

---

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE ARTS AND COMMERCE

---

## THE (DE) LEGITIMIZATION OF BUILDING BRIDGES INITIATIVES BY POLITICAL ACTORS IN KENYA

Authored by:

**Nkatha Euridise Gitonga**  
[nkathaeuridise@gmail.com](mailto:nkathaeuridise@gmail.com)

**Dr. Humphrey Ireri**

[ireih@yahoo.com](mailto:ireih@yahoo.com)

Department of Humanities

---

### ABSTRACT

*Language is vital in communication between people. They understand each other through shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. It is a major mechanism within the process of social construction, seen as an instrument for consolidating, manipulating concepts, seek attention, create relationships in the area of power, and use it as tool to control the society. Anchored in Critical Discourse Analysis theoretically, this study shed light on the crucial use of language in the society. The study sought to explain specific linguistic ways in which language is used to represent an instrument of control and manifest symbolic power in the Kenya's Building Bridges initiative speeches. The study developed and proposed various strategies of (de) legitimization employed by political leaders in Kenya to justify their course of action regarding the Building Bridges initiative. Qualitative research methodology was used in this study, of which the descriptive survey method was employed for the analysis of data. You Tube videos of speeches made by specific political actors regarding the Building Bridges Initiative since November 2019 to 2021 were purposively sampled, transcribed and analyzed in their written form. The study established that strategies used by politicians in (de)legitimizing BBI were; authorization, rationalization, moral evaluation, and mythopoeic. This paper is important since its findings will add to the existing literature in the field of critical discourse analysis.*

**Keywords:** *Power Struggle, Authorization, Rationalization, Moral Evaluation, and Mythopoeic*

---

## **I. Introduction**

This paper aims at discussing the use of language by political actors in Kenya to (de)legitimize the Building Bridges initiative. This section is divided into Language, Power Struggle and (de) Legitimization

### **1.1 Language**

The linguistic details of speeches can be seen to be far from incidental, but rather delicately structured and functional in the management of social and political relationships. Language plays a role in disseminating these social constructs, creating relationships and gaining power. van Dijk (1985) argues that language is an enabler and a mechanism for social construction. According to Atieno, Mukuthuria and Muriungi (2016), language is a medium through which humans share knowledge, values, attitudes, views, desires, demands, compliments, obligations, vows, and sentiments. Mulhern, Wasserman, Friedman & Fairclough (1989), posit that language is certainly crucial in politics since it may mislead as well as represent realities and, in some situations, increase well-being, but it can also linguistically befog facts and intellectually interpret them to support unjust power structures. According to Chilton (2004), politics is concerned with the ability to make decisions, manage resources and other people's conduct, and, at times, govern their values. Language is vital in this process since every political action legitimately or not is planned, accompanied, affected, and acted upon by speech.

### **1.2 Power Struggle**

The democratic spaces that most nations, including Kenya, enjoy have traditionally been viewed in the political arena as a battle for power; a struggle to occupy leadership, present alternatives, win influence, and rule. Power and dominance, according to Wodak (2001) and Althusser (1971), are considered as an exploitative force in society, aimed to repress dissent to processes that maintain the status quo in the interests of power holders. These are loosely defined as an association of legislatures, capitalists, and general capital stakeholders who, when joined, create the dominant bloc within capitalist states and, more widely, global capitalism. According to Atieno, et al. (2016), those in authority tend to dominate the other, resulting to vengeance by the governed.

According to Kiguru (2014), power is an unavoidable reality in all elements of society and the institutions that society has built. According to Mulhern et al. (1989), power manifests itself in a variety of ways, with physical force or violence being one of them. Power wielded through the fabrication of consent or at least acceptance to it is subtler, maybe more difficult to discern. According to Lynch (2006) much of politics is language that is brought in more explicitly through legitimizing tactics that audiences are unaware of.

Building Bridges Initiative (BBI) in Kenya portrays a classic example of power struggle. With its launch, political actors took in their speeches to agree, disagree, legitimize as well as delegitimize the Building Bridges Initiative report. Every one of them seeking to convince the citizens that what they said or did regarding the report was of the sole benefit of the citizens. Political dynamics in the country had changed significantly since the 'Handshake', fueling suspicions that BBI may have been designed

to influence the 2022 succession. Politicians perceived to be supportive of Deputy President William Ruto, an aspirant for the presidency in 2022, had increasingly become uneasy over the supposedly growing influence of the opposition leader Hon. Raila Odinga in state affairs.

