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Abstract
A speech of human being has the best number of styles, forms and it has beautiful meaning each words. Thus, a success of the speech cannot be measured by loud applause of the people but can be measured from the result of an enlightening speech. This research deals with the differences of rhetoric styles: the use of ‘us’ and ‘them’ between speeches of Soekarno and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY). This analysis is aimed to find out the characteristic of the speakers reflected the rhetorical style through the use of modality and to find out the ideology of the speakers reflected the use of pronouns (us and them). This research uses the method of qualitative that requires collecting textual data and examining the text by using it. It employs Aristotelian rhetoric’s framework by Herrick (2005) focus on logos, pathos, and ethos. It is combined with systemic functional linguistics framework by Humphrey, et all (2003) reflected the use of modality: modal verbs. Additionally, it employs critical discourse analysis framework on polarizing structure between US and THEM by Van Dijk (1995). First, the findings between speeches of Soekarno and SBY shows to be neutral: they use all aspect of rhetoric styles. Therefore, Soekarno has dominant aspects of ethos (28,7% of logos, 21,8% of pathos, 49,3% of ethos). Meanwhile, the findings of SBY's speech also has most dominant aspects of ethos (20% of logos, 8,5% of pathos, and 71,5% of ethos). Second, the findings show Soekarno and SBY uses the first plural pronouns of ‘us and them’ to build the five principles of Pancasila are reflected towards the rhetoric styles. Also, Soekarno adopts the use of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in the five principles: were called ‘Pancasila’: religiosity, humanitarianism, unity, nationalism, social justice as his ideologies. However, SBY adopts most dominant of the use of
‘us’ in the three of the five principles (pancasila): humanitarianism, unity or nationalism, unity as his ideologies at the Asia Africa Conference. Those conclude that the speakers have different styles and ideologies to persuade and send the messages to the audiences towards their idea.
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A. Introduction

Speech is a recognizable component of everyday life that people once in a while pause to characterize it. Most of the people aware of the importance of address is to empower a man to specifically associate with a substantial number of individuals. For Sapir (1921), he expresses speech is a human movement that differs without assignable cutoff as we go from social gathering to social gathering since it is an absolutely authentic legacy of the gathering, the result of since quite a while ago proceeded with social application. Hence, speech can be tools of social environment as a human movement.

In other words, a key of success is rhetoric styles. Rhetoric styles are intended to inspire audience members to acknowledge a specific perspective, and afterward persuade them without hesitation. For Aristotle (in Freese, 1926) points out rhetoric is an art where becomes part of life to make a better situation. In this case, rhetoric is a partner of rationalization; for both need to do with issues that are in a way inside the perception of all men and not limited to any exceptional science. Therefore, rhetoric, in the general feeling of the application of language in such a way as to inspire the listeners and impact them for or against a specific game-plan, is as old as dialect itself and the beginnings of social and political life. Here in, the present study will set out with the aim of assessing the importance of rhetoric in two influential leaders in the Republic of Indonesia. Moreover, Soekarno is the first president of the Republic of Indonesia and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono is the sixth president of Republic of Indonesia. In this case, the most important of this study will be comparing Soekarno and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) speeches at the Asia Africa Conferences in different times.

With regards to the study above, the outlined art of rhetoric will show from both the leaders in different era. The researcher will find the rhetoric styles and will find ideologies from both leaders of Indonesia through the educational background and political background. The researcher also will find those issues by Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis.

The structure of the first research is an introduction. Moreover, the second part will show the theoretical framework and methodology of this research. The following steps will explore the differences between rhetoric styles and the ideology of the speakers. The last but not least is a conclusion of the whole paper which includes some useful suggestions to readers for further study in the future.
B. Research Method

Firstly, the data was collected from the chain of paragraphs of the speeches which consist of the sequence of events (introduction, content, and conclusion). Then, the data were classified into some groups. After the data has been collected and classified, the data were arranged and analyzed by using SFL and CDA reflected the use of modality and pronouns. Therefore, the findings of the data were explained and discussed in order to answer the research questions.

