



ISSN: 0976-3031

Available Online at <http://www.recentscientific.com>

International Journal of Recent Scientific Research
Vol. 6, Issue, 4, pp.3523-3528, April, 2015

**International Journal
of Recent Scientific
Research**

RESEARCH ARTICLE

POWER STRUGGLE DISCOURSE PRODUCED BY TUNISIAN AND EGYPTIAN REVOLUTIONS DURING ARAB SPRING

Hassan Mahill Abdallah Hassan¹ and Abdulgadir Mohammed Ali Adam²

¹Sudan University of Science & Technology-College of Education

²University Of Algazeera-College Of Education

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 5th, March, 2015
Received in revised form 12th,
March, 2015
Accepted 6th, April, 2015
Published online 28th,
April, 2015

Key words:

Power, power relations,
Causative Group, Effective
Group and CDA.

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to investigate the power struggle discourse produced by Tunisian and Egyptian Protesters and aims at demonstrating how powerful group can control less- powerful group in terms of access to the power. To bring to light that media discourse highlights power struggle between the dictatorial governments and oppressed masses and in the service of the powerful elite and state. Therefore, the analysis concentrates on such linguistic means as causative group which referred to as top down in the investigation of the cause; whereas effective group which referred to as bottom up in the investigation of the effect. These means have been chosen as primary tools for the analysis due to the fact that they are closely related to the three types of constrains such as content(what is said), relations(the social relations that people express in the discourse) and the subjects (subject positions people can occupy). The critical discourse analysis is used to respond to such problems. Language is said to perform, namely action and reaction. The approach is concerned with the analysis of how ideologies mediated through discourse are embodied in linguistic cause and effect perspectives. The result of analysis has demonstrated that the political elites do not adjust their political discourses which lead to actions processes of individual actors who are regarded as part and parcel from group actions and social reaction processes. These are exemplified in unequal power relation between dictatorial governments which refer to as causative groups and oppressed masses which refer to as effective groups in the investigation of cause and effect in the above mentioned revolutions.

Copyright © Hassan Mahill Abdallah Hassan and Abdulgadir Mohammed Ali Adam., This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is 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. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality.

Fairclough (1985) said that power involves control, namely by one group over other groups. Such control may pertain to action and cognition: that is, a powerful group may limit the freedom of action of others, but also influence their minds. Besides the elementary recourse to force to directly control action as in police violence against demonstrators, or male violence against women, modern and often more effective power is mostly cognitive, and enacted by persuasion, dissimulation or manipulation, among other strategic ways to change the mind of others in one's own interests. It is at this crucial point where discourse and critical discourse analysis come in: managing the mind of others is essentially a function

of text and talk. Note, though, that such mind management is not always bluntly manipulative. On the contrary, dominance may be enacted and reproduced by subtle, routine, everyday forms of text and talk that appear natural and quite acceptable. Hence, CDA also needs to focus on the discursive strategies that legitimate control, or otherwise naturalize the social order, and especially relations of inequality.

In many situations, Houston and Kramarae(1991) said that volume may be controlled and speakers ordered to "keep their voice down" or to "keep quiet," women may be "silenced" in many ways and in some cultures Albert (1972) said that one needs to "mumble" as a form of respect.

Aim and Scope of the Study

This study is traced back to the acknowledgement that there is a direct connection between a linguistic choice and a certain ideology maintained by relations of power, and the power as phenomenon as manifested in a variety of linguistic structures is not yet explored. The extracts are drawn exclusively from

*Corresponding author: Hassan Mahill Abdallah Hassan
Sudan University Of Science & Technology

Tunisian and Egyptian Revolutions which are analyzed as essential genre of power struggle.

Accordingly, this study aims to investigate that media discourse highlights power struggle between the dictatorial governments and oppressed masses and in the service of the powerful elite and state.