### **1.3 (De) legitimization**

The process by which a speaker approves his ideas and gives permission on a type of behavior is sometimes referred to as legitimization. van Djik (1997) observes that, just as philosophies are the intellectual equivalents of systems, entities, or groups at the broader, societal, and political macro-levels, political players, deeds, and discursive are regionally influenced, understood, and analyzed by various forms of political cognition, such as shared social knowledge and political attitudes, as well as more expert information (features) of cementitious political developments. Ideologies are manifested in the speakers will to believe that what he/she is saying is the truth and should be practiced by his followers. This in essence legitimizes his stand as the truth begot to follow.

According to Lynch (2006) the practice of legitimization is carried out through discourse, which is the provision of justifications that justify our social acts, beliefs, thoughts, and pronouncements, among other things. It is scholars like Stankiewicz, (1976) who advanced the idea that legitimacy is used in three forms; reality of social supremacies, the fulfilment of power and the way power is practiced. Thus, bringing the idea of legitimacy. van Djik (1997) opines that there are three senses in which the term legitimacy is used in political theory. Firstly, the existence of social powers, secondly, the attainment of power and thirdly, the way power is exercised. The significance of the concept of legitimacy is that it transforms coercive power into binding authority; “the must” of obedience becomes an “ought”.

According to Rojo and van Djik (1997), legitimization is linked to what one says in defending his actions and advancing their rationality thus approving it as normal and acceptable. However, the opponent or the audience sometimes have the right of reply in another discourse or the same forum. Speech of any social group can be controlled, legitimized, or delegitimized in some ways. van Leeuwen (2008) pronounced four legitimization categories, which he refers to as the 'grammar of legitimization; authorization, rationalization, moral assessment, and mythopoesis that this study has used to assess their use by politicians as strategies to (de)legitimize the BBI.

#### **1.3.1 Authorization**

van Leeuwen (2008) defines authorization legitimization as legitimization by reference to authority. It is the answer to the implicit or explicit question 'Why is it so?' or 'Why must it be so?' is essentially 'Because I say so', or 'Because so-and-so says so', where the 'I' or the 'so and so' is someone in whom institutionalized authority is vested. This could be a parent, a teacher, a doctor, an expert among others. The authority may be impersonal, for example, the regulations, the law, the Bible, the Constitution. In both cases, the typical form in which this kind of legitimization is expressed involves either a saying verb with the relevant authority as subject. For example, the rules stipulate that ..., The Bible says that ... or a circumstance of attribution, like, According to Foucault ..., As the professor said..., According to Chapter five, article three of the constitution... among others. In other words, authorization may be

based on the authority of tradition, custom, law, impersonal or personal authority, or expertise. More so, authorization legitimation is done by either institutionalized authorization or impersonal authorization. In political documents, most of the time, impersonal authorization is used, and to a large extent, they are legal authorizations that quote from certain laws, rules or regulations. Conformity authorization, which is also another kind of authorization, 'rests on the principle that something is legitimate when 'everybody does it', or 'everybody does so'.

### **1.3.2 Rationalization**

The rationalization legitimation can be described as "legitimation by reference either to the utility of the social practice or some part of it, or to 'the facts of life. (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). This kind of legitimation is enacted when political actors present the legitimation process as a process where decisions have been made after a heeded, evaluated and thoughtful procedure. van Leeuwen (2007) refers to this rationalization as Theoretical rationalization. Rationalization needs to be understood as a *modus operandi* defined and shaped by and from a specific society. In this sense, it can be considered rational to consult other sources and explore all the options before making a decision. Consequently, this strategy of legitimation is linguistically articulated by clauses like, "After consultation with the board of management..." or other verbs denoting verbal and mental processes. For example, explore, consult, and deliberate.

### **1.3.3 Moral Evaluation**

Moral evaluation legitimation is based on norms and may involve moralization (by abstraction or comparison), evaluation and naturalization (Rojo & van Dijk, 1997). It has two forms, namely, moral abstraction and moral evaluation by means of straightforwardly evaluative clauses. Moral abstraction appears to be straightforward description of what is going on rather than an explicitly formulated legitimacy argument, and it is therefore one of the least explicit forms of legitimation. Moral abstraction legitimation means moral values expressed in abstract references (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999.) According to Rojo & van Dijk (1997), public speakers in particular, as well as all social actors, make sure their proposals do not appear driven only by personal interests. They present themselves, for instance, as serving their voters, and therefore legitimize proposals as a common good that will improve the conditions of a particular community. Institutional actions and policies are typically described as beneficial for the group or society as a whole. This society can include the community of the politician and audience, or it can refer to a remote society that the speaker presents in need of 'our' help. This legitimation responds to the wellbeing of other people and is related to the idea of altruism.