This research attempts to analyze the content of the speeches, that can be proved through the statement of problems entitled *Rhetorics in The Opening of Speeches by Soekarno and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono at The Asia Africa Conference*. It was also found out that those speeches can be implied from Critical Discourse Analysis, SFL, and rhetorical approaches.

However, the researcher will use the qualitative methods in analyzing in order to give new insight for the readers Soekarno and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) who has the different styles of rhetoric to deliver the speeches during Asia Africa conference in different times. They also have different ideologies to build two continent be great in the world from the messages of Asia Africa Conference.

C. Result and Discussion

1. Rhetoric styles

Rhetoric, is about motivated or persuaded the audience in a particular circumstance, wherein a writer or speaker strives to inform or advise something. According to Aristotle (in Baca & Villanueva, 2010) claims that rhetoric is most suitably connected to encourage the choice of issues about which genuine information is inaccessible.

Furthermore, rhetoric is helpful, to start with, on the grounds that reality and justice are normally more grounded than their contrary energies; so that, when awards are not given appropriately, truth and equity more likely than not been worsted by their own blame. Prior to McCormack (2014) rhetoric styles is used Aristotle's theory divides into three forms: *logos* (as logical argument), *pathos* (as the psychology of emotion), and *ethos* (as the sociology of good character). Therefore, these are three classifications have since been ordinarily referred to as Aristotle's three methods of rhetorical style. It will be described one by one through the theory of three forms of rhetoric such as *logos, pathos, and ethos*.

Firstly, *Logos* is the persuasive technique that refers the rationale behind an argument. In case, *logos* try to provide and persuade particularly audience using logical arguments. *Logos* is
proposing mind or rationality by and large. Furthermore, the owner of *logos* was the unmistakably human trademark that isolated us from different creatures such as an animal (Herrick, 2005: 82).

Also, *logos* covers two forms such as logical argument (example) and *enthymeme* aspect. This kind of *logos* will be drawn the speakers is. Moreover, the people will be known the practical of arguments related to the situation among the speaker and audiences.

The following briefly explanation both two forms of the logic of sound statement as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catagories</th>
<th>Sub Catagories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logos (The logical of sound statement)</td>
<td>Entymeme</td>
<td>It appears when the speaker delivers some statements which have roles as premises and it is connected one another to conclude the result of the statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>The speaker define his idea by the analogy or fable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 (*The forms of the psychology of emotion*)

Secondly, *Pathos* speaks to an interest in the feelings of particular the audience and evokes emotions that as of now live in them. However, pathos not only comes from all good emotional sense but also from the wildest sense (Solivan, 1998:96). In line with Solivan, Herrick (2005:83) claims that the term of *pathos* that is used to the emotional appeals, which gives the messages for persuading the audience. The term *pathos* has drawn from the critical of speakers who manipulated the psychology of emotion to the audience. This kind of *pathos* also is used the felling to reflect to the emotional approaches to achieve the goals of the speaker. In this case, the speaker will give persuasive message to them in order to make audience to take an action.

On the other hand, this kind of *pathos* divided into four points. It is related to the emotional aspect of human being. Moreover, prior to Aristotle (in Herrick, 2005: 83) states that Aristotle looks at the feelings such as fear, shame, pity, anger as the form of the psychology of
emotion. Thus, it will make easier to analyze the text uses those aspects.

The following table will show as a briefly explanation of four forms of the psychology of emotion below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catagories</th>
<th>Sub Catagories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathos (The psychology of emotion)</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>a pain represent the mental picture of someone towards some destructive area in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>an action that had been prompted from the emotions as it had done something regrettable at that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>an expressing that somebody or something defenseless is being hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>a pain comes from an impulse accordingly conspicuous revenge directed without any clarification or justification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 (The forms of the psychology of emotion)

Thirdly, *Ethos* is the believability or dependability that build up in the communication. Moreover, *ethos*, represents an idea that if the audience can trust the speaker, it probably means the audience will take an action from his ideap. In this case, usually, *ethos* covers the credibility of argument by the persuader.