Political speeches are analyzed as a particularly important genre of the power that affects the social construction of reality. As Bourdieu (1994:26) stated:

"The political field is ... the site par excellence in which agents seek to form and transform their visions of the world and thereby the world itself: it is the site par excellence in which words are actions and the symbolic character of power is at stake. Through the production of slogans, programs and commentaries of various kinds, agents in the political field are continuously engaged in a labor of representation by which they seek to construct and impose a particular vision of the social world, while at the same time seeking to mobilize the support of those upon whom their power ultimately depends".

This study aims to analyze the textual mode of political speeches that in mind from two perspectives: firstly, an ideological aspect they carry and secondly, as an endeavor employed to address and confirm hearers' interests, concerns, and point of view by relations of power. This study, therefore, aims to specify the system of linguistic forms which are set into the service of the expression of power and which shape a system of particular values and beliefs.

Hopefully, this study will also provide some insight and practical helps in decoding political speeches, in evaluating linguistic aspects of the ideas conveyed, and the way the more powerful employ language in order to impose their ideas on the less powerful members of society.

Theoretical Background

There are many ways in which linguistic discourses can express relations of power. As competent speakers, people are sensitive to variations in accent, intonation and vocabulary; most of these features locate language users at different positions in social hierarchy.

People are conscious that a proper use of language helps them to speak with different degrees of authority; therefore, their words can be loaded with different degrees of weight. Accordingly, the language can be used as an instrument of coercion and constraint. Briefly, language is an integral part of social life and it is regarded as a part of an individual's social life that consists of daily communications of linguistic expressions which are tacitly adjusted to relations of power.

However, seldom do people differentiate the direct connection between a linguistic choice and a certain ideology; the meaning conveyed by linguistic expressions is taken by them for granted, as natural and unequivocal. Fairclough, (1991:1) said:

"The acknowledgement of power as an implicit and pervasive phenomenon in all communicative situations is a crucial issue for a competent speaker. It has to be mentioned, however, that 'these studies have generally set out to describe prevailing sociolinguistic conventions in terms of how they distribute power unequally'".

Forms of Power Manifestation

Power is exercised and enacted in discourse. Fairclough (1991:46) believed, "power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants". Each discourse, maintaining its ideology, dictates the conditions of what kind of text to produce, what meanings to highlight, and what perspectives to impose. Accordingly, he said there are three types of constraints which derive from the conventions of the discourse type and within which the writer or speaker is positioned when producing texts. Constraints operate on:

- *Contents.*
- *Relations.*
- *Subjects.*

Hence, power is manifested if one is capable to constrain content, that is, to favor certain interpretations and 'wordings' of events, while excluding others. The type of power exercised here is the power to disguise power: the favored interpretations and wordings are those of the power-holders in a society.

Another form of power is related to constraints operating in social relations; it determines to what extent power will be overtly expressed. Interestingly, the power-holders have been recently forced into the less direct ways of exercising and reproducing their power.

Fairclough (1991:71) said, "More recently, however, there has been a shift towards a system based upon solidarity rather than power".

Thus according to Fairclough (1991:193) claimed an established relationship of solidarity should be treated with caution:

"Versions of the solidarity or authority mix are now conventional for political leaders, but their effects in terms especially of solidarity upon the actual social relationship between politicians and the rest of the population cannot be taken for granted. The solidarity of the politicians is with constructed and fictional 'public'; they do neither claim solidarity with all the diverse sections of the actual 'public', nor one imagines would such a claim be reciprocated! There is a spurious and imaginary quality about this 'solidarity'".

Finally, power is associated with the construction of a subject position, the presupposition of an ideal reader who will make the 'right' inference from what has been said and, consequently, will accept the attributes that the powerful want them to be attached.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Sample of the Study

The study will use Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Approaches namely, Top Down and Bottom up Approaches as well as method of Fairclough which speaks about power struggle that is exercised and enacted in discourse. Fairclough (1991:46) believed, "power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants". Each discourse, maintaining its ideology, dictates the conditions of what kind of text to produce, what meanings to highlight, and what perspectives to impose. Accordingly, he said there are three types of constraints which derive from the conventions of the discourse type and within which the writer or speaker is positioned when producing texts. Constraints operate on:

- **Contents**, i.e. on what is said or done;
- **Relations**, i.e. on social relations that people express in discourse;
- **Subjects**, or the 'subject positions' people can occupy.