### **1.3.4 Mythopoesis**

According to Bradley, Erickson, Stephenson, C & Williams, (2000). mythopoesis is referred to as the way a speaker brings in his speech the aspect of a tale that is based on what he is advancing so that the audience can follow or be persuaded to take the correct action. The telling of stories is very important in some discourses. A story or an event is used to support a general norm of behavior. However, majority of the time, negative stories are told. In other words, Mythopoesis is the telling of stories about

what might happen if one does or does not do what is expected. Mythography allows us to consider how generic decisions, rhetorical maneuvers, and formal devices can all be used to lend authority and credibility to the underlying message of a speaker.

#### **1.4. Theoretical Framework**

This study used Critical discourse analysis theory, which is a multidisciplinary method of examining discourse that considers language to be a kind of social exercise. According to Widdowson (2007) it is the uncovering of implicit ideologies in texts. Critical discourse analysis deals with analyzing the content and social relations in a text and this way, it reveals ideologies and power relations in a context. Rahimi and Sahragard, (2007) agrees that CDA tries to reveal the sources of dominance and inequalities observed in the society by analyzing texts. By using the Critical Discourse Analysis, the use of the (de)legitimization strategies: Authorization, Rationalization, Moral Evaluation and Mythopoeic by politicians in BBI discourse paved way to understanding use of language to dominate, manipulate, consolidate, build relationships, power, and control society.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

A total of eight streams of talk from different political actors were used, where four were pro-BBI and the other four were against it. The YouTube video talks were purposively sampled. These videos were then transcribed into text and used to capture the (de) legitimization strategies as used by the politicians. No pseudo names were used for these politicians since the videos were in the public domain.

### **3. Strategies Used by Political actors to (de)legitimize the Building Bridges Initiative in Kenya**

#### **3.1 (De) legitimizing Strategies**

The (De) legitimizing Strategies included: Authorization, Rationalization, Moral Evaluation, and Mythopoeic

##### **3.1.1 Authorization**

Authorization in itself gives credit to the speaker, or the speaker takes credit since it is in him or her that institutionalized authority is vested. Here is an example of authorization by Deputy President of Kenya Hon. William Ruto:

*I want to say as a leader in Kenya.....*

Miring'u (2020) describes Hon. Ruto as aggressive, with unparalleled charisma and cracks the most laughable jokes, is a people's person, hustler, religious eloquent, courageous, brilliant and has the master of statistical information and is a mobilizer per excellence. In this example Deputy President

William Ruto is reminding his audience that he is the deputy president and a leader with authority hence what he was going to talk about is credible. The disposition of this statement is meant to be ironic to the audience yet the need to have it is both ridiculous and laughable since the audience's background information is that they already know who he was in the first place. The strong indication of this implicature is that according to him, he has the authority to speak. The authority is or was given to him when he was elected together with President Uhuru Kenyatta. This means he is standing on the moral ground to speak as a credible individual and the audience needs to pay attention.

Prof. Patrick Lumumba uses authorization

*I am a lawyer by training, I have been a teacher of law and I practice law.*

In this example, Prof. Patrick Lumumba categorically means that all his life, he has been in law and there is nothing he loves more than having spent his time teaching it, being a professional, and practicing it as of that time.

Hon. Sen. Onesimus Murkomen

*"..... there is no way I will be told as a leader in this country, I will be expected to sanitize the politics in this nation and our voices are not going to be heard when we speak here."*

Hon. Murkomen had been irritated by the way the program was being run, in that the majority of those who had been invited were pro-BBI, and the meeting excluded those with dissenting voices on the subject.

In the first part of the sentence, "*.... there is no way I will be told as a leader in this country...*" he is portrayed as one with the authority to speak to matters of BBI or the people he represents. He reminds the audience that he is one of the leaders with authority because he was the Senate majority leader, and claimed to represent many. His line of argument brings in a metaphorical speech when he says "*.... I will be expected to sanitize the politics in this nation and our voices are not going to be heard when we speak here.*" Since the COVID-19 era, the word sanitize had been widely used in the country as people were taught to fight the corona virus with sanitizers, which is an alcoholic-based chemical liquid recommended by World Health Organization (WHO).

In this case, Hon. Murkomen asserts that as a leader, he was unwilling to mislead his people if the process and invitees were not representative of the people for whom the meeting was intended. That is why he adds "*... and our voices are not going to be heard when we speak here.*" He used the pronoun: "*We*" (used to refer to the speaker together with other people regarded in the same category), the possessive pronoun: "*Our*" (belonging to or associated with the speaker) and a plural noun: "*Voices.*" (a particular opinion or attitude expressed) to bring out his clear intention as a leader with authority. To the audience, he wanted to be seen as representing many people whom the meeting had excluded. The strong indication of his involvement is that he is delegitimizing the meeting because it lacks representation from dissenting voices; had they been invited, the process and the entire discussion would have been legitimate.

