

Rudiments of Political Power: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hamas Political Leader's Speech

Chioma Esther Osuji

Department of English Education,
FCE(T), Umunze, Orumba South LGA, Anambra State.

&

Chinwe Udoh, PhD

Department of English Language and Literature
Nnamdi Azikiwe University
Awka
vc.udoh@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

This study examined the social power manifestation, ideologies and identities represented in the political discourse as well as the social implications of these social phenomena as represented in the political speech of the political leader of Hamas in October 2023. Insights from Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analytic model was drawn as theoretical framework. A few extracts were sampled randomly for analysis. Applying a qualitative and content analysis, the findings revealed that the political leader strategically suppressed the manifestation of asymmetrical power relations in socio-political structure. It also showed that the political actors used more inclusive lexemes on his people and that of exclusion on their enemies and created the ideology of unity with his people and enmity with their rival and as a Political leader charged with responsibility of protecting his land, the political leader of Hamas maintains the protection objective of their land and celebrates the Palestinian people.

Keywords: political discourse, power relations, ideologies, identity, social reality, Palestinian people

1.0 Introduction

Language as a form of social pattern is employed by people in their carrying out their daily activities within the social environment. Discourse which is the actual use of language in context can be used to achieve basically, two objectives which are transactional or exchange of information and interactional or creation of interpersonal relationships. Discourse embodies both hidden and opaque features of a particular society. From the micro to the macro levels of discourses, houses facts of the politico-economic and socio-cultural aspects of a people. the tool of critical discourse analysis has proven, over the years, critical discourse studies looks at all levels of language particular with the interest to bring to fore or make conspicuous hidden or opaque phenomena underlining a particular society. According to Ezeifeke (2018, 153-154) CDA has the objective of "taking political stance explicitly and applying critique to the analysis of oppressive, discriminatory, offensive, and repressive language use" and their main purpose is "identify and expose hidden power structures within the text, highlighting how such power is used and misused, so that they can be thoroughly examined". It also has the objective to unravel the manifestations of power and power relations in discourse, ideological representation as well as identities constructions for social actors or organizational bodies and hegemony prevailing in a discourse. In human world power (ab)use, power relationship in society, ideologies, identities and hegemony exists and are not crystal clear as their manifestation and existence are through channels that are popularly use but not so clearly seen, for example language. Therefore, a critical discourse analysis studies discourse in order to unravel these features and even more as well as show the implication for such means employed by discourse producers or addressers. Discourse objective of providing information exchange can as well manipulate the discourse consumers into buying or agreeing with the subject discussed talked about by the speakers especially with political undertone.

Political discourse is one loaded with struggle for power (retention). Political discourse producers employ discourse strategically to attain their political whims. Through political speeches, interviews, comments, and what have you, political leaders present their ideologies. Political speeches are non-interactional discourse genre that has the discourse producers deliver their discourse delivered to their target audience. This is the thrust of the paper to examine the political speech delivered by the leader Ismail Haniyeh on the occasion of Operation Al-Aqsa Flood war victory over Israel. The war was launched in October 2023 as an operation involving several attacks on Israel from the Gaza Strip by using means of tunnels, rockets, airstrikes etc (New York Times, 2023.28) The operation was named after the Al-Aqsa Mosques in Jerusalem as it is marked holy by Muslims and seen as symbolic to Palestinian resistance against Israeli occupation. Hamas won in the operation and that has resulted in incessant conflicts and casualties in Hamas and Israel. This situation has however remained continuous though there are diplomatic efforts channeled to achieve a ceasefire and resolve the overarching issue.

Upon the Hamas' with, the political leader of the politico-geographical region of Hamas, who controls or influences his people's behaviors and make for continuity of the wars between the Israeli and Hamas, addresses the Palestinian people to encourage and celebrate them for their unanimous win as well as send notes of warning

to the enemies of their land. Given the currency of the Israeli-Hamas conflict and, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, little or no research has been done on this speech to examine the usage of language by a political leader to address his people. Therefore, the thrust of this paper to uncover the power relationships, identities and ideological representations in the political discourse as well as the socio-political implications of these social realities. The research objectives this study intends to achieve in order to fill the gap in knowledge are to:

- A. Investigate the ways relations of power are manifested in the text
- B. Examine the ideologies and identities are represented in the text, and
- C. Explore the socio-political implications of these social realities.

