

## Socio-Political Ideologies of Gaza's Chief Ismael Haniyeh: A Political Discourse Analysis

Farooq Ahmed<sup>1</sup>, Lubna Aram Azam<sup>2</sup>, Samia Anwar<sup>3</sup>, Khalil ur Rehman<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer, Department of English University of Bhimber Email: [farooq@ajkuob.edu.pk](mailto:farooq@ajkuob.edu.pk)

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer, Department of English University of Bhimber Email: [lubna@ajkuob.edu.pk](mailto:lubna@ajkuob.edu.pk)

<sup>3</sup> Lecturer, Department of English University of Bhimber Email: [samia@ajkuob.edu.pk](mailto:samia@ajkuob.edu.pk)

<sup>4</sup> Admin University of Bhimber Email: [khalilmust8995@gmail.com](mailto:khalilmust8995@gmail.com)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i3.932>

### Abstract

The present study explores the socio-political ideologies reflected in the speech of Chief Ismael Haniyeh within the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict. The primary objective is to highlight the socio-political ideologies he embodies. The findings reveal that he employs various linguistic forms—such as nouns, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives—and rhetorical devices, including number games and hyperbole to construct discursive strategies like actor description, appeals to authority, the burden of responsibility, national self-glorification, victimization, and lexicalization. These strategies are used to promote their respective ideologies, portraying the in-group positively and the out-group negatively. Comparative analysis shows that Chief Ismael Haniyeh more frequently employs discursive devices such as actor description, authority, burden, number games, national self-glorification, lexicalization, and exaggeration. In contrast, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu more prominently uses actor description, number games, burden, and appeals to authority. While both leaders depict their in-group in a positive light, Chief Ismael Haniyeh consistently portrays the out-group negatively, whereas Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu focuses more on positive representation of the in-group. Overall, the analysis reveals that the two leaders hold opposing ideological positions on key issues such as peace, terrorism, war negotiations, agreements, and their respective global and diplomatic stances.

**Key Words:** Socio-Political Ideologies, Israel-Palestine Conflict, Rhetorical Devices, Diplomatic Stance

### Introduction

This study applies Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine and compare two key political speeches relating to the Israel-Palestine conflict. The speeches under analysis are those delivered by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on October 10, 2023, in which he issued a stern warning to Hamas, and by Hamas Chief Ismael Haniyeh on March 11, 2024, during indirect negotiations with Israel. Both leaders aimed to mobilize support domestically and internationally for their respective causes during an intense phase of the ongoing conflict. The research focuses on the rhetorical and discursive strategies employed by these two prominent figures, using Van Dijk's Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) framework (2006) as a theoretical lens. The study aims

to reveal how deeply ingrained socio-political ideologies and differing worldviews are embedded in political discourse during times of war.

The Israel-Palestine conflict has a long and complex history, marked by numerous wars, negotiations, and failed peace processes. The recent escalation began on October 7, 2023, when Hamas launched over 5,000 rockets from Gaza into Israel, killing approximately 1,400 Israelis and capturing several hostages. In response, Israel initiated large-scale airstrikes and declared war against Hamas. Within days, by October 15, about 2,700 Palestinians had died, and over one million people were displaced in Gaza. Israel also imposed a complete blockade on Gaza, cutting off food, water, electricity, and fuel supplies. Israel ordered residents of Northern Gaza to evacuate, whereas Hamas encouraged civilians to remain, highlighting the immense humanitarian crisis that ensued.

Deep-seated ideological, religious, and political differences are at the core of the conflict. Hamas, founded in 1987, seeks the liberation of Palestine and the establishment of an Islamic state. Israel, established as a predominantly Jewish state in 1948, also holds minorities of Christians and Muslims. A key site of contention is Jerusalem, a city of immense religious significance to Jews, Muslims, and Christians alike. The Old City of Jerusalem is divided into four quarters—Muslim, Jewish, Christian, and Armenian—and houses several holy sites such as the Western Wall, the Al-Aqsa Mosque, and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Control over Jerusalem remains one of the thorniest issues in the Israel-Palestine conflict, with both sides claiming it as their rightful capital. Israeli control of security at the Temple Mount (known to Muslims as Haram al-Sharif) further exacerbates tensions, as religious and political sovereignty are intertwined (Waxman, 2012).