There are three senses in which the term legitimacy is used in political theory. Firstly, the existence of social power, secondly, the attainment of power, and thirdly, the way power is exercised. The significance of the concept of legitimacy is that it transforms coercive power into binding authority; "the must" of obedience becomes an "ought" (Stankiewicz, 1976). Without even stating other things he does in life; this shows that Prof. Patrick Lumumba wants to tell the audience he understands the law and is versed with matters law which gives him legitimacy and authority to speak boldly about it and that whatever he says can be relied upon.

Hon. Charity Ngilu:

*Let me just say, I have been invited here to speak on behalf of women but I also speak on behalf of Kenyans .... Your Excellency, you know I wear two hats. I am a party leader and I am also a woman and I am a governor and the only one you didn't call.*

Her Excellency, Hon. Charity Ngilu, the governor of Kitui, delivered her speech and, after the usual greetings and acknowledgment to dignitaries, she opted to let the audience know in what capacity she had attended and what it all meant for her to be there. As a woman, it did not just mean anything to the audience, but when she adds "...but I speak about the behavior of Kenyans", this makes the audience get attentive.

It should not be lost to the reader that she once vied for a presidential post in 1997. The significance of this boils down to the audience's need to recognize her as a leader. A leader represents a multitude; thus, in addition to representing her constituency as a woman, she wants the audience to understand where she gets her authority, which is not confined to her as a woman but is widely distributed.

Her use of the metaphor of "two hats" later reveals her true representation when she says, "...your excellency, you know I wear two hats." The idiomatic expression of wearing two hats is explained as playing two (or more) roles; to holding two different positions. This expression alludes to the hats of two different uniforms. The practice is ancient, and Gilbert and Sullivan made glorious fun of it in *The Mikado* in the person of Pooh-Bah, who holds practically every office in the town of Titipu. The term dates from the mid-nineteenth century. A 1972 issue of the *Village Voice* stated, "I wear two hats. Are you asking me this question as president of the Bartenders' Union or as chairman of the ABC? "

The strong implication of that in this pronouncement is an idiomatic expression to represent her position both in the county and as a national leader, where she goes on to make clearer to the audience that not only is she a woman leader, but also a party leader which has a national outlook. Take a look at how she manages to bring out the outlook of a woman leader, governor, and party leader to emphasize how clear her responsibilities are. If she has these positions, therefore, she has moral authority in the sense that whatever she says on the BBI is as clear as day and that she believes and legitimizes the whole process by the understanding of her authority.

President Uhuru Kenyatta: -

*I am telling you this honestly as your President who consumes first-hand information, only available to the Head of State*

President Uhuru Kenyatta made this remark during the launch of the BBI signature collection on November 25th, 2020. This being one of the many stages the BBI was going through, the President went so far as to explain to the audience that the handshake they had with Hon. Raila Odinga after the divisive election in 2017 which followed six months of unrest by NASA supporters was destructive to the economic growth of the country. Hon. Raila Odinga and his colleagues had urged their supporters to boycott the use of Safaricom and Brookside products (both of which the audience was aware of) to sabotage the economy. According to the president, it was the handshake that cooled things down. He went so far as to tell the audience that the country had been heading in the wrong direction since independence and that the BBI which was birthed from the “handshake”, was a cure to everything that ailed it.

This example is one of the few times the president is referring to himself as the president. "*I am telling you this honestly as your President who consumes first-hand information.....*" To the audience, the verb "consume" means to eat something similar to food, but when he adds "first-hand information," the President leaves them with questions as to how one can eat information.

The clear inference here is that he was reminding the crowd that there is the knowledge that is only accessible to the head of state, and him being the president, had the advantage. He takes the opportunity to remind the crowd that he is the head of state, that an intellectual unit feeds him secret material that is only available to a president like him, as a result, he understood what he was doing or legitimizing when he spoke of the BBI. He went on to say that the handshake was not to be taken lightly, since the situation at that time would have escalated had it not been for his efforts to subvert them as the head of state. In his speaking, he appeals to the audience's logic to believe that it was not a prank but a real effort that called everyone to get on board because he, as the chief and having all the power, was legitimizing the mechanism as a result of the facts he had.

On the weaker implication, the listener is left with the impression that he is a father figure who does not want anything bad happening to his children. The children in this situation are Kenyans, and he is the father figure who cannot just lie, which is why he goes on to say "...I am telling you this frankly as your President..."