In this case, he also explains the form of *ethos* reflected Aristotle’s rhetorical theory that covers three parts of an *ethos*. He separates character into its three constituent parts. Keeping in mind the end goal to build up *ethos*, the speaker must ‘show phronesis (knowledge, great sense), arete (virtue), and eunoia (goodwill)’ in the speech (Herrick, 2005:84). Thus, all those forms have drawn the sociology of good character.
The following table will show as a briefly explanation of three forms of the sociology of good character below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catagories</th>
<th>Sub Catagories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethos (The sociology of good character)</td>
<td>Intelligence or great sense</td>
<td>the credibility of the speaker by explaining the logical statement from his competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>an ability of the speaker which describe from the speaker to establish trustworthiness of the audiens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>is kind of a perception of the audience that the speaker intention to the audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (*The forms of the psychology of emotion*)

2. **Systemic Functional Linguistic**

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a way to deal with semantics that thinks about language as a social semiotic framework. Additionally, SFL is a theory of language that has at its heart the concept of choice between meanings. This framework will find context based on the meaning.

In addition, Halliday’s SFL *(in Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014)* points out the speaker’s explanation behind saying something and for saying it the way they do. Thus, there is the meaning behind the speaker utterances reflects to the situation around them. Thus, there is a tool of styles are used by the speakers. One of the tools is the use of modality of SFL. Therefore, prior to Haliday’s SFL also covers modality that implies likely or far-fetched (if a recommendation), attractive or unfortunate (if a proposition). A recommendation or proposition may wind up questionable through being surveyed as far as the level of likelihood or commitment that is related to it *(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:88)*.

Thereupon, not only rhetoric plays a role in a validity of the text but also modality plays a role in it. The modality divided into three forms: the modality of low degree, the modality of
medium degree, and the modality of high degree. Thus, from those forms will be easier to find rhetoric styles by using it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Modal Verb (Auxiliaries)</strong></th>
<th><strong>High modality</strong></th>
<th><strong>Medium Modality</strong></th>
<th><strong>Low Modality</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal adverbials</strong></td>
<td>Must, ought to, need, has to, had to</td>
<td>Will, would, should, is to, was to, supposed to</td>
<td>Can, may, could, might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal adjectivals</strong></td>
<td>Certain, definite, absolute, necessary, obligatory</td>
<td>Probable, usual</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal nouns</strong></td>
<td>Certainty, necessity, requirement, obligation</td>
<td>probability</td>
<td>possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal clauses and phrases (interpersonal metaphors)</strong></td>
<td>I believe (that) ..</td>
<td>I think (that) ..</td>
<td>I guess (that) ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is obvious (that) ..</td>
<td>In my opinion ..</td>
<td>It’s likely (that) ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everyone knows (that) ..</td>
<td>It isn’t likely (that) ..</td>
<td>It’s likely (that) ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers agree (that) ..</td>
<td>If .. then ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 The example of modality (adapted from Humphrey, Droga, & Feez, 2003)

3. **Critical Discourse Analysis**

Linguistic structures are conceptual tools for imposing particular ways of viewing a situation. One of the tools to analyze the linguistic and the social is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Furthermore, CDA serves in growing of social change because language changes are
very influential every time.

A large and growing body of literature has investigated CDA is a form of analysis. For Fairclough (1995) claims that CDA is combined here as a 'three-dimensional' system where the point is to outline isolate types of examination onto each other. It is included as three-dimensional framework that aims to build three separate forms of analysis such as analysis of spoken or written language texts, analysis of discursive events as example of sociocultural practice.

Here in, through the explanation above, he believes that CDA can be a tool to analyze a text both oral and written. Moreover, according to Rogers points out ‘CDA is a broad framework that carries critical social hypotheses into discourse with speculations of language to answer specific research questions’. She states CDA is tended to as a performativity of writings—both written and spoken which focus on the form of analysis (Rogers, 2011:8). Moreover, one of the important features of critical discourse analysis is Ideology.

On the other hand, nowadays, the social reality makes the human wonder towards thought and social reality. Indeed, they are related each other called the study of ideology. Furthermore, ideologies have similar concepts with Van Dijk (1995), he has drawn a group-relevant, self-serving selection of fundamental socio-cultural values. On the whole, it is a social construct, comprising of shared values inside a gathering of individuals. Therefore, if ideologies show a polarizing structure between us and them, so they have a correlation with the link of the pronoun as a persuasive.