The approaches and method will be adopted to investigate

Media discourse highlight power struggle between the dictatorial governments and oppressed masses and in the service of the powerful elite and state.

The extracts were exclusively drawn from the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. For more verification this site can be checked (The Guardian, on line source).

These revolutions prompted the oppressed masses to resist and later overthrow the two Arab regimes were regarded as political discourses. The analysis of the political discourses was centered on the cause and effect perspectives.

They set out to investigate the causative group which referred to as top down in the investigation of the cause; whereas effective group which referred to as bottom up in the investigation of the effect.

The researcher was depended on his analysis to the extracts which have been taken from Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions so as to identify to what extent powerful group can control less-powerful group in terms of access to the power.

These were used as tools of analysis which were aimed to highlight power struggle discourse produced by the above mentioned revolutions, namely Tunisian and Egyptian Revolutions.

Top down and Bottom up Approaches can be defined as follows Gaventa's model of power is an attempt to integrate the three dimensions of power in order to explain processes of power and powerlessness in situations of social equality. He examines the concentrated influence of mechanisms from the three dimensions on responses in such situations. He claims that a challenge, or a rebellion, can occur only if there is a shift in the power relations: a loss of power by A or a gain of power

by B. Together with this, before an open conflict can take place, B has to take some steps in order to overcome his powerlessness. B has to overcome both the direct and the indirect effects of the third dimension: he has to go through a process of issue and action formulation, and he has to carry out the process of mobilizing action upon issues. By means of these processes B will develop his own resources – both real and symbolic – to engage in manifest conflict. In other words, B can actually participate in a conflict in the first, overt dimension, only after he has successfully overcome the obstacles of the second and third dimensions. Actual participation means the presentation of well-defined claims and grievances which are brought to discussion in the decision making arena by B together with others who are in an identical situation. As John Gaventa (1980: 3) stated:

"The phenomenon of quiescence – the silent agreement in conditions of glaring inequality– and tried to understand why, in difficult conditions of oppression and discrimination, no resistance arises against the rule of a social elite. He found that the social elite make use of its power principally to prevent the rise of conflicts in its domain and to attain social quiescence".

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher will use the top down and bottom up approaches as well as Fairclough's method to investigate the following hypothesis which said:

Media discourse highlight power struggle between the dictatorial governments and oppressed masses and in the service of the powerful elite and state.

Whereas the researcher is going to investigate the action and the reaction of the two groups which are exemplified in 'causative group' which refers to as top down in the investigation of the 'cause' as well as 'effective group' which refers to as bottom up in the investigation of the 'effect'. The researcher will depend on his analysis to the extracts which have been taken from Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions so as to identify to what extent powerful group can control less-powerful group in terms of access to the power.

CAIRO—President Hosni Mubarak's 30-year grip on power hung in the balance as protesters massed around Egypt and overpowered the police, prompting the army to deploy on the streets of the nation for the first time in 25 years.

Why protesters massed around Egypt and overpowered the police? If we take this question in consideration, we will find those protesters are objected to the president Hosni Mubarak, because he hung in this power for 30 years. He stirs up their anger when he prompts the army to deploy on the streets.

The protesters returned to Cairo's central Tahrir Square Saturday, chanting slogans against Mr. Mubarak after Egyptian television broadcast a speech in which the president signaled he would stay but dismiss his government.

If we ask a question, why the protesters returned to Cairo's central Tahrir and chant slogans against Mr. Mubarak? If we take this question, we will find Mr. Mubarak disdain them in his Egyptian television broadcast a speech, when he said, "he would stay but dismiss his government".

