations in the North, the Vanni and the East, we entered into development work in those areas. At no time since independence has the development work now being done in the East and Mannar been done. A Presidential Task Force has already been appointed to expedite development work in the Vanni and the North.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are committed to carry out accelerated development in all areas that were under terrorism within the next three years. While bringing people’s lives within a democratic political structure, we are approaching the Northern Spring where not only education and health but irrigation, roads, electricity, water and such foundational facilities necessary for the improvement of agriculture, fisheries and tourism sectors will be improved.

Table 2.5: Description of the international community immediately following the end of the war

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 Lokaye balawath ratawal pawa thrathawaadhin idhiriye asarana bawak pennuwa; samahara ratawal thrasthawa:di idhiriye saeluna, dhana naemuwa. (55-56)</td>
<td>Even the powerful countries of the world showed helplessness before the terrorists; some countries shook and fell on their knees before (the) terrorists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 Nidhahas keragath janatha:wage wagakeema ba:ra ganna kota apata noyek ratawalain a:yathanawalin noyek yo:jana: idhiripath wenewa. Ape:ma Dhemala janatha:wa hondhin bala:ganneyaei owun apitama kiyanawa. (103-104)</td>
<td>When we accept responsibility of the people who were liberated, we receive various proposals from various countries and institutions. They ask us to look after our own Tamil people well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09 Me : maithriya, karuna:wa purudhukala Baudhha Hindhu, Muslim, Christhina:ni dharmayange-gen</td>
<td>We who are nurtured in the Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim and Christian tradition of loving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Garu Katha:na:yakathumani, me: janatha:wata, rate: anith pradheshya wala janatha:wata se:ma, pradha:chanchrawa:dhi: nidhahas a:ka:re pilibandha upadhes uwamana: nae. (116)</td>
<td>Honorable Speaker, we need to give these people the democratic freedom that are the right of people in all others parts of this country. Similarly, we need to swiftly provide the political solution they need. However, it cannot be an imported/foreign solution. We do not have the time to experiment with the solutions suggested by other countries. Therefore, we must provide our own nation’s solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>(Referring to a national/local solution) Eyata ja:thiyantthar-ra ratawalin sahaya mise ba:dha:wan apa balaporuththuwanne nae. (146)</td>
<td>We expect support from the foreign countries, not impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-May-09</td>
<td>Api thrasthawa:dhayata erehiwa stheera:dhistha:nayen peramunata yanakota noyek ratawal apagen kothekuth illeem kela. Namuth e: siyalu illeem walata apata aehungkang dheemata puluwang wun-wunath, e: siyalla kriya:thmaka kireemata idak thibune: nae:. E: mage: rate: janatha:wata 2005 janadha-jana:dhipathiwaranaye:dhi: ma: dhun balu:poroththuwa, mata dhun janawaramath itukireemata ma: baendhi: siti: nisa. E: wage:ma ma:hruboomiyi nidhahasath shrayarithwath mage: dhwiwdhenenikota saelakoo nisa (206-209)</td>
<td>When we proceeded against terrorism with firm determination, various countries made many requests of us. Although we were able to listen to all those requests, we were unable to implement all of them. That is because I was bound to carry out the expectations I offered and the mandate given to me in the 2005 Presidential elections. Likewise, it was because I considered my life second to the motherland’s freedom and sovereignty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