The roots of the current conflict can be traced back to 1948, when the Arab-Israeli War led to the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians. Since then, hostility between Israel and Palestinian groups has intensified, marked by several wars, notably in 2008, 2012, and 2014. These conflicts resulted in thousands of Palestinian deaths, significant Israeli military casualties, and widespread international condemnation. Human Rights Watch and other organizations have characterized many actions by both Hamas and Israel as potential war crimes (Cohen, 2016). Recent escalations continue to revolve around contested areas like East Jerusalem, which Israel declared its undivided capital—a move that has been rejected by most of the international community, but supported by the Trump administration through the relocation of the U.S. embassy (Singh, 2022).

The broader context of Middle Eastern politics, including the U.S.-Iran nuclear deal and the Russia-Ukraine war, has further complicated efforts to resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict. For over seventy years, the struggle has persisted, with Israel expanding settlements and maintaining military occupation over Palestinian territories, while Palestinians continue to seek an independent state. The Balfour Declaration, Jewish immigration, and subsequent wars have only deepened divisions (Khan, 2022). Hamas, initially a resistance movement during the first Intifada, later entered politics, winning the 2006 Palestinian legislative elections. However, after losing crucial financial and diplomatic support, Hamas's governance of Gaza became fraught with internal and external conflicts, especially with Fatah, leading to the Battle of Gaza in 2007. Meanwhile, Israel has faced political instability in recent years, with Prime Minister Netanyahu's Likud party winning elections but struggling to form stable governments (Singh, 2022).

Given the protracted nature of the conflict, speeches, articles, documentaries, and political debates continue to shape public opinion globally. Political speeches, in particular, play a critical role in influencing audiences, mobilizing support, and framing ideological narratives. In the context of

this study, the speeches of Netanyahu and Haniyeh serve as rich texts for discourse analysis, revealing how language functions as a tool of power, persuasion, and ideological reproduction. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides a useful framework to unpack the relationship between language and power. CDA examines written or spoken texts to uncover hidden structures of dominance, inequality, and power relations in social, political, and historical contexts (Fowler, 1991). According to Fairclough (1992), CDA reveals how discourse both reflects and shapes social practices and structures. It connects micro-level language use to macro-level social phenomena, exposing how language contributes to the maintenance or challenge of power hierarchies.

For this study, Van Dijk's Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) model is particularly significant. Van Dijk (2013) emphasizes that the thematic structure of political discourse—how topics and ideas are sequenced and presented—reveals underlying ideologies. PDA focuses on the strategies used by political actors to emphasize positive aspects of the in-group (their side) while highlighting negative aspects of the out-group (the opposing side). Techniques such as actor description, lexicalization, number games, appeals to authority, national self-glorification, and victimization are common in political discourse. As Van Dijk (1997, 2006) argues, political discourse is fundamentally ideological and often polarizing, aiming to establish a clear division between "us" and "them."

The persuasive power of political speech is crucial to this dynamic. As Joseph (2006) notes, effective speakers can align their personal or party interests with the perceived interests of the general public, thus masking self-interest behind appeals to national unity or moral high ground. In conflict situations, this manipulation becomes even more pronounced, with leaders framing their actions as just, necessary, and defensive, while portraying the opposing side as unjust, aggressive, or immoral.

In analyzing the speeches by Netanyahu and Haniyeh, this study employs Van Dijk's PDA framework to identify the discursive and rhetorical strategies each leader uses to construct their socio-political ideologies. By comparing these speeches, the research highlights not only the different ideological stances of Israel and Hamas but also the linguistic and rhetorical techniques used to legitimize their narratives and delegitimize the other side.

In sum, this study seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of how political discourse reflects and reinforces ideological divisions in times of war. Through Critical Discourse Analysis of two significant speeches from the Israel-Palestine conflict, it aims to illuminate the power of language in shaping perceptions, constructing national identities, and sustaining long-standing conflicts. The following research questions will be addressed in the current research paper.