His words came as protesters continued to trade control over swaths of downtown Cairo with the army. Many remained on the streets. Protesters set alight the monolithic Mugamma building on Tahrir Square, the office that issues birth certificates visas and other permits, and which has become a symbol of Egypt's labyrinthine bureaucracy. The boom of tear-gas canisters being fired, a near-constant throughout the day, could still be heard across the city. Cars smoldered.

Some of the most serious violence Friday was in Suez, where protesters seized weapons stored in a police station and asked the policemen inside to leave the building before they burned it down, according to the Associated Press. They also set ablaze about 20 police trucks parked nearby. Demonstrators exchanged fire with policemen, trying to stop them from storming another police station, and one protester was killed in the gun battle.

Why protesters seized weapons stored in a police station ...they burned it down ...they also set ablaze about 20 police trucks parked nearby? If we take this long question for granted, we will find for each action is a reaction which is exemplified in the boom of tear-gas canisters being fired by policemen.

As the day began, protesters convened as planned at mosques around the city for Friday noon prayers. At Cairo's eminent Al Azhar Mosque, regular noon prayers were cut short by an hour. Security officials said they were instructed not to allow anyone to loiter outside the mosque following prayers.

"We will use force to disperse the people," said one plainclothes officer.

As worshippers filed out of the service under heavy security, a chant of "Allahu Akbar," or "God is great," rose from the exiting crowd. Once the mass of about 500 left the mosque, the chant changed to, "The people want the regime to go," and "Punish those people," a reference to the government.

Why worshipers repeatedly chant "Allah Akbar" or "God is great" and even changing their speech when they said, "The people want the regime to go", and "punish those people" a reference to the government. After performing their prayer at Cairo's eminent Al Azhar Mosque? If we answer this question; we will find that is happened as a result of orders which are given to security officials when they said, "they were instructed not to allow anyone to loiter outside the mosque following prayers".

The images of the masses demanding the departure of Hosni Mubarak utterly dominated the media. Unified in cause, the protestors demanded Hosni Mubarak to step down from his position as president. They yell: "This man has to go!"

Mubarak said this week "If I leave now, there will be chaos in the streets." There already has been chaos in the streets orchestrated by Mubarak and his Minister of Interior: what can be more chaotic than uniformed policemen shooting unarmed protestors?

Why the protesters demanded Hosni Mubarak to step down from his position as president? If we want to answer this question, we will find that there is a philosophy behind this; because he turns his deaf ear to them, when he said, "if I leave now, there will be chaos in the street". In turn, they have asked him, "What can be more chaotic than uniformed policemen shooting unarmed protestors".

President Hosni Mubarak still refuses to step down, regardless of the growing calls for his resignation. Protesters continue to defy the military-imposed curfew across Egypt and thousands remain gathered in Cairo's Tahrir Square. Hundreds of others have marched through Alexandria. Opposition groups continue to call for a "million man march" and a general strike to commemorate one week since the protest movement began.

If we ask a question, why protesters continue to defy the military imposed curfew across Egypt and thousands remain gathered in Cairo's Tahrir Square? If we want to answer this question, we will find that comes as the result of Hosni Mubarak's refusal insisting to step down from the presidential chair.

Mubarak announces in a televised address that he will not run for re-election, but refused to step down from office. ElBaradei, now labeled as the opposition figure, returned to Cairo to take part in the protests criticizing Mubarak's unwillingness to step down immediately. After his speech, clashes broke out between pro-Mubarak and anti-government protesters in Alexandria.

Why after Mubarak's speech, clashes broke out between pro-Mubarak and anti-government protesters in Alexandria? If we want to answer this question repeatedly, we will find that takes place as the result of Mubarak's unwillingness to step down immediately.

For much of Wednesday there were violent clashes around Tahrir Square. Nearly 1,500 people were injured and at least three deaths were reported by the Reuters news agency. Reports claim that the military allowed thousands of pro-Mubarak supporters, armed with sticks and knives, to enter the square.