**Descriptions of social actors post-war speeches**


### Table 3.1: Description of the LTTE in post-war speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Thrasthawa:dheen nisa wasara thihak thisse: mage: janatha:wa si:ruwen hitiya. (55)</td>
<td>My people were constantly alert for thirty years because of terrorism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>(in Tamil) Muppathu warata ka:lama:ha irumndha payanggarawa: dha nilamai ippo:duhu illai. (69)</td>
<td>(in Tamil) The state of terror present for thirty years is no longer there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Ja:thyantharayathal balape:m kala Kotti thrasthawa:daya dhaen awasa:nai. (110)</td>
<td>Tiger terrorism that also impacted the international community has now ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-11</td>
<td>This (30) wasarak thisse thrasthawa:daya nisa: dhe:shayata ahimi wu: jeewithha haera anek siyalla laba: dheeme maha abhiyo: gayakata api dhaen mahunna dee thibenawa. (13)</td>
<td>We now face the great challenge of restoring everything else except the lives lost to the nation during thirty years of terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-12</td>
<td>Thrasthawa:deen Lanka:wata erehiwi pitarata wala indan karana kumanthrana daewaentha boru pracha:raka katayuthu wala iwarayak nae kiyala oba thannawa. (33)</td>
<td>You know that there is no end to the conspiracies and massive campaigns of lies that the terrorists make against Lanka from foreign countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2: Description of the Tamils in post-war speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Uthura ha: Naeginahira pradhe:sha walin marana bhaya iwath karala ithiha:saye: dhawantha sanwardhanayak api e: pradhe:sha wala aethi kala:. (58)</td>
<td>We removed the fear of death from the North and East and created in those places massive development in history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Wasara thihak thisse: pajathanthrawa:daya nisa: dhe:shayata ahimi wu: jeewithha haera anek siyalla laba: dheeme maha abhiyo: gayakata api dhaen mahunna dee thibenawa. (13)</td>
<td>You know that the people of the North and East suffered for thirty years without democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>(in Tamil) appa:vi makkalai (95)</td>
<td>(in Tamil) innocent people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3: Description of the Sri Lankan Armed Forces in post-war speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>nidhahasa wenuwen as; his, mas, le: wage:ma jeewithha parithya:ga kala ranawiruwanuth (8)</td>
<td>and soldiers who sacrificed their eyes, hair, flesh and blood as well as (their) lives for freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>rata raekagaththa wa- meheyume:dhi rata wenuwen satan kala senpathiyen (41)</td>
<td>during the operation to defend the country, the Commanders who fought for the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-11</td>
<td>thrasthawa:daya thuran kireemata divihimiya kaepa woo e: siyaluma ranawiruwan wath ma: itha: gaurawayen shihapth karanawa:. (4)</td>
<td>I remember the soldiers who dedicated themselves unto death to drive away terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-11</td>
<td>E: wage:ma thamai api A:siyawe paeranima</td>
<td>We are one of Asia’s oldest democracies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to this democracy, the unity and single-mindedness of our motherland should be protected. We have travelled an old/mature democratic path which (helps) us to solve our own problems. We have shown the world the humanitarian and democratic signs of our society by rebuilding what was destroyed after the the tsunami and resettling refugees.

Table 3.4: Description of the government in post-war speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Gewunu siwuwasara nidhahasin pasuwa gewunu artha:nwitha siwuwasara bhawata pathkarannata apata puluwan winuyi kiyuwoth eya niwaeradhi:.</td>
<td>It would not be wrong to say we were able to make the past four years the most meaningful four years since independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Wijayakgrahanayak laba:ganna- laba:gaththa api, ape: janatha:watath e: aya pasukarayanna puluwan bawa api oppu karala thiyenawa.</td>
<td>We, who have obtained a great victory, have proved that our people can overtake them (i.e. other countries that have shown progress).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Dhan seeruwen hitapu yugaya awasan karala: pahasuwen hitaganna puluwan ratak api godanagamin thiyenawa.</td>
<td>Now ending the ear of alertness we are building a country that can be at ease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Mithrawaruni, Uthura ha: naginahira pradhe:sha walin marana bhaya iwath karala ithiha:saye: dhanawo sanwardhanayak api e: pradhe:sha wala aethi kala:. E: witharak newei: mulu rate:ma api e: sangwardhanaya dhiyath ka:]. Naegenahira nawoodhaya, Uthuru wasanthaya, me: rate: thibunu dhaewaentha sangwardhana waeda piliwelawal keepayak. Wasara thihak thisse: pajanthantrawa:dhaya ahimi woowa Uthura saha Naegenahira janatha:wa dhukwindha bhawa oba dhannawa:. Owunta pajanthantrawa:dhaya laba: dhenna apita puluwan wuna:. E: kai api pasugiya dha: labapu visa:lathama jayakgrahana:. Gamatama balaya genemin Uthura ha: Naegenahira aethulu mulu rate:ma purawaesiyan balanganwana wisandhumak laba: dhunnama e: e: pradhe:shawala janatha:wata swa:dheenawo thamange pradhe:sha wenuwen waeda karanna, naegee sitinna puluwan bhawa maha wise:aya nokulana:.</td>
<td>Friends, we have brought massive development to the North and East regions as never witnessed in history after removing their fear of death. Not only that, we launched that development in the entire country. Uthuru Vasanthaya (Northern Spring) and Naegenahira Navodaya (Eastern Awakening) are some of the major development projects that were in the country. You know that the people of the North and East suffered for thirty years without democracy. We were able to grant them democracy. That is the greatest victory we have achieved in the recent past. I believe that when a solution that empowers the citizens of the North, East and the entire country is provided by empowering the village, each region’s people can work independently and stand up for their area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-11</td>
<td>E: nisa: nidhahasa dina: gaeneemata wage:ma eya ma:thru: bhu:miye: thahawuru kireematath kisida: kisiwek nogath yo:dha piyawara ras:hiyak api ganu labuwa:.</td>
<td>Like in winning it (i.e. freedom), we have taken many giant steps that no one has ever taken to upholding that freedom in the motherland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-11</td>
<td>Ka:lagunika wiparya:sa apita pa:lanaya kala nohaeki wunath wipathata path siyulu janatha:wa naga:situwemata api kaepawee sitinawa. Owun wenuwen dhanatamath wisa:la mudhal sangkya:wa: wak api wen karala: e: e: prade:sha wala nilada:reenta yawala thiyenawa.</td>
<td>Although we are unable to control the effects of extreme weather, we are committed to uplift all those who are affected by it. We have already allocated a large amount of funds for them and sent it to the authorities of those regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4-Feb-11 | Bim bo:mba walin pri bhu:miya wasara dhekak gathaweemata pero batha bulathin sarusa:ra alangka:ra | Before two years passed, we were able to transform land that was filled with landmines.
kethya:yak bawata pariwarthanaya kireemata apita puluwana wuna: (21)