### **Research Questions**

1. What rhetorical devices and discursive strategies are used in the speech of Chief Ismael Haniyeh?
2. What socio-political ideologies are reflected in the speeches of Chief Ismael Haniyeh?

### **Literature Review**

Discourse, whether written or spoken, constitutes the medium through which ideas, concepts, and expressions are communicated. As Van Dijk (1997) notes, discourse can exist in both written and oral forms, encompassing either restricted language practices or a broader range of communicative procedures (Van Dijk, 2004). The field of discourse analysis, and more specifically Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), investigates how texts and spoken words enact, reinforce, or challenge societal power structures, abuses, and inequalities, as framed by Van Dijk (1997). CDA is not only

a method but also a theoretical approach for examining the social dimensions of language use. Fairclough (2001) defines it as a tool for exploring how individuals and groups utilize language, linking it closely to ideology, power dynamics, and social issues. It incorporates philosophical and social theory to interpret linguistic material, offering insights into how external factors mold language use.

Leeuwen (1993) outlines CDA as a process divided into stages, beginning with the juxtaposition of an individual's knowledge and experiences against their beliefs. The next phase explores how social relations shape discourse, perceptions of reality, and identity construction. Talja (1999) further emphasizes that CDA analyzes communication through the lens of societal discursive practices such as racism, authoritarianism, and human rights violations, highlighting the profound influence of societal structures on language.

An influential contribution to the domain of political discourse analysis is Van Dijk's 2006 framework, which offers a dynamic and multifaceted approach for understanding political texts and speeches. This model intertwines argumentative, rhetorical, semantic, and political strategies, revealing how language serves the interests of in-groups while marginalizing out-groups (Biria et al., 2014). Van Dijk (2006) conceptualizes political discourse as a key domain where politicians craft and perpetuate ideologies to secure public support, defend controversial policies, and reinforce social divisions. This process unfolds across multiple platforms, from parliamentary speeches and legislative debates to media articles, talk shows, campaigns, and even academic conferences (Bello, 2013; Bayram, 2010; Ahmed, 2018). Through such mediums, political ideologies are not only disseminated but also continuously constructed and contested.

Van Dijk's seminal work, *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse* (2006), asserts that political discourse is inherently ideological, organized around alliances and oppositions. Discourse acts as the explicit manifestation of political ideologies, shaping and reflecting societal divisions. This phenomenon often leads to the polarization of groups into 'us' (the in-group) and 'them' (the out-group), a dynamic central to the structure and function of political communication (Van Dijk, 2002). Political language, thus, becomes an instrument for reinforcing group identities and delineating social boundaries.

The analytical framework proposed by Fairclough builds upon Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (SFL) theory and highlights the intricate connection between language and social relations. In this tri-dimensional model, language is viewed as a social practice influenced by economic, ideological, cultural, and political factors. At the micro-level, CDA examines linguistic elements such as vocabulary choice, grammar, cohesion, and textual structure, while at the macro-level, it explores the broader socio-cultural processes underpinning language production, distribution, and consumption (Shakoury, 2018).

Similarly, Van Dijk's 2006 model identifies twenty-five discursive strategies critical for constructing ideological and political discourse. These strategies collectively unveil the subtleties of ideological manipulation embedded in political language. Actor description, for instance, highlights how language is used to portray the in-group positively and the out-group negatively, reinforcing existing social divisions. Authority appeals serve to legitimize political actions by referencing influential figures or organizations. Burdening strategies evoke emotional responses by emphasizing the hardships faced by particular groups.

Categorization plays a vital role in labeling social groups, often assigning value-laden characteristics to them, while euphemism masks harsh realities through softer linguistic expressions. Evidentiality ensures claims are backed by evidence, thereby constructing an aura of credibility. Hyperbole exaggerates aspects of discourse to evoke strong emotional reactions, and

lexicalization strategically selects words with specific positive or negative connotations to sway public perception.

Moreover, national self-glorification glorifies the nation's history and values, fostering a strong sense of identity. The number game deploys statistics to lend objectivity and authority to arguments. Polarization deepens social divides by consistently emphasizing contrasts between the in-group and out-group. Victimization techniques paint the in-group as unfairly treated, appealing to emotions and justifying counteractions. Comparisons further underline the differences and similarities between groups, often casting the out-group in a negative light.