Thus, the research questions to be answered by this current study are:

1. What ways are power relations reflected in the text?
2. What ideologies and identities are projected in the discourse?
3. What are the socio-political implications of these social realities?

2.0 Critical Discourse Studies

According to Tistcher et al (2000, 42), "discourse is a broad term with different definitions, which 'integrate a whole palette of meanings'". It is a means of realizing social practice using linguistic items by which ideologies, power relations and hegemony possessed by a certain group are manifested. Critical Discourse is a "branch of discourse studies that goes beyond 'how' and 'why' discourse cumulatively contributes to the reproduction of macro-structures and highlights the traces of cultural and ideological meaning" (Ramanathan and Hoon, 57). Agbedo (2015, 294) submits that CDA is both a theory and a method given that it "offers not only a description and interpretation of discourses in social contexts but also offers an explanation of why and how discourses works". Teun van Dijk sees CDA as a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. From the studies so far by van Dijk (2009), Fairclough (1989), the tenets of CDA could be said to include but not limited to: (a) it is an interdisciplinary approach and concept. (b) it is interested in unethical and uncommon issues which investigates the subjugation or prejudice of groups of people to discursive injustice.

2.1 Power, Ideology and Identity

Power is a force of control manifested physically, linguistically which transcends from language to emotion, psycho-cognitive aspects. Certain individuals have power more than others, perhaps as a result of their social advantages, as such there is no balance or sameness in relation of power. Ejiaso (2024, 35) asserts that "power relations are asymmetrical and unequal in our society which makes forte inequality, discrimination, victimization etc. in human social construct". In discourses, the individuals with more social power tends to control the discourse pattern. Bloor and Bloor (2013) acknowledges that power and control are at the heart of critical discourse analysis. Fairclough (1989, 38-39) has that discourse is controlled by powerful participants. By implication, powerful participants are those mostly enjoying certain advantages provided them by the socio-cultural provisions, say class, status, age, gender, etc. Ejiaso (2024, 89) stressed that "powerful individuals control the less power-privileged and "strategic use of certain linguistic elements which underlies their power as well as ideologies, beliefs, or worldview shared by that set". For Ezeifeika (2018, 158) power is concerned with "the shaping [of] the consciousness of institutional subjects, through persuasion mediated by discourse, to accept the ideas, beliefs and values of those in control as 'the truth' that everyone should strive after".

Ideology is a perception about certain social phenomena and represent the social world shared by a group of people or an individual. Ejiaso (2024, 35) sees an ideology possessed by an individual as "how a phenomenon is perceived or viewed by such [a] person which conditions or structures how things or events in the society are interpreted...". She further asserted that, generally, ideologies are "social forms and practices that are structured cognitively in the minds of social groups and also guides their thought patterns and attitudes to things".

The pattern of things or social realities or system of beliefs which are borne by an individual or a group of people is ideology. People in different spheres have certain perceptions they project. Politicians have of themselves, their rivals and the general public. Lecturers have of themselves, their students and schools' systems and their colleagues. Through these ideological manifestation, an individual or group construct their own identities as well as that of others. the social image which an individual or a group would like to be identified with or as others created for them is an identity.

3.0 Political Discourse

Political discourse is a form of discourse that involves a discourse producer or addresser from the government. Sharndama (2015,9) sees political discourse as one that is "associated with either struggle for power or maintenance or control of it". Udoh and Ejiaso (2023, 90) identifies and describes two parties in political sphere: 'political actor' 'who produce the discourses of politics' and 'political recipients' who are described as the general masses that receive the discourse. Igwedibia (2016, 253) asserts political actors possess political power that "has

to do with the position of being in charge over people's behaviour, making decisions and controlling of general resources of society".

Political discourse ranges from political speeches, political interviews, comment, posts etc. Any discourse that more or less emanates from a social actor that wields political power by virtue of their political positions they occupy either by election, selection or appointment is a political discourse. Such discourses express the ideologies of the political actors such as power (ab)use, social relationship, identities for themselves and others.