4. Islam and Pancasila

Islam and pancasila speak correlation between islamic and pancasila, then we will find values contained in sila-sila of pancasila, found a lot in the values of islamic teachings, and because it only islam-lah the only religion very template the concept. Islamic about is not only regulate or their beliefs and worship god, from sleep, but we until we go back to sleep, all arranged religion. That is why - it is individuals who said that pancasila from it, like someone who takes dipper who shoved religion into the sea, hence water in dipper are his name pancasila Of signs, the that contained in pancasila, the to be found in the source is religion Come the first: the one. Come this aligned with some value contained in allah in al-qur'an chapter al-ikhlas, 1-4. Allah said,

قَلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ (1) الَّهُ الصَّمَدُ (2) لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يَوْلَدْ (3) وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ (4)
Say: He is Allah, the One!; Allah, the eternally Besought of all!; He begetteth not nor was begotten.; And there is none comparable unto Him. (QS.Al-Ikhlas[112]:1-4).

Come second, for justice and civilized
This second we find the final communiqu of the content , among others on god;

يا أيها الناس إن خلقناكم من ذكر وأنثى وجعلناكم شعوبًا وقبائل لتعارفوا إن أكرمكم عند الله أتقاكم إن الله على خير

Mankind! Lo! We have created you male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another. Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allah, is the best in conduct. Lo! Allah is Knower, Aware. (QS.al-Hujurat[49]:13).

The word of god as other,

يا أيها الذين آمنوا كونوا قوامين لله شهداء بالقسط ولا يجرمنكم شئان فقوم علّى ألا تعدلوا اعتدلوا هو أقرب للتقوى واتفقوا الله إن الله خبير بما تعملون (8) المائدة

who believe! Be steadfast witnesses for Allah in equity, and let not hatred of any people seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal justly, that is nearer to your duty. Observe your duty to Allah. Lo! Allah is Informed of what ye do. (QS. Al-Maidah[5]:8)

Come third indonesia union
Come it is the essence of the al-qur': below

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ إِخْوَةٌ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَ أَخَوَيْكُمْ وَاتَّفَقُوا اللَّهُ إِنَّ الله خَبِيرٌ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ

The believers are naught else than brothers. Therefore make peace between your brethren and observe your duty to Allah that haply ye may obtain mercy. (QS.al-Hujurat[49]:10).

Allah has stated in another verse:

وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلََ تَفَرَّقُوا

And hold fast, all of you together, to the cable of Allah, and do not separate. (QS.Ali-Imran[3]:103).

Come fourth , society-based led by wisdom discretion in consultation and the representatives of . ~
All four of these precepts relevant with the word allah in al-qur’ s: below

فَبِمَا رَحْمَةٍ مِنَ اللَّهِ لِنْتَ لَهُمْ وَلَوْ كُنْتَ فَظًّا غَلِيظَ الْقَلْبِ لَنْفَضُّوا مِنْ حَوْلِكَ فَاعْفُ عَنْهُمْ وَاسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُمُ َ
وَشَاوِرْهُمْ فِي الأمْرِ فَإِذَا عَزَمْتَ فَاعْفُ عَلَى اللَّهِ إِنه اللَّهُ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَوَكِّلِينَ

It was by the mercy of Allah that thou wast lenient with them (O Muhammad), for if thou hadst been stern and fierce of heart they would have dispersed from round about thee. So pardon them and ask forgiveness for them and consult with them upon the conduct of affairs. And when thou art resolved, then put thy trust in Allah. Lo! Allah loveth those who put their trust (in Him). (QS.al-Imran[3]:159).