Consensus-building emphasizes unity and agreement, particularly during external threats, while counterfactuals speculate on alternative outcomes to advocate for specific policies. Disclaimers allow speakers to present positive traits before discrediting the out-group. Examples and illustrations provide tangible evidence to reinforce ideological positions. Generalizations extend the attributes of individuals to entire groups, further entrenching stereotypes. Irony, metaphor, and norm expression also play crucial roles in shaping audience perceptions through rhetorical sophistication.

Populism invokes the will of the common people against elites, presupposition introduces assumed truths without evidence, and vagueness creates ambiguity, often to obscure controversial or sensitive topics. Finally, implication conveys hidden meanings, forcing audiences to read between the lines to grasp the intended message (Van Dijk, 2006).

The study of political discourse reveals its pivotal role in shaping social behaviors and political actions. Political communication, whether through traditional media or modern platforms like social media, enables leaders to craft narratives that influence public opinion and policy directions. Van Dijk (1997) notes that political discourse analysis is both political and critical, seeking to uncover the underlying motivations and consequences of political language use. Fairclough (1992) highlights how the evolution of political discourse in media shapes cultural and social development, offering insights into the transformation of public consciousness over time.

Notably, political discourse is dominated by professional politicians and political organizations, including presidents, prime ministers, parliamentarians, and political parties, all of whom communicate at local, national, and international levels (Van Dijk, 1997). Their discourse aims not just to inform but to persuade, mobilize, and consolidate power.

Language plays an indispensable role in mediating power and ideology within society. The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thoughts defines power as the capacity to compel others to act according to one's will, while David suggests that true power lies in influencing others without overt coercion. In social contexts, language becomes the primary medium for transforming power into perceived legitimacy, and submission into perceived duty (Al Jumiah, 2016). Language perpetuates social norms and ideologies by constructing realities and shaping perceptions. As Edward et al. (1996) argue, human interpretation of sensory experience is fundamentally shaped by language.

Thomas (2004) adds that language's expressive function regulates who may say what to whom, underlining the relationship between discourse, social hierarchy, and authority. Fiorin (2014) stresses that language's meaning is derived not from structure alone but from use, influenced by social context. Thus, the representation of thoughts and beliefs in discourse is deeply tied to the social positions and experiences of speakers and audiences alike (Fairclough, 2013).

Several recent studies underscore the practical application of these theoretical insights. Ahmad, Mubeen, and Nawaz (2022) analyzed Pakistani and Indian print media discourse following the revocation of Article 370, utilizing Van Dijk's Ideological Square Model (2005). Their macro-

level analysis revealed discursive strategies such as positive self-presentation and negative portrayal of others, with micro-level devices like actor description, authority, and lexicalization prominently featured.

Similarly, Shakoury (2018) conducted a CDA of UN General Assembly addresses by Iranian Presidents Hassan Rouhani and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, employing Van Dijk's political discourse analysis framework. Their analysis revealed that Rouhani often used tactics such as consensus, illustration, hyperbole, and polarization, whereas Ahmadinejad leaned towards lexicalization and vagueness, demonstrating their contrasting ideological orientations.

Kazemian (2014) investigated five speeches by Barack Obama from 2012, focusing on rhetorical and linguistic strategies using Fairclough's CDA approach informed by Hallidayan principles. Kazemian identified techniques like nominalization, modality, and parallelism as central to Obama's efforts to project unity and assert authority, offering significant implications for reading, translation, and political writing pedagogy.

Rachman (2017) analyzed Donald Trump's 2015 campaign speeches, highlighting his strategic use of metaphors, irony, and hyperbole to sway public opinion and consolidate political support. Utilizing Van Dijk's thematic theory, Rachman illustrated how Trump's rhetorical tactics played a critical role in his political success.

Finally, Khalil et al. (2017) examined Imran Khan's speeches before Pakistan's 2013 elections through Fairclough's three-dimensional model. They found that Khan strategically deployed positive self-portrayal and negative other-representation through repetition, lexical choices, and appeals to collective identity. His discourse sought to mobilize the public against perceived governmental injustices while emphasizing the West-Islam relationship to establish broader ideological narratives.