4.0 Empirical Studies

4.1. Critical Discourse Analysis on Political Discourse

Udoh and Ejiaso (2023) worked on power and ideology: a critical discourse analysis of campaign speeches of 2023 Nigerian presidential aspirants to examine power relations and ideology in the campaign speeches of the top three 2023 Nigerian presidential candidate: Peter Obi, Bola Ahmed Tinubu and Atiku Abubakar. A qualitative research design were deployed for the examination. A total of 6 tweets, 2 each, were purposively sampled from the X handles of the candidates. The researchers employed Fairclough's critical discourse model as theoretical framework. The findings of the study revealed that there is asymmetrical power Relations between the political aspirants and the general masses which invariably show the ideology of imbalance between political actors in Nigeria. The study however concludes that Nigerian presidential aspirants employ more inclusive lexemes as well as implement the inclusiveness in their service as leaders.

Sharndama (2015) examined the political discourse of president Muhammadu Buhari's inaugural speech to explore ideological representations of his government in his speech. Using Fairclough's model of CDA for the dataset analysis, the findings revealed that the discourse is loaded with appreciation, identified plans for good governance, fight against corruption and criticism of past governments.

Koussouhon and Dossoumou (2015) investigated the political and ideological commitments of president Buhari's inaugural speech to explore the hidden ideologies in the text. Drawing insights from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) principles to analyze Buhari's inaugural speech, the researchers focused the analysis on mood, modality, linguistic choices, references to pronouns. It revealed that political leaders' discourse show harmony with ideologies that tally and commensurate the domestic, sub-regional and international realities as well as showed that the choice of grammar structures is a strategic method of structuring and transferring ideological information.

Abdulkadir (2023) worked on the topic "A critical discourse analysis of selected political interviews in Nigerian news media" to investigate ways ideological beliefs of individuals or groups were linguistically conveyed to manipulate others. The researcher drew insights from van Dijk's socio-cognitive model of critical discourse analysis and rhetoric as theoretical framework. A total of two (20) interviews conducted by Channels TV were randomly selected by downloading them from the YouTube official pages of the media and qualitatively analyzed. The findings of the analysis showed that individuals' perception of ideologies represent their projected ideologies and interviewees used language to express domination and supremacy which permitted them to control the views of others, such creating asymmetrical power relations; the more privilege are represented with 'we' and 'us' while less privilege 'they' 'them' through positive self-representation and negative other representation. Rhetorical strategies prevalent in the text include actor description, polarization, burden, categorization, comparison, consensus, populism, vagueness and appeal to emotions amongst others which projects politicians' ideologies.

4.2 Critical Discourse Analysis on Other Linguistic Aspects

Turhan and Okan (2017) conducted a research on the topic: 'critical discourse analysis of advertising: implications for language teacher education' to investigate the language of a non-product advertisements. Using Fairclough's CDA, the researchers analyzed the semi-structured interviews conducted with English Language teacher candidates to examine the social function of advertising not only from sounds, sights and text language and impact on the teachers' views. The findings of the study revealed that there exists a close relationship between teachers image and advert discourse and this provides insights into how to question ideologies critically and grow resistance to manipulators.

Udumoh and Okpala (2024) worked on the topic of 'Discourse Manifestations of Power in Helen Habila's Measuring Time' to investigate power elements and manifestations in Helen's Measuring Time. It employed qualitative-descriptive research design. Ten extracts from the novel were samples purposively. Using Fairclough's CDDA as a theoretical framework for analysis, the findings of the research showed that power manifest at the linguistic levels of lexical, syntactic and grammar, for example: metaphor, repetition, adjectives etc. which express asymmetry. The power reflected in the discourse manifests in sub-themes of power as manipulation,

imposition, exploitation, and the derogatory labelling of disabled characters by the able-bodied ones. The study concludes that these findings helps in structuring the story's plot, characterization and thematic makeup and analysis of the text.