The adverb honestly (in a genuine, equal, or honorable manner) is used deliberately to emphasize that he wishes the viewer to believe him. People want a leader they can trust and believe in, so "honestly" eliminates fear and doubt and replaces it with confidence, which the president was aware of and used to advance his legitimacy as a leader with authority over BBI matters.

Hon. Raila Odinga: -

*Your excellency, like the Bible, says in the book of Isaiah 1:18, "Come now let us reason together..." Then the Quran says in Surat z-Zumar 38:18 "those who listen to all statements and then follow the best of it, these are the ones whom Allah has guided and these are the ones possessed of Mind"*



Hon.Raila Odinga states this during the launch of the collection of BBI signatures on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at Bomas. He had just told the audience before this statement that the BBI document had gone through a lot of scrutiny and consultations. He acknowledged that it was work in progress that should be inclusive irrespective of religious affiliations, social, or any other background emphasizing that it requires all to be part of it. He further added that it was important for all to be together and think as one through God's guidance.

Hon.Raila Odinga was alive to the fact that the audience was made up of people who subscribe to Christianity or the Muslim religion. He is one of the many speakers who used authority as defined in its sense. The strong implication of his use of the Bible leads Christians to believe that he is not only alone but that the Bible says so and agrees with what he is advancing to them. The need to come together is subscribed in the bible where he is deriving his authority. It supports people being together for a good cause in a way as he says; to put their minds together and come to a conclusion on an issue like the BBI.

Another strong implication can be seen in the way he quotes the Quran, which demonstrates that Muslims believe in their God and that guidance is enshrined in the Quran; "... *when you listen to a statement and then follow it...*" He is implying that the "statement" is the figurative speech of metaphorical nature standing for the BBI document. Hence, whoever follows it is not alone; he is already chosen by (*Allah*) God to have the intelligence of knowing the right things like the BBI. Hon.Raila Odinga is appealing to a higher authority by implying that the BBI is not just a document, but it is chosen by God hence those who follow it are only selected by *Allah*, and possess His intelligence.

The use of the Bible and Quran in its weak implications shows that in matters of religion, Hon.Raila Odinga is a man who knows these divine books. He is endearing to all those who subscribe to this faith simply and directly. The use of simple language devoid of lexicalism and idioms dramatize his ability to speak spiritual things and relate them to common things like BBI. Therefore, he shows himself as having the moral authority derived from understanding the Bible or the Quran, and the fact that he uses it in a simple but understandable manner is unquestionable.

Deputy President William Ruto: -

*I want to remind you, good people, Abraham Lincoln the 17<sup>th</sup> president of the United State of America said, "Things may come to those who wait but only things left by those who hustle."*

He had been informing the audience of the need to have a discussion on the BBI document and straighten out controversial issues that were stopping him from supporting it. As a result, he the leader of "the hustlers," had been told by various speakers, including Hon. Kalonzo Musyoka and Bishop Oginde, to stop fronting the narrative and focus on the BBI as a unifying document, rather than putting Kenyans on hustling or not hustling classes. Some of the leaders seemed to believe that he, as the

deputy president, should be in the front line of those supporting the BBI. This prompted him to quote the former renowned USA president as his basis for explaining why he was still standing with the hustler narrative.

This quote lay in the fact that, as Lincoln himself demonstrated, he specifically meant yes, it is good to wait for things to happen, but they would not happen overnight or be given to anyone on a silver platter; but rather, required one to go for them by putting strategies in place which align the goals and success. According to Deputy President William Ruto, hustling is going for it, planning and dragging yourself towards what you wanted to achieve, whether it is getting rich, being a leader, or something else. In this approach, he used this forum to remind those opposed to the hustle narrative that he would not stop until he achieved what he wanted because hustlers never get tired and that the BBI would not make him stop, thus coming out as one using Abraham Lincoln's authority as a defiant leader and delegitimizing the BBI, since it does not align with what he believes in.

Put differently, Lincoln's quote is a simple saying but uses such a deep meaning. Abraham Lincoln was simply saying if somebody worked hard, which Deputy President William Ruto subscribed to, then achieving his or her goals became easier, while those who did not work to their fullest potential lagged behind. This meant that Hon. William Ruto hoped that by introducing the hustle narrative, he would inspire those earning less than a dollar per day to see the value in working hard and eventually follow or vote for him as the 5<sup>th</sup> President of the Republic of Kenya because he is the only one who understood their plight.

Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen: -

*Number two, your Excellency, being the majority leader in the Senate, we in the Senate will stand for strengthening of devolution and sending resources to the grassroots.*

Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen had just previously said that he had gone through the BBI document which was a big volume, and made him sleep at 4.00 am. He pointed out that The Senate, in which he was the majority leader, was mentioned in the document and therefore it was his duty speak on behalf of those he represented.

van Leeuwen (2008) defines authorization legitimation through the use of the question 'Why is it so?' or 'Why must it be so?' essentially therefore it answered about oneself 'because I say so.' Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen uses this kind of authority when he says that "We in The Senate" essentially to put across that he was representing the views of The Senate and there should be no doubt about it.

His talk implied that in the one hundred and fifty-six pages long BBI report, there was a likelihood that The Senate had not been recognized as the body with the final say in the resource and devolution matters. This made him want the audience to know that he as a leader of The Senate, which did not have the powers subscribed to it by the 2010 Constitution of Kenya in the new BBI report, believed that it (BBI) shall not stand the test of time hence delegitimizing it.

This could also be seen as a means to remind the authority or the people who were in charge of the BBI report that decisions were made final through him because as the leader of The Senate, he had the power and authority to make it pass or not

### 3.1.2 Rationalization

This study found out that many of the speakers were inclined to use rationalization to prove a point. According to van Leeuwen (2007), rationalization is legitimization based on making practices appear rational; that is, as sensible, logical, or an indisputable truth.

Here is an example of rationalization by President Uhuru Kenyatta: -

*Siku ya leo ni siku muhimu. .na ni kwanini? Ni kwasababu kila mkenya pahali popote alipo anataka kusikia mambo yale ambayo yanajadiliwa hapa Bomas ambayo tunaanzisha, kujadili kama wakenya hapa Bomas; itabadilisha maisha yao ya kawaida kwa njia gani?*

Today is an important day... and why? It is because every Kenyan wants to hear the things that are being discussed here in Bomas that we are initiating, discussing as Kenyans here in Bomas; how will it change their lives? – theoretical by explanations.

This kind of talk brings in itself rationalization of events and how they become moral leading to the legitimization of the process going on. Through this narration, President Uhuru Kenyatta wanted to imply that the BBI had a big audience ready to listen to the discussion at the Bomas of Kenya that day.

This is why he used rhetorical questions for example, “*And why?*” and “*How will it change their lives?*” The questions were deliberate to drive anticipation and a sense of collective one. He asked and provided the answers in a great way of explaining why they were listening to their radios or watching televisions. He strongly implied that BBI was a process that would affect them in one way or the other. If people were listening and watching (theoretically) it meant the discussion was huge and legitimate. There was no way people would take time to listen or watch something that they were not interested in.

Rationalization by Hon. Kalonzo Musyoka: -

*Your excellency, if we can empty ourselves of what I call prejudice and even anger because even the Bible, the Holy book says that anger does not workout righteous, it doesn't.*

Hon. Kalonzo Musyoka – Wiper Party Leader was given a chance to deliver a speech on BBI Report Initiative On 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019 at Bomas of Kenya, in which he spoke at length on the need for Kenyans to unite. He gave a story on how he had spoken in anger at Uhuru Park, and in the process quoted a famous human rights fighter of The United States of America, which was misinterpreted by mostly the people from Mt. Kenya and to which he apologized.

Hon. Kalonzo Musyoka makes use of a figure of speech called metaphor. He metaphorically tells the audience, “Empty ourselves.” First “empty” means “containing nothing”, “not filled or occupied” while the use of pronouncing “Ourselves” meaning “we or us personally (used to emphasize the speaker and one or more other people considered together” including him from something; prejudice – preconceptions or bias and anger. Imagine the whole phrase literally - imagine the act of emptying, taking yourself, and pouring out. The audience knows that to empty only applies to the act of removing dirt or water from a container to another one or something else.

The phrase "empty ourselves" is interpreted metaphorically meaning that the speaker (Hon.Kalonzo Musyoka) wanted the audience including himself to remove all those preconceptions or bias and anger that lived within themselves to achieve higher grounds of living and in this case righteousness. Instrumental legitimization mostly uses adjectives. In this case, he used the adjective: righteous, which he evinced an opinion about morality and proper behavior about Hon. Murkomen who had spoken earlier and seemed to be so angry because of the lack of inclusion of dissenting voices in the meeting at Bomas of Kenya.

Hence, Hon. Kalonzo used instrumental rationalization that is based on moralized purposes, which just like legitimizations, are constructed in discourse to explain why social practices exist. Purposes can serve as legitimizations if they contain an element of moralization, that is ,if they are linked to a discourse of moral values by a highlighted desirable quality. Prejudices and anger are the instruments that if not checked are not going to lead to a righteous life. A righteous life is a moral practice that Hon.Kalonzo Musyoka wants to be instilled in the audience himself included. According to him when prejudices are removed, the righteous life enters which he envisions is positively looking at the world with all the events including the BBI process that only righteous people would have the power to see the good in, hence legitimizing the BBI document as true, and that is meant to unite the people of Kenya.