These studies collectively illustrate the diverse methodologies and theoretical frameworks employed in analyzing political discourse, highlighting its crucial role in shaping public consciousness, reinforcing ideologies, and influencing social and political outcomes.

## **Research Methodology**

This study relied on Van Dijk's (2006) PDA framework. Textual analysis uses discursive and rhetorical devices including actor description, authority, hyperbole, number game, etc. The following discourse analysis devices from Van Dijk's 2006 framework will be employed in this study:

### **Discursive and Rhetorical Devices**

Following are discursive devices and rhetorical devices proposed by Van Dijk in his 2006 framework:

Actor Description, Authority, Burden, Categorization, Euphemism, Evidentiality, Hyperbole, Lexicalization, National self-glorification, Number Game, Polarization; US-Them categorization, Victimization, Comparison, Consensus, Counterfactuals, Disclaimers, Example/Illustration, Generalization, Irony, Metaphor, Norm expression, Populism, Presupposition, Vagueness, Implication

## **Research Design**

This section contains the researcher's model for this research. Based on Van Dijk's (2006) framework. From the speeches of the two leaders, the researcher will be able to extract the following devices.

The researcher will find out the grammar, rhetorical devices and discursive devices according to Van Dijk's (2006) framework.

**a. LEXICO GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS)**

Noun, Pronoun, Adverb, adjective etc.

**b. RHETORICAL DEVICES**

- Hyperbole
- Number game

**c. DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES**

- Actor Description
- Authority
- Burden
- Lexicalization
- Victimization
- National Self Glorification

This research will be qualitative. The researcher has collected the English transcript of speeches of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Hamas Leader Ismail Haniyeh from the website.

**Sampling**

This study will use a purposive sample. This study will examine Netanyahu and Haniyeh's war speeches.

**Data Analysis**

In Ismael Haniyeh's speech, various actors and elements are strategically represented to highlight the Palestinian struggle, delegitimize the opposing force (Israel), and construct a narrative that positions Hamas and Gaza as victims of aggression and burdens of war. Through careful rhetorical choices, Haniyeh emphasizes positive self-representation and negative other-representation, portraying Hamas and Gaza as responsible actors burdened by Israel's actions.

In the first excerpt, Hamas is introduced as both a proper noun and a political actor. Haniyeh claims that Hamas "has shown positivity and responsibility" during indirect negotiations with Israel. This is a deliberate attempt to portray the organization as a rational and constructive participant in conflict resolution. By emphasizing these qualities, Haniyeh aims to reshape international perceptions of Hamas, distancing it from its militant image and presenting it instead as a political actor striving for peace. His choice of words reflects a strategy of positive self-representation, whereby Hamas is framed as capable of engaging in diplomacy and showing maturity. Simultaneously, the use of the term "indirect negotiations" suggests a level of distrust or political tension that prevents direct dialogue, implicitly pointing to Israel as the party unwilling to negotiate in good faith. Thus, Haniyeh not only repositions Hamas but also casts Israel in a negative light, reinforcing negative other-representation.

The emphasis on Hamas as a responsible actor is further reinforced by Haniyeh's broader political objectives. By highlighting Hamas's positive behavior, he calls for global recognition and support, urging the international community to aid Palestine and advocate for peace. This framing also reflects a broader ideological narrative in which Palestine is seen as a nation desiring peace, rejecting violence, and seeking justice through diplomacy. Grammatically, Hamas functions as a proper noun and acronym (Ḥarakat al-Muqāwamah al-'Islāmiyyah), indicating its institutional

identity. This lexical choice supports the construction of Hamas not just as a militant group, but as a legitimate governing body with political agency.

In the second excerpt, Gaza is similarly used as a proper noun and a conflict actor. Haniyeh states, “We do not want to reach an agreement that does not end the war on the Gaza Strip or does not let displaced people return to their homes.” This statement reflects key Palestinian demands: an end to violence, return of displaced persons, and withdrawal of Israeli forces. Haniyeh’s use of the pronoun “we” functions inclusively, indicating his identification with the broader Palestinian population and government. This in-group association strengthens his positive representation as a leader who represents collective national interests rather than individual or factional goals.