Why the military allowed thousands of pro-Mubarak supporters, armed with sticks and knives, to enter the square? If anyone ever wants to answer this question, briefly, he can say, "They want the protesters to be punished".

Unrest and discontent within the military against Mubarak began to form months before the uprising, when it became obvious Mubarak intended to have his son, Gamal, take his place.

If we ask a question, why unrest and discontent within the military against Mubarak began to form months before the uprising? If we want to answer this question, we will find that there is essential reason for them to feel unhappy, because they have discovered that Hosni Mubarak planned to replace his son Gamal, to succeed him. They have put in their mind, Gamal Mubarak was not a military man and they have justified their views by saying that this will be hereditarily rule.

Dozens of people have died in recent weeks as unrest has swept the country and security forces have cracked down on demonstrations over unemployment, food price rises and corruption.

Why dozens of people have died in recent weeks? If we want to answer this question, we will find this can be attributed to the security forces that cracked down on the demonstrations over unemployment, non-improvement of standard of living and corruption.

A desperate act on December 17 by a young unemployed man triggered a much wider series of protests and clashes with the police. Mohamed Bouazizi set fire to himself when officials prevented him from selling vegetables on the streets of SidiBouazid. This act of defiance and desperation set off protests about jobs in the town, based on an agriculture-based economy in one of the poorest regions of Tunisia. The unrest continued and police responded by opening fire on demonstrators, further exacerbating the already angry community of protesting citizens.

Why Mohammed Bouazizi set fire to himself? If we want to answer this question, first we should understand that no one can be forgiven if he disdains his brother; what is happened to Bouaziz is that officials prevent him from selling vegetables on the streets of SidiBouazid. Almighty God the sustainer of all punishes them by stirring up the people against the government.

On December 20, Tunisian Development Minister Mohammed Al Nouri Al Juwayni travelled to SidiBouazid to announce a \$10 million employment program. Despite this announcement, unrest continued. Then, on December 22, 22-year-old HoucineFalhi committed suicide by electrocution in a demonstration over unemployment in Tunisia. As the protests escalate throughout the country, an 18-year-old protestor, Mohamed Ammari, is killed by the police during demonstrations in MenzelBouzaïene.

If we ask a question, why hundreds of protesters rallied in front of the Tunisian Labor Union Headquarters? If we want to answer this question, we will find that this took place as the result of 22-year-old HoucineFalhi who committed suicide by electrocution in a demonstration over unemployment in Tunisia as well as 18-year-old protestor, Mohammed Ammari who is killed by the police during demonstration in MenzedBouzaïene.

On December 28, Zine El Abidine Ben Ali ran a national TV broadcast saying that the protests are not acceptable and will have a negative effect on the economy, adding that law will be applied to punish protestors. Despite his efforts, protests continued into January with increasing violence.

Why protests continued into January with increasing violence? If we answer this question, we will find that is happened as the result of Ben Ali's who ran a national TV broadcast saying that the protests are not acceptable and added that the law will punish protestors.

In early January, the Tunisian Bar Association announced a strike in protest over police attacks against its members and it is reported that 95 per cent of Tunisia's lawyers are on strike to stop police brutality.

Why the Tunisian Bar Association announced a strike? If we answer this question, we will find that this strike is made to protest against the police brutality in terms of attacking its members.

Ben Ali announced that he would not seek re-election in 2014 and promised new legislative elections in six months. He also announced a state of emergency, firing Tunisia's government.

Why thousands of protesters demand Ben Ali's resignation? If we answer this question, we will find that he does not redeem his promise, announced a state of emergency and fired his government.

It seems clearly that the political elites do not adjust their political discourses which lead to actions processes of individual actors who are regarded as part and parcel from group actions and social reaction processes. These are exemplified in unequal power relation between dictatorial governments which refer to as causative groups and oppressed masses which refer to as effective groups in the investigation of cause and effect.