Come fifth, social justice for all Indonesian people
come this its essence in line with our al-qur’ s: below

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنها خَلَقْنَاكُمْ مِنْ ذَكَرٍ وَأُنْثَى وَجَعَلْنَاكُمْ شُعُوبًا وَقَبَائِلَ لِتَعَارَفُوا إِنه أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ إِنه اللَّهَ عَلِيمٌ خَبِير

Mankind! Lo! We have created you male and female, and have made you nations and tribes that ye may know one another. Lo! the noblest of you, in the sight of Allah, is the best in conduct. Lo! Allah is Knower, Aware. (QS.al-Hujurat[49]:13)

And in another verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُونُوا قَهْدِمِينَ لِلِّهِ شُهَدَاءَ بِالْقِسْطِ وَلَيْ يَجْرِمْنَهكُمْ شَنَآَنُ قَوْمٍ عَلَى أَلَه تَعْدِلُوا اعْدِلُوا هُوَ أَقْرَبُ لِلتهَقْوَى وَاتهمُوا اللَّهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ خَبِيرٌ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ (8) المائدة

Who believe! Be steadfast witnesses for Allah in equity, and let not hatred of any people seduce you that ye deal not justly. Deal justly, that is nearer to your duty. Observe your duty to Allah. Lo! Allah is informed of what ye do. (QS. Al-Maidah[5]:8)

Thus, do not need another polarizing between Islam with Pancasila. And on the way the nation history Indonesia is only the communists who always undermining want to delete and then change as the ideology of the state Pancasila.

5. Findings

Regarding to the speeches between Soekarno and SBY, researchers have analyzed and compared frequencies of rhetoric styles appeared on those speeches. The results are described as follow:
a. Rhetoric Styles Indicating Modality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Ethos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthymemes</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Rhetoric Styles Indicating Modality on Soekarno's Speech
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODALITY</th>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Ethos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthymemes</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Rhetoric Styles Indicating Modality on SBY's Speech

The table above shows that the type of speech rhetoric style has a different type. At present, pathos is used less frequently than the text of Soekarno's speech. However, the appearance of the rhetorical style was also roughly the same between the two parties. Soekarno's speech used three forms by dominantly. Likewise, the same rhetorical style also emerged through SBY's speech. However, in SBY's speech, ethos becomes the dominant aspects of his speech.
On the other hand, three forms of rhetoric styles are reflected to the ideologies of the speakers. The results are described as below:

b. **Ideologies Indicating US & Them**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOEKARNO's SPEECH</th>
<th>SBY's SPEECH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDEOLOGIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>US</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasionalism</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Ideologies Indicating Us & Them between Soekarno and SBY's Speech

Regarding to the table 6 describes the ideologies of the speakers. Soekarno and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono uses the first plural pronouns of 'us & them' to build a sense of unity between the speaker and the audience. In this case, Soekarno is more dominant than Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono to uphold the five principles. Meanwhile, SBY prefers not to become dominant in the five principles.

On the other hand, the use between ‘us’ and ‘them’ shows the audiences and the speakers are the same as one indivisible entity. Therefore, it explains that they are part of the people to which their speak. The research finds 23 clauses of ‘us’ and 1 clause of ‘them’ in the speech of Soekarno and 10 clauses of ‘us’ in the speech of SBY. All those data divided into several categories of the principles.

6. **Discussions**

Based on the data gained, some findings are worth to discuss in this part. The speakers are adopted three aspects: the logical of sound argument, the psychology of emotion and the sociology of good character through the modality. Modality also covers three of forms: the modality of low covers the words, for example, *can, may, might, could* as the modal verbs, the modality of medium covers the words, for example, *will, should, would, was to* as the modal
verbs, and the modality of high covers the words, for example, *must, need, ought to* as the modal verbs (Humphrey, et.all, 2003:61).

In this case, the research will show one of the choice modality is the use of modality of low on *rhetoric styles*:

[1a] The States of the world today depend one upon the other and no nation **can** be island into itself.

The use of modality ‘can’ might be answer *yes or no*. It probably means the audience will make a question of logical statements from those clauses (Otieno, 2015:80). Here in, Soekarno uses **can**, especially states that is credibility: yes, no nation can be island into itself. Moreover, in example [1a], Soekarno points out that his argument seems sensible covers logical reasoning by creating an *enthymeme*. In this case, there is one conclusion which is no nation cannot depend one upon the other. That conclusion means there is no nation can be a big or island without togetherness or no nation is independent of each other as described from enthymeme below:

1st premise: The States of the world today depend one upon the other
2nd premise: no nation can be island into itself.