Moreover, Gaza is portrayed not just as a geographical region but as a site of suffering and resilience. Its historical and cultural significance is subtly invoked to stress its identity as a victimized yet dignified entity. The broader depiction of Gaza’s humanitarian crisis—high unemployment, infrastructural collapse, and scarcity of basic needs—serves to underscore the immense toll of Israeli military aggression. Through such descriptions, Haniyeh paints Israel as an oppressive force, employing the phrase “Zionist enemy” to underscore ideological opposition to Zionism and to reinforce a dichotomy between the aggressor and the oppressed.

The third excerpt introduces the concept of psychological warfare as a metaphorical burden. Haniyeh warns that “the enemy is waging a psychological war against our people,” aiming to “sow discord and create chaos.” This statement articulates the non-physical dimensions of conflict—emotional, cognitive, and social trauma. By highlighting this, Haniyeh calls attention to the psychological toll inflicted on Palestinians, who, according to his narrative, are not only subject to physical violence but also to constant emotional destabilization. The word “enemy,” used with the determiner “the,” refers specifically to Israel, constructing a binary opposition between aggressor and victim. The term “psychological” as an adjective modifies “war,” emphasizing the intentional targeting of civilian morale.

The portrayal of psychological warfare shifts the narrative from a conventional military conflict to a broader campaign of suppression and control. Haniyeh positions himself as a leader who acknowledges this burden and seeks to resist it through unity and negotiation. His role as a positive actor is accentuated through this resistance and his efforts to restore stability amid chaos.

The fourth and final excerpt deals with the humanitarian burden imposed by the Israeli military campaign. Haniyeh cites data from the United Nations, stating that the war has displaced 85% of Gaza’s population and damaged 60% of the enclave’s infrastructure. This reference to international authority adds credibility and emphasizes the severity of the crisis. By using the phrase “Israeli war,” Haniyeh directly attributes the humanitarian catastrophe to Israel, reinforcing the negative portrayal of the out-group. The word “crippling,” used as an adjective to describe the blockade, intensifies the narrative of suffering, suggesting that the restrictions have rendered Gaza incapable of sustaining basic human needs.

This strategic use of statistics and vivid descriptors aims to evoke international empathy and action. It also reaffirms Haniyeh’s image as a responsible and compassionate leader, concerned with the wellbeing of his people. By invoking the authority of the UN, he appeals to international norms and human rights discourse, further legitimizing his stance.

Grammatically, adjectives such as “Israeli” and “crippling” are used to attribute blame and highlight suffering. The acronym “UN” is used to enhance factual credibility. Together, these elements construct a narrative in which Haniyeh emerges as a positive leader confronting immense burdens imposed by an aggressive adversary.



In conclusion, Ismael Haniyeh's speech utilizes actor descriptions, burden metaphors, and strategic grammar to present Hamas and Gaza as victims of unjust aggression and to frame himself as a rational, empathetic, and responsible leader. Through contrastive depictions of in-groups and out-groups, he crafts a powerful narrative aimed at garnering both domestic support and international sympathy.

## **Discussion and Findings**

The research examined the discursive strategies and rhetorical devices that have been used to represent the in-group positively and the out-group negatively. The researcher analysed the use of rhetorical and discursive devices in the speeches of Chief Ismail Haniyeh. Chief Ismael Haniyeh used different themes such as positivity and responsibility, Zionist enemy, humanitarian issues, holiest places (Al-Aqsa and Jerusalem), internal and external Infrastructure of Gaza Strip, psychological war, unity of the Palestinian people, Islamic masses, and genocide through discursive strategies to promote his ideology. For example, the head of Hamas' political bureau said that the group "has shown positivity and responsibility" In this example, Chief Ismael Haniyeh used a political theme through the strategy of Actor description to represent the in-group positively. The ideology shows that he wants to convey the message that Hamas is trying to make a peace deal with Israel that ends the war, and let the displaced Palestinians return home, and end Israeli occupation, leave Gaza, but Israel government is not agreeing. He emphasised the importance of Palestinian unity and urged support from Palestinians and regional allies. All these themes used by Chief Ismael Haniyeh to represent the in-group positively and the out-group negatively. The main focus of Chief Ismael Haniyeh was to disband the out-groups. Therefore, he criticised the Israeli government through the usage of discursive strategies.