President. Uhuru Kenyatta: -

*Both the BBI Taskforce and the BBI Steering Committee listened to thousands of Kenyans from all walks of life in every one of our 47 counties .... I am, therefore, confident that this process has been widely consultative and has captured the best of our ideas and ideals.*

The President was speaking during the launch of the BBI signature collection exercise, on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020. He was explaining to the audience how this BBI process had traveled from BBI 1 released in November 2019 and BBI 2 that was a process of ensuring that the views of all Kenyans were represented as given. He said that in several occasions, views came up that led to the validation of the launch of the report. He pointed out that the referendum bill being discharged on that day, was meant to ensure every Kenyan including critics and those with dissenting voices were involved in the process.

This shows that the participation by many people in contributing to the BBI from all the forty-seven counties through the capturing of these views by professionals (Task Force, and the BBI Steering Committee) in what he termed as “*ideas*” – accepted wisdom and “*ideals*” – moral values; shows acceptance as a moral practice since no one out of the many people who contributed to BBI looked at it as a sin. This, therefore, gave him the rationalization that if all those people took time to contribute then this document must be legitimate. The discourse of moralization and legitimization is based on goal legitimization since he is ascribing motives to the contribution made by many, for example, why did they participate, and the answer would come because they had a motive, intention, and goals which can be translated as interest since the ideas are concerns of their lives and affect them in one way or the other.

When he says; “*I am, therefore, confident that this process has been widely consultative and has captured the best of our ideas and ideals,*” it brings in the idea of instrumental legitimization, which as van Leeuwen (2007) notes, mostly employs evaluative adjectives to moralize ideas and practices. In this case therefore, the president uses the adjectives; “*confident*” – in no doubt and “*widely*” far and wide “*consultative*” – to discuss with or advice-giving on what the BBI should constitute. This makes him sure that the process was legitimate, unquestionable, and having substance to be supported by all.

The strong implicature is that the president wanted to show that there was no way a visit all those Kenyans across the counties would bring back a document that is neither concrete nor worth supporting. The weaker implicature is that the president was appealing to the logical thinking of the audience to support the BBI.

Deputy President Willian Ruto: -

*There are those who believe this to be the moment to discuss the ravages of CoVID-19 and the reality of our economic status especially the majority 40% old people of our country who live below the poverty line and the 16 million or so young people who are unemployed.*

While delivering his speech during the launch of the BBI on November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at Bomas of Kenya, Deputy President William Ruto pointed out that there were Kenyans who considered the BBI process as something worth exploring at that time while others were of the view that there were more pressing matters that needed attending to.

Deputy President Willian Ruto used communication speech grounded on appeal and rationalization of reason using numbers which are commonly referred to as logos. Logos is a term in Western rhetoric, psychology, and religion that is derived from a Greek word variously meaning "ground", "speech", "account", "reason", "proportion", and "discourse". It became a technical term in Western philosophy beginning with Heraclitus (c. 535 – c. 475 BC), who used the term for a principle of order and knowledge by Aristotle in his concept of the three artistic proofs or modes of

persuasion, that is, *Logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*. It gives credit to the speaker. In this case, Deputy President Willian Ruto is using numbers like “40% of old people” and “16 million of young people” to show by way of “count” and “reason” that those people who have been affected by the COVID-19 and unemployment are many. His intention was to make the two issues stand out as the more pressing needs that needed urgent attention compared to the BBI.

To delegitimize the BBI process, he used an adjective “majority” meaning many or just mainstream, effectively showing rationalization by way of instrumental legitimization of his point. The strong implicature here is that Hon. William Ruto wanted the audience to know that BBI is not a priority, many other urgent issues should be highlighted instead, thus delegitimizing it by way of logos rationalization and instrumental renationalization.

Michira (2013) says that politics is essentially about power and authority, how to obtain and appropriate it, how to make decisions and control resources, and even manipulate those who are governed. According to him, these objectives depend so much on language for them to be achieved and this, therefore, means that language is power.

This is why the following example illustrates how Deputy President Willian Ruto uses language to advance his point of delegitimizing the BBI process through rationalization: -

*There is no superior or inferior opinion that all of us is a citizen of Kenya and can air our views openly, frankly so that we can have an informed conversation.*

He was delivering his keynote speech on BBI Report Initiative on 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2019 at Bomas Kenya, where he, first of all, appreciated the work done by the team that came up with the document and formed a report out of it. This report is what he hoped would form a national conversation regardless of the position one held in society.