Conclusion: no nation cannot depend one upon the other

[2a] How **can** we say it is dead, so long as vast areas of Asia and Africa are unfree.

Another way of *logos* is ‘example’, covers the way to create logical reasoning which defines the idea to get the audience understand the meaning. In example [2a], Soekarno uses one of parts from *logos* is example based on his experiences. Moreover, he expresess about the important things that related to the audience expectation by giving an explanation refers to the the real sector or nature of two continents in the future. Moreover, to express possibility of something from the speeches, the use of ‘can’ explains that the speaker in the creed: yes, its can.

The following example comes from SBY’s speech as below:

[1b] Acting as one community, we **can** make sure that even the smallest among us will be not marginalized.

An instance of those example shows two clauses represented the aspect of ‘example’ of *logos*. SBY shows the use of modality low degree ‘can’ as possibility of logical ideas from one his goals to persuade the audience through it. The following data come from example [2b] described that he gives an example of the logical rationale of one an example that is a community. He also shows the possibility reflected the use of ‘can'.
On the other hand, based on indicating modality in those speeches will describe the ideologies of speakers through the use of ‘us’ and ‘them’.

The speakers was adopted dominant unity as the third principal. In this case, Soekarno uses principle of unity in the colonialism era:

[3a] And let us remember, Sisters and Brothers, that for the sake of all that, we Asians and Africans must be united.

From the previous explanation gives an impact to the example [3a]. Hence the points that he will announce to them is unity in diversity. Thus, he points out that two continents must be united although they have a diversity. Therefore, the word of ‘unity’ is the important points become one of the ideologies from Soekarno. Accordingly, he strongly upholds it is seen in the repetition of examples of unity. Equally important he uses the pronoun of ‘us’ in every clause as a part of the audience that brings about the closeness between the speaker and the audience closely.

Therefore, from his ideas, described that the future of Asian African Africa depends on the audience at that time. Moreover, Asia Africa cannot be a great without the responsibilities that are emblazoned by each individual. According to Moss (2009), it also concerns the roles of action as well as individual contributions and outcomes from the individual.

On the contrary, in SBY speech, found for about four clauses of unity as his expectation for the new strategic. In this case, two examples will show as follows:

[9b] Let us therefore build a Strategic Partnership that will bind our two continent in a vibrant, pragmatic, and forward-looking way.

[10b] Acting as one community, we can make sure that even the smallest among us will be not marginalized.

For example [9b] describes a unity to build a partnership that is a strategic partnership to unite the two continents through the vibrant, pragmatic, and forward-looking way in the future. As described in humanitarianism or internationalism principles that he invited the audience to sympathize based on the situation around them. In this case, example [10b] he also gives the solution to make it sure that the smallest among the will be not marginalized.
D. Conclusion

This research shows the perspective of the rhetorical style are reflected of the use of modality of low degree, modality of medium degree, and modality of high degree. So, regarding to the rhetoric styles are reflected the ideologies of the speakers by using the use of ‘us’ and ‘them’

Firstly, the rhetoric styles between Soekarno and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono has different ways. They seem to be neutral: they use all the aspect of rhetorical component logos, pathos, and ethos reflected the words of modality. Soekarno shows all those aspects as a rhetoricians master. He did not conceal his psychological emotions for the situation around two continents at that time. He invited them to be wary of everything at the time. Thus, he has powerful aspects: the logical statement, the psychology of emotion and the sociology of good character. Meanwhile, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono prefers to declare the important thing of the situation around them in short and clear at the Asia Africa Conference 2005. He denied the psychology of emotion to be declared openly. He was more explore his ideas in the sociology of good character as build the capacity of him. In this case, he looks more powerful to the aspects of ethos that builds himself to deliver the Asia Africa messages by using the us and them.

Therefore, there is influenced to the ideologies of the speaker. Hence, the dominant principles from the five principles were called Pancasila used by Soekarno. Moreover, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono uses three principles out of five principles. As the background of his creator of the origin Pancasila, it is influenced by his speech
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