Ejiaso (2024) conducted a research on 'linguistic violence on women: representation of women in ritual killing discourse on Nigerian Social Media space' to explore the representation of linguistic violence on women in ritual killing discourse on Nigeria social media. The researcher employed a qualitative research design and Fairclough's CDA model to analyze data. The data were collected between January and March of 2022 and the researcher purposively collected and sampled eight data from Facebook and four from X (formerly Twitter). The findings of the study revealed that linguistic violence of blame and derogation of women were represented in the discursive representation of women in ritual killing discourse and the perpetrators who are predominantly men are excused. It concludes that this approach strengthens patriarchal structure against women.

5.0 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is the Norman Fairclough's model of Critical Discourse Analysis. Fairclough (1989) saw discourses a social practice. The principles of this framework provides insights for this study's analysis. Fairclough sees language as a part and parcel of human existence or society as such calls discourse as a social practice. Thus, language houses a lot of practice or realities in the society which are more or less not conspicuous.

Fairclough maintained that text, interaction and social context are two parts to discourse and are enablers to the three important epochs to the analysis of discourse according to Fairclough (1989). They are:

- A. Description of text stage. This stage is concerned with the analysis of text at the linguistic levels bordering the formal linguistics properties such as tone, mood, vocabulary, parts of speech, grammar, graphology.
- B. Interpretation Stage (Interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction). It is a stage that is concerned with analyzing the relationship that text and interaction has in a text. Through this perspective, a 'text' is viewed as a product of a process of production and 'interaction' as a tool to arriving at interpretation.
- C. Explanation stage. The explanation stage borders around analyzing the relationship between interaction and social context as such it studies the social implication of the text production process through interpretation.

6.0 Methodology

The current study adopts a qualitative-descriptive research design. This is considered appropriate because of the nature of the dataset for analysis. The political leader of Hamas', Ismail Haniyeh's celebration speech on the First Day of operation Al-Aqsa Flood on the 7th of October, 2023. The researcher randomly sampled a few extracts for critical examination and analysis.

7.0 Data and Analysis

Research Question 1: What ways are power relations reflected in the text?

Description Stage

Question 1: What relational values do textual features have?

Through the relational values in the text, the social relationships between the discourse producers and discourse consumers are manifested in the discourses. This will be achieved through the way the political leaders of Hamas present them, their experiences, and their beliefs in his discourse. Pronouns and choice of lexemes help in identify this.

Pronouns

Pronouns are linguistic elements that has the capacity to create relations (close or distant) in a discourse. This pronoun is used to show solidarity and unity or unfriendliness or enmity. The way the leader used pronouns on the audiences will be examined.

Our:

This personal pronoun is predominantly employed by the discourse producer in his speech. This could be in an attempt to show his perspective of the people he is addressing. The following are instances of its manifestations:

Extract A: "*O children of our Palestinian people. O children of our Ummah [the Arab-Muslim community] ...*"

Extract B: "*...How many times have we warned the world and this enemy that there are prisoners in the jails of the Zionist occupation, more than 6,000 of our brothers, our children, our youth, our heroes, our men and women, some of whom have spent up to 30, 40, even 43 years behind bars?...*"

Extract C: "*...We have warned them, and we have warned the whole world, that even if, in the face of what is happening in Al-Quds and Al-Aqsa Mosque, the whole world remains silent, we will not stand idly by; not our people, not our Resistance, not our Al-Qassam Brigades, not this Ummah...*"

Extract D: “*What happened today [Saturday, 7 October], O Palestinian people, O children of Ummah, reveals the greatness of this Resistance, the greatness of our readiness and the credibility of our declarations, the veracity of our promises, and Operation Al-Aqsa Flood [?] ...*”

Extract E: “*... We have only one thing to say to you: get out of our land. Get out of our sight. Get out of our city of Al-Quds and our Al-Aqsa Mosque. We no longer wish to see you on this land. This land is ours. Al-Quds is ours, everything [here] is ours....*”

You(r):

The second pronoun is used by the political leader of Hamas in two ways: to show his address to his people or Palestine and as a reference to the rival or enemies of their land. Again, the possessive pronoun “your” is used to refer to their rivals. Instances are:

Extract A: “*O children of our Palestinian people. O children of our Ummah [the Arab-Muslim community]. Today you have a rendezvous with a great victory and a dazzling triumph....*”

Extract B: “*... You are most magnificent, O men of faith, O men of Al-Qassan Brigades, O men of Gaza, Gaza of pride and dignity, of courage, heroism and sacrifice. Today, Gaza erases from the Arab-Muslim community the shame of defeat, the shame of acceptance and inaction. You are most grand, O commanders who lead this battle, the battle of the beginning of the Liberation of Al-Quds [Jerusalem], our land, our people and our prisoners held in the jails of the Zionist occupation....*”

Extract C: “*... In conclusion, to this threatening and irruptive enemy, we say: neither your threats, nor your irruptions, nor your arrogance, have served you so far, and they will be of no use to you in the future. We have only one thing to say to you: get out of our land. Get out of our sight. Get out of our city of Al-Quds and our Al-Aqsa Mosque. We no longer wish to see you on this land. This land is ours. Al-Quds is ours, everything [here] is ours....*”

Extract D: “*... How many times have we warned them of the existence of a Palestinian people who, for 75 years, have been living in the diaspora in tents and refugee camps? You don't recognize our people, and you don't recognize our [legitimate] rights...*”

Extract E: “*... We have only one thing to say to you: get out of our land. Get out of our sight. Get out of our city of Al-Quds and our Al-Aqsa Mosque. We no longer wish to see you on this land. This land is ours. Al-Quds is ours, everything [here] is ours. You are strangers in this pure and blessed land. there is no place or safety for you....*”

We:

The plural first person pronoun is predominantly used by the political discourse producer to show friendliness and unity or sameness with his audiences or people. Instances:

Extract A: “*... We have warned them, and we have warned the whole world, that even if, in the face of what is happening in Al-Quds and Al-Aqsa Mosque, the whole world remains silent, we will not stand idly by; not our people, not our Resistance, not our Al-Qassam Brigades, not this Ummah....*”

Extract B: “*... We have only one thing to say to you: get out of our land. Get out of our sight. Get out of our city of Al-Quds and our Al-Aqsa Mosque. We no longer wish to see you on this land. This land is ours. Al-Quds is ours, everything [here] is ours....*”

Extract C: “*How many times have we warned you about what you are committing and perpetrating in the Palestinian territories occupied in 1948 [today called Israel], and your attempts to isolate our people there?....*”

They:

The political leader of Hamas used this pronoun to refer to the enemy of their land.

Extract A: “*... But they plugged their ears and closed their eyes [to our warnings]. And because of their arrogance and insolence, in recent days, during their sinister religious festivals, they have invaded Al-Aqsa Mosque. They desecrated and defiled it. they molested our women. They entered with their shoes up to the mirhrab and minbar [features inside the mosque]. They imposed on our people what appears to be a ban on movement in the Holy City [of Jerusalem]. They have forbidden prayer in the Sanctuary of Ibrahim (Caves of the Patriarchs, Ibrahimi Mosque in Hebron)*”

Relational value of lexical items

The discourse producer, Ismail Haniyeh, strategically employed linguistic items that expressed solidarity and unity with his people, Hamas. Such lexical items include:

Extract A: “*O children of our Palestinian people. O children of our Ummah*”

Extract B: “*O my brothers and sisters*”

Extract C: “*our brothers, our children, our youth, our heroes, our men and women*”

Extract D: “*the Palestinian people*”

Extract E: “*O men of faith, O men of Al-Qassam Brigaders, O men of Gaza*”

Extract F: “*O my brothers*”

However, the speaker deliberately and intentionally employed linguistic or vocabulary items that showed enmity, hatred to Israel and the regions rivals.

Extract A: “*this enemy*”

Extract B: *“our enemy, its colonies, its settlers and its soldiers”*

Power displayed through these linguistic elements have capability to create social distance of closeness or farness between the political leader of Hamas, Ismail, and his audiences. Thus, he marks out remarkably as one that wields authority and social power over others. henceforth, he is represented as a leader. He expresses solidarity with the people of Hamas but unfriendliness with their nation’s rival or enemies.