He uses the adjectives “superior” and “inferior” to legitimize his point while at the same time delegitimizing the BBI report through the use of instrumental rationalization in the form of “views/opinion” as the instrument that should be allowed in an open situation when he says “can air our views openly, frankly”. *Air* implies a particular kind of discussion — involving both informality and a minimum level of disagreement, while *openly* is an adverb meaning without concealment, deception, or prevarication, and “*frankly*” - in an open, honest, and direct manner without looking at rank, leadership, position, or otherwise.

It turns out that Deputy President Willian Ruto’s line of delivering his speech is a mixed bag of irony and outmost laughable in the eyes of the audience considering his position in the society specifically being the deputy president and talking about “*There is no superior or inferior opinion.*” Which he should have had a chance to advocate for previously now that he has been in the government for over seven years. Wanjala (2014) studies irony in selected Kenyan political utterances. She affirms

that politicians make ironic utterances intending to criticize bad leadership and also to attack opponents, humiliate them to succeed in getting approval from the audience. It also enables the hearer to save face since unfavorable judgment is perceived to be moderate than direct criticism which is seen as face-threatening.

Speakers and more so politicians use language that is persuasive to convince their listeners to agree with their standpoints, share their values, and adopt their way of thinking. It is the skill in using rationalization as they try to convince their audience that makes most politicians successful. Typically, the political process is all about persuasion and negotiation (Gass & Seiter, 2010).

Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen: -

*Your Excellency, I want to appreciate the leadership you provided in this process because I was among the first and among the people who were very skeptical about this process*

This, he says after openly complaining that he was not ready as a leader to support a process he thought others had been left out of. According to him, it amounted to being dishonest. He said that as a leader who had gone there for national unity he had demanded to be heard. However, after being given time to continue since a section of the audience did not want to hear what he had to say, he later on, thanked the president for it.

In this example Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen comes out as someone who knows where his bread is buttered although very late. He thanked the president and appreciated his leadership perhaps by realizing that had the president signaled that he did not want him to go on, he would be somewhere else. He perfectly employs theoretical rationalization by way of explanations in ironically appreciating the president's leadership. This kind of rationalization describes the general attributes and activities of the actors in question. He heaps praises on the president so that the answer to the question "why?" would be "because doing things this way is appropriate for these actors." For Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen to praise and admit that the process of BBI was legitimate in the process of his boss seemed the logical ideal action. He used an adjective, "*skeptical*" which means having doubts, suspicion, or questioning which was true he had been the voice in opposing the BBI, yet in this case, he wanted to impress the president. However, this turns out to be ironic in the audience's view, since he was already known to be against the BBI.

He is seen as trying to endear the president and appear as supporting the process, while in actual sense, he was buying time to finish his tirade and delegitimize the BBI. A look at his body language which is beyond the current study showed a man at war with words, having been jolted from his thought plan of action. The weaker implicature is that Hon. Kipchumba Murkomen wanted the audience to see him as a man of reason who even if he was angry at the event, recognized and appreciated the leadership of the president.

Hon. Raila Odinga

*But then your excellency I am not just saying this without a reason. Why am I saying this? I am saying this because it has been a journey*

Shortly before this, he had narrated how the process of constitution making had taken a long time. He told the audience that as they were making the constitution there were dissenting voices who had walked away and later went to court and stopped the process. No one gave up though, since there was another event dubbed “Kilifi” and then “Wako” that yielded the famous “Banana and Chungwa” that led to a referendum. Those who opposed the constitution by then were using the symbol “Banana” and those who were pro were using the symbol “Chungwa” (orange) two things happened by then, the Chungwa people won the referendum headed by Hon. Raila Odinga. The other thing was that Chungwa(orange) became a party-christened Orange Democratic Movement.

He used theoretical rationalization by way of explanations. This helped him put a picture in the mind of the audience logically that there is nothing that comes easy. He used a rhetorical question that he provided an answer to thereafter, as a way of describing general attributes and activities of the actors in question so that the answer to the question “why?” would be thereafter “because doing things this way is proper for these actors.” The “why” is the reason he was giving this narrative because he wanted to show that constitutional changes take time. There had been a history of events that had taken place other than mere talks including struggles and shaming in equal measures.

This implies that he wanted to show the audience, that he had been present in the constitution making process and he therefore knew and understood the pain it takes. He was telling the audience that he was prepared for anything including going to court to defend what he believed in since it was the only way the people of Kenya could be liberated.

Hon. Martha Karua;

*So instead of fixing the electoral process, they are just putting additional seats for people to share at the National level. If there were indeed true, there should be similar seats at the county level because there are elections both at the national and county level.*

She was giving a talk at the backyard of