Moreover, Chief Ismael Haniyeh used a number game strategy that nearly 31,000 Palestinians, mostly women and children, have since been killed in Gaza, and over 72,500 others injured. This is a rhetorical device known as figures and facts. Chief Ismael Haniyeh does this to show positively in-group, presenting the victimisation of his region. He also used the Israeli war has push 85% of Gaza's population into internal displacement, while 60% of the enclave's infrastructure has been damaged, to portray out-groups negatively, referring to the damage caused by the outer group. Meanwhile, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu employed a statistical strategy, stating that Israel has mobilised 3,00,000 troops; here, he demonstrated in-group positivity. His ideology shows a good attitude toward their in-group and a negative attitude toward their out-group.

In the actor description, Chief Ismael Haniyeh and PM Benjamin Netanyahu used similar negotiations as the Israel-Palestine war actor in their speeches. Chief Ismael Haniyeh said we do not want to reach an agreement that does not end the war in the Gaza Strip; it showed Ismael Haniyeh's views that he wants the attention and support from all Muslim countries for the protection and survival of Palestinians. He desires peace on Palestine. He appeals to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) they all should work collectively on the Palestine issues. Here, he proved himself a responsible and global leader. Meanwhile, PM Benjamin Netanyahu used hyperbole and said this is the largest mobilisation. He wants to say that Israel has a strong army to defeat them. Here, he showed in-group positively by using this rhetorical device.

Chief Ismael Haniyeh said there are attempts to sow discord and create chaos, but all of this will fail, as an authority in his speech. He is showing strong hope and power in all these war circumstances. Here, he shows in-group positivity himself and Palestine country and the destruction of the Israeli Army through the strategy of out-group negativity. In contrast, PM

Benjamin Netanyahu said, " I want to thank US President Joe Biden and many world leaders for your unprecedented support for Israel. Here he used this strategy (Authority) for showing the in-group positively.

Chief Ismael Haniyeh said the enemy is waging a psychological war against our people as a burden. He said that this war is weakening Palestinian Muslims not only physically but also mentally. He used leaders used this device (Burden) for showing responsibility and in-group positively and out-group negatively. The Psychological war, and the savage attacks are two similar concepts carried by him.

Chief Ismael Haniyeh used National Self-glorification in his speech since he called on Palestinians in Jerusalem, the West Bank and the diaspora "to support the battle of the Al-Aqsa Flood to protect Jerusalem and Al-Aqsa Mosque. He used this strategy and showed his country, Palestine (in-group), positively.

Hyperbole, Number game, lexicalisation, and National Self-glorification used by Chief Ismael Haniyeh in his speech to construct his ideology and get the favour of the international community. while PM Benjamin Netanyahu did not used these devices in his speech. Comparison and contrast showed that Chief Ismael Haniyeh developed 8 devices and PM Benjamin Netanyahu utilised 5 devices in his speech.

### 5.3 Findings

The present research aimed at a critical discourse analysis of the speeches of Chief Ismael Haniyeh to examine how various discursive techniques are employed by the speakers to promote their ideologies. The research is conducted through Van Dijk's (2006) Political Discourse Analysis framework, there has been used different strategies and techniques. These devices include actor description, authority, burden, number game, national self-glorification, lexicalisation, victimisation, and hyperbole. Both PM Benjamin Netanyahu and Chief Ismael Haniyeh made significant arguments about the Israel-Palestine war to support their countries. Thus, Chief Ismael Haniyeh discursively devices and portrays in-group members positively and out-group members negatively on an equal basis. He has used both strategies equally to demonstrate positive in-group and negative out-group