Research Question 2: What ideologies and identities are projected in the text?

Question: What values do textual features have in terms of the subject position of the discourse producer?

Here, the concern is on how the subject position of the speaker is structured for himself as the political leader. He has the role of a leader that encourages and celebrate his people and to continue protecting his people. Through modes and modality, the speaker’s position for himself is provided by the text. The declarative mode is prevalent in the discourse. Through this mode, the discourse producer controls and disseminates information while the addressees’ position is one at the receiving end of the information. Samples

Extract A: *“O children of our Palestinian people. O children of our Ummah [the Arab-Muslim community]. Today you have a rendezvous with a great victory and a dazzling triumph....”*

Extract B: *“...We have warned them, and we have warned the whole world, that even if, in the face of what is happening in Al-Quds and Al-Aqsa Mosque, the whole world remains silent, we will not stand idly by; not our people, not our Resistance, not our Al-Qassam Brigades, not this Ummah...”*

Extract C: *“What happened today [Saturday, 7 October], O Palestinian people, O children of Ummah, reveals the greatness of this Resistance, the greatness of our readiness and the credibility of our declarations, the veracity of our promises, and Operation Al-Aqsa Flood [?]...”*

Extract D: *“This battle is not only that of the Palestinian people, or that of Gaza: Gaza is the spearhead of the Resistance and has launched this battle, but since it concerns the entire land of Palestine and Al-Quds and Al-Aqsa, it is the battle of the entire Arab-Muslim community....”*

Interrogative Mode

Extract A: *“How many times have we warned you about what you are committing and perpetrating in the Palestinian territories occupied in 1948 [today called Israel], and your attempts to isolate our people there? ...”*

Extract B: *“... How many times have we warned them of the existence of a Palestinian people who, for 75 years, have been living in the diaspora in tents and refugee camps?”*

Extract C: *“How many times have we warned them about the unjust blockade imposed on the Gaza Strip, which has led to all this human suffering?”*

Imperative Mode

Extract A: *“... We have only one thing to say to you: get out of our land. Get out of our sight. Get out of our city of Al-Quds and our Al-Aqsa Mosque. We no longer wish to see you on this land. This land is ours. Al-Quds is ours, everything [here] is ours....”*

Extract B: *“Enough is enough! There was no choice but to embark on this strategic course, and complete the cycle of the First and Second Intifadas, Revolutions, and crown them with the battle for the liberation of our land, our holy places and our prisoners held in the jails of the Zionist occupation....”*

Modality, on the other hand, deals with authority the speaker has in the text. Through the speaker’s employment of modal verbs helps in conveying the attitudes and perceptions of the discourse producer. Fairclough (1989, 183) expresses ‘relational modality of obligation’ and ‘expressive modality’ of possibility, intention, permission, which the text studied embodies. When speaker want to give commands that are unquestionable or non-negotiable. They employ relational modality: such as must, should, have to, and outright command.

Extract A: *“... We have warned them, and we have warned the whole world, that even if, in the face of what is happening in Al-Quds and Al-Aqsa Mosque, the whole world remains silent, we will not stand idly by; not our people, not our Resistance, not our Al-Qassam Brigades, not this Ummah...”*

Extract B: *“...And the Resistance had declared more than once that the harvest [of Zionist soldiers] **would** continue, and that the bill **would** increase...”*

Extract C: *“This battle has begun, and **will** be fought with battle and fire, with glory and arms”*

These modes portray asymmetries as they place the political leader of Hamas in a position of authority and control as he gives information, interrogates as well as give commands while the audiences receive the information and are manipulated to take actions.

Question 3: What values do textual features have with respect to the subject position of citizens of the Hamas and their rival.

Here, insights to the subject position of the audiences are provided by certain linguistic items employed by the speaker.

For Hamas

Extract: *“...You are most magnificent, O men of faith, O men of Al-Qassan Brigades, O men of Gaza, Gaza of pride and dignity, of courage, heroism and sacrifice. Today, Gaza erases from the Arab-Muslim community the shame of defeat, the shame of acceptance and inaction. You are most grand, O commanders who lead this battle,*

the battle of the beginning of the Liberation of Al-Quds [Jerusalem], our land, our people and our prisoners held in the jails of the Zionist occupation....”