4-Feb-11


4-Feb-11

4-Feb-12 E: nisa: 1948 nidhahasana laba:gena ada siya wasak
thunaka ka:laya thula ja:thiyata laba:dennata apita
puluwan kama laeboona. (13)

Therefore, during these three years of
obtaining freedom from terrorists we were able
to provide greater results than the half century
since obtaining independence in 1948.

4-Feb-12 me: rata thrasthawa:dayen muda:gena stheera
sa:mayak ja:theen athara samagiyaath godanaa:ee:me:
karyaba:raye daen api yedila sitinawa kiyala
thamunna:nsela dannawa. (39)

You know that following the rescue from
terrorism we are now working towards to the
task of building stable peace and unity among
communities.

4-Feb-12 api daenatamath me: komis: me: adangu de:
krama:nuku:lalesa kriya:thmaka karanna api patan
aragena thiyenne. Me: wiywas- me: wa:rtha:wa
pa:lime:nhuwata idhiripath karala- kale mang
hithanne desaembar 17th wenida:. Eda: indala: sati
hayak thama- tharam sulu ka:layak- e: kiyanne ada
wenakota sathi hayak. Metharang durata api wisha:la
prama:nayak waeda kotasak api kriya:thmaka karala
thiyenawa. Niwa:du ka:leth, naththala thiyenaka kalath-
iwa:du kalath e: ka:leth me: aya waeda karana:. (53-57)

We have already started implementing the
commission’s (i.e. Lessons Learnt and
Reconciliation Commission) recommendations
systematically. I think this report was
presented to parliament on December 17th. In
the short span of six weeks since then – that is,
until today it has been six weeks.
Thus far we have implemented a huge amount
of work. These people worked (on it) even on
vacation time, even at Christmas time.

Table 3.5: Description of the international community in post-war speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeches</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>A:yo:janaya karanna thiyena hondhama rataw athare Sri Lanka:wath thiyenawa. Api owun wetha a:ra:dhana: karanawa:.</td>
<td>Sri Lanka is also listed among the best countries for investment. We cordially invite them here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-10</td>
<td>Wide:sha prathipaththiye:dhi: mama kale: mage rate: janatha:wage: yayapathatha he:thuwana de:wal. (107)</td>
<td>In foreign policy, I have done what was in the interest of the people of my country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Feb-12</td>
<td>Thrasthawa:deen Lanka:wata erehiwa pitarata wala indan karana kumanthraana daewaentha boru prach:ra kata:ayuthu wala iwarayaraj nae kiyala oba thannawa. Ethera ehema wenakota methera inna piris-samahara piris- ma:thru: bhui:miya astha:vara karanna noyek de: karanawa. Lo:kaye: aethaem ratawala siduwu:de: Lanka:wa thulath itu:garaganna me: aya balaporoththu wenawa kiyali mata haengenne. Me: degolloma ekama pirisak. Lanka:we karana me: satan walata haebi theluth watthurath laebenne wide:sha wala kriya:thmaka wana bedumwa:dayen bawa nang rahasak newei. (33-37)</td>
<td>You know that there is no end to the conspiracies and massive campaigns of lies that the terrorists make against Sri Lanka from foreign countries. When that happens there, groups here - some groups here – do various things to destabilize the motherland. I feel that these people hope to make things that happen in certain countries of world take place in Sri Lanka too. Both these groups are the same. It is not a secret that that for the struggle that happens in Sri Lanka, fuel and water are provided from separatism that operates abroad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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