Causative groups have more or less power and they are able to control the acts and minds of members of other groups. This ability presupposes a power base of privileged access to scarce social resources, such as force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, "culture," or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication of the vast literature on power as stated by (Lukes 1986; Wrong 1979).

The coercive power of the military and of violent men will rather be based on force; the causative groups will have power because of their money, whereas the more or less persuasive

power of effective groups may be based on knowledge, information, or authority.

In the enactment or exercise of group power is control not only over content, but over the structures of text and talk which seem clearly in giving orders by ruling class. Relating text and context, thus, we already saw that members of powerful groups may decide on the possible discourse genres or speech acts of an occasion. Wodak (1984a, 1986) said that a teacher or judge may require a direct answer from a student or suspect, respectively, and not a personal story or an argument. More critically, Linell and Jonsson (1991) claimed that we may examine how powerful speakers may abuse their power in such situations, e.g. when police officers use force to get a confession from a suspect or Van Zoonen (1994) said that when male editors exclude women from writing economic news.

In many situations, Houston and Kramarae (1991) said that volume may be controlled and speakers ordered to "keep their voice down" or to "keep quiet," women may be "silenced" in many ways and in some cultures Albert (1972) said that one needs to "mumble" as a form of respect. Verbal aggression has been made from both sides and this seems obviously in their selection of words, terms, slogans and expressions. Williams (1995) stated that the public use of specific words may be banned as subversive in a dictatorship, and discursive challenges to culturally dominant groups (e.g. white, western males) by their multicultural opponents may be ridiculed in the media as "politically correct". And finally, action and interaction dimensions of discourse may be controlled by prescribing or proscribing specific speech acts, and by selectively distributing or interrupting turns as stated by (Diamond 1996). Briefly, virtually all levels and structures of context, text, and talk can in principle be more or less controlled by powerful speakers, and such power may be abused at the expense of other participants. It should, however, be stressed that talk and text do not always and directly enact or embody the overall power relations between groups: it is always the context that may interfere with, reinforce, or otherwise transform such relationships.

CONCLUSION

The analysis has demonstrated that the political elites do not adjust their political discourses which lead to actions processes of individual actors who are regarded as part and parcel from

How to cite this article:

Hassan Mahill Abdallah Hassan and Abdulgadir Mohammed Ali Adam., Power Struggle Discourse Produced By Tunisian And Egyptian Revolutions During Arab Spring. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research* Vol. 6, Issue, 4, pp.3523-3528, April, 2015

group actions and social reaction processes. These are exemplified in unequal power relation between dictatorial governments which refer to as causative groups and oppressed masses which refer to as effective groups in the investigation of cause and effect in the above mentioned revolutions.

References

1. Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Language and Symbolic power*. Polity Press. Cambridge.
2. Fairclough, N. (1991). *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman.
3. Lukes, S., ed. (1986) *Power*. Oxford: Blackwell.
4. Fairclough, N.L. (1985) Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis *Journal of Pragmatics*.
5. Albert, E. M. (1972). Culture patterning of speech behavior in Burundi. In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: Ethnography of Communication*.
6. Diamond, J. (1996). *Status and Power in Verbal Interaction. A Study of Discourse in a Close-knit Social Network*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
7. Houston, M. and Kramarae, C. (eds). (1991). Women speaking from silence. *Discourse and Society*, 2(4), special issue.
8. Williams, J. (ed.) (1995). *PC Wars. Politics and Theory in the Academy*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
9. Wodak, R. (1984a, 1986). Determination of guilt: discourses in the courtroom. In C.
10. Wrong, D. H. (1979). *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. John Gaventa (1980) *Theories of Power*.
12. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian>
13. The Guardian, Wednesday 2 February 2011 via APTN, via
14. Egypt TV via APTN, via Associate Press, published: February 10, 2011
15. <http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/africa/02/10/egypt.mubarak.statement/index.html>