For Their Rival

Extract: “...But they plugged their ears and closed their eyes [to our warnings]. And because of their arrogance and insolence, in recent days, during their sinister religious festivals, they have invaded Al-Aqsa Mosque. They desecrated and defiled it. they molested our women. They entered with their shoes up to the mirhrab and minbar [features inside the mosque]. They imposed on our people what appears to be a ban on movement in the Holy City [of Jerusalem]. They have forbidden prayer in the Sanctuary of Ibrahim [Caves of the Patriarchs, Ibrahim Mosque in Hebron]”

These lexical structures present the ideologies possessed by the leader. The people of Palestine are celebrated and appreciated while the enemies of the Hamas people are warned, threatened and informed that the war would continue and they [Palestinian people] would not rest until their enemies are defeated and thrown out of their land.

Interpretation Stage

Based on Fairclough’s CDA model’s provision, the interpretation stage involves the situational as well as the intertextual and contextual analysis. The situational context is concerned with analyzing if the situation matches the language used and the text corresponds to what is obtainable in the situational environment of text production. Answering the following four questions shall provide meaning dimension to the situational context of the discourse.

What is going? Here, the activity, topic and purpose are of concern. The activity is celebratory speech on achievement over the Israeli-Hamas War. The topic refers to political address to an audience while the purpose is to celebrate the Hamas win and war other warring sect.

Who is involved? This involves the positions of the speaker and the listeners or addressees. In the speech, there is no alternation of roles between the discourse producers and receivers as a speech is a single term genre and involves no interaction. The speech addresser is Ismail Haniyeh, the political leader of Hamas. The addressees are the general people of Hamas or Palestine.

In What Relations? This question is concerned with the dynamism in the subject positions with respect to power relations and the social distance created in the situation. The political leader of Hamas is the head of Hamas as such wields power and authority.

What is the Role of Language? It is a strategy deployed to convey opinion, manipulate and influence others or the discourse addressee as well it is used to warn and celebrate. The Hamas political leader deployed language to encourage, praise and celebrate his group for their join win and warn their enemies or rivals.

Research Question Three: What are the socio-political implications of these social realities?

Here, through the social analysis stage, the socio-political implication of the power relations and ideology as studied above will be discussed.

Explanation Stage (Social Analysis)

The idea in this stage is that the social and cultural power relations shape discourse and discourse in turn affects socio-cultural phenomena and through the provisions of ideologies, this dialectal pattern is maintained. The political institution structure of Hamas particularly at the level of leadership is embedded in asymmetries of power(relations) and has the political leader at the helm of the affairs of the nation. based on the provisions of a leader, the political leader of the Hamas region is saddled with the responsibility of protecting his people and their interest and to ward off threats to them and this he rightly points at several places in his speech such as “...In conclusion, to this threatening and irruptive enemy, we say: neither **your** threats, nor **your** irruptions, nor **your** arrogance, have served **you** so far, and they will be of no use to **you** in the future. We have only one thing to say to **you**: get out of our land. Get out of our sight. Get out of our city of Al-Quds and our Al-Aqsa Mosque. We no longer wish to see **you** on this land. This land is ours. Al-Quds is ours, everything [here] is ours. You are strangers in this pure and blessed land. There is no place or safety for you....” And he further articulates the objective upheld which he rightly points in “Our objective is clear: we want to liberate our land, our holy sites, our Al-Aqsa mosque, our prisoners. We have no hesitation about this. This is the goal that is worthy of this battle, worthy of this heroism, worthy of this courage. Al-Qassam Brigades made the enemy lose its balance in just few minutes, with this grand and blessed incursion; with this epic presence of men who write history with their blood and their guns; with their footsteps that crush the occupying invaders...”. The audience who are his discourse consumers are the ordinary masses (Palestinian people) some of whom participated in the war and to the victory he Hamas is escalating. Some of their audiences are their enemies whom they are warning and asking to leave their land.