## Conclusion

This study has examined how political leaders utilize discourse to construct favorable representations of their in-group while portraying out-groups negatively. Employing Teun A. van Dijk's (2006) framework for Political Discourse Analysis (PDA), the research analyzed a 2024 speech by Hamas Chief Ismail Haniyeh amid the Israel-Palestine conflict. The analysis focused on identifying discursive strategies and rhetorical devices that reflect ideological positioning. The findings reveal that Haniyeh's discourse predominantly emphasized humanitarian concerns in Palestine, the sanctity of religious sites such as Al-Aqsa and Jerusalem, the internal and external infrastructure of the Gaza Strip, psychological warfare, the unity of the Palestinian people, the broader Islamic community, and allegations of genocide. These themes were instrumental in articulating his ideological stance. Notably, the analysis uncovered a nuanced application of Van Dijk's ideological square, wherein Haniyeh's speech occasionally presented the out-group in a positive light and the in-group negatively. This deviation from the typical dichotomous portrayal suggests a complex rhetorical strategy aimed at achieving specific communicative objectives. Overall, the study underscores the efficacy of Van Dijk's PDA framework in dissecting political discourse, highlighting how language serves as a tool for ideological expression and persuasion.

The research contributes to a deeper understanding of the interplay between political rhetoric and ideology, particularly within the context of protracted conflicts.

## References

- Ahmed, F. (2018). A critical discourse analysis of great leaders and present time political leader speeches. *Interaction*, 36(1), 85-90
- Al Jumiah, A. (2016). Language, power, and ideology in high school EFL textbooks in Saudi Arabia. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 7(5), 184-210.
- Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Erdogan's Political Speech. *Annual review of education, communication & language sciences*, 7(8), 23-40.
- Bello, U. (2013). " If I Could Make It, You Too Can Make It!" Personal Pronouns in Political Discourse: A CDA of President Jonathan's Presidential Declaration Speech. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(6), 84.
- Biria, Sardabi, N., R., & Azin, N. (2014). Rouhani's UN Speech: A Change in Ideology or Strategy. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 7(3), 84-97.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of Anthropology*, 29(1), 447-466.
- Darweesh, A. D., & Muzhir, H. D. (2016). Representation of the Syrian crisis in the American political speeches: A critical discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(1), 85-112.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & society*, 3(2), 193-217.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. How to analyse talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods, 8(9), 25-38.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Fiorin, J. L. (2014). Argumentation and discourse. *Bakhtiniana: Revista de Estudos do Discurso*, 9, 53-70.
- Kazemian, B., & Hashemi, S. (2014). Critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's 2012 speeches: Views from systemic functional linguistics and rhetoric. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies (TPLS)*, 4(6), 1178-1187
- Khalil, U., Islam, M., Chattha, S. A., & Qazalbash, F. (2017). Persuasion and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's Election Speech (2013). *Pakistan Vision*, 18(2), 193-210.
- Pollak, S., Coesemans, R., Daelemans, W., & Lavrač, N. (2011). Detecting contrast patterns in newspaper articles by combining discourse analysis and text mining. *Pragmatics*, 21(4), 647-683
- Rachman, A., & Yunianti, S. (2017). Critical discourse analysis in Donald Trump presidential campaign to win American's heart. *TELL*, 5(2), 8-17.
- Shakoury, K. (2018). Critical discourse analysis of Iranian Presidents' Addresses to the United Nations General Assembly (2007-2016) (Doctoral dissertation, University of Saskatchewan).
- Talja, S. (1999). Analyzing qualitative interview data: The discourse analytic method. *Library & information science research*, 21(4), 459-477.

- Thomas, L., & Wareing, S. (2004). *Language, society and power: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1988). *News Analysis: Case Studies of International and National News in the Press*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 4(4), 301-325.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese discourse*, 1(1), 17-27.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Political discourse and ideology. In Clara Ubaldina Lorda & Montserrat Ribas (Eds.), *Anàlisi del discurs politic*. Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada (IULA), Barcelona, 10(9), 207-225.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *From text grammar to critical discourse analysis*. Unpublished Academic Autobiography, version, 2.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Politics, ideology and discourse. In: Ruth Wodak, (Ed.), *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Volume on Politics and Language, 728-740.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908>
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: A synopsis. *Discourse & society*, 4(2), 193-223.