The political leader of Hamas shows strategic choice of lexical item which he deliberately selected words that showed solidarity and sameness with his listeners to suppress power relations manifestation from him to his Palestinian people. such solidarity shows equality or friendliness with general public and to breach the inequality that underlies socio-political structure. The political of Hamas also mildly exerted authority by making demands of their enemies to leave their land and also celebrate the defeatists from their land that brought their land championship in the Operation Al-Aqsa Flood. There is ideological replication in the discourse of the leader as

he showed sameness with the people of Palestine and usage of his position to make or influence change of conduct of a people especially their enemies to desist from their affair or invading them.

At the level of the socio-political sphere, the political leader marks a remarkable social identity for himself and his audiences. As a president of his nation, he creates a boundless social spheres in that he is of a balanced status with his people regardless of their heroes, children, women, and men of Palestine, who have found, in different forms to bring home their victory. In this discourse, Ismail, is the “leader” while the audiences are his followers. The impact of this discourse on the audiences be that of being encouraged and swung into more action to continue to bring home success to their land and also to trust their leader more and assured that with him there is safety.

8.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

Discourse has been an effective social tool of informing and getting things done without the involvement of any physical forms. The discourse studied manifested that the political leader of Hamas showed strategically suppressed manifestation of social power relation between himself and his people but expressed it with their enemies where he interrogates and gives them command as he is the leader of Hamas. He also created an identity of a protector, inspirer, and leader for himself and his audience (Palestinian people) as his followers while their enemies who war against them he identified as threats to their land. This discourse also unearthed the ideologies possessed in the leader as on in charge and at the helm of the affairs of the nation and saddled with the duty to lead and protect and celebrate his people as well as fight their enemies. The speech studied expressed that the political leader of Hamas consciously chose linguistic items that helped him to not only celebrate his people but also to cause their enemies to steer clear their land. Language, in sum, is a tool of swinging social actors into actions and impacting on the feelings of social actions which make people to have a change or maintain particular behavior.

References

- Abdulkadir, A.U. (2023). A critical discourse analysis of selected political interviews in Nigerian news media, *Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies (JLLLS)*, 3(2), 47-61.
- Agbedo, C. U. (2015) *General linguistics: An introductory reader*. Ibadan: Penguin Books.
- Bloor and Bloor (2013). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, Routledge, New York, USA.
- Ejiaso, V.K. (2024). Linguistic Violence on Women: Representation of Women in Ritual Killing Discourse on Nigerian Social Media Space, *Studies in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 5(1), 32-45
- Ezeifeke, C. (2018). *Discourse analysis: concepts and approaches*, Patrobas Nigeria Limited, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*, Longman Group, UK limited.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Igwedibia, E. A. (2016). Analyzing the political speeches on “race and economic renewal in America” in the light of the theory of conversational implicature, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, MCSER Publishing-Rome-Italy, 7 (3).
- Koussouhon, L. A. & Dossoumou, A.N. (2015). political and ideological commitments; a systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis of president Buhari’s inaugural speech, *International Journal of Linguistic and Communication*, 3(2), 24-34.
- Ramanathan, R. and Hoon, T. B. (nd). Application of critical discourse analysis in media discourse studies, *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies in Media Studies*, 2(2), 57-68.
- Sharndama, E, C. (2015). political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of president Muhamadu Buhari’s inaugural speech, *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 3(3), 9-21
- Tistcher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage
- Turhan, B. & Okan, B. (2017). Critical discourse analysis of advertising: implication for language teacher education, *International Journal of Language Education and Teaching*, 5 (4), 213-226.
- Udoh, C. & Ejiaso, V. K. (2023). Power and ideology: A critical discourse analysis of campaign speeches of 2023 Nigerian presidential aspirants, *Nigerian Journal of Arts and Humanities (NJAH)*, 3(1), 89-95
- Udumoh, O. B. & Okpala, V. O. (2024). Discourse manifestations of power in Helen Habila’s *Measuring Time*, *Cross-Currents: An International Peer-Reviewed journal on humanities and social Sciences*, 10(3), 84-68.
- Van Dijk, T. (2009). Critical discourse studies: a sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (2nd ed). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, pp. 62-86. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, (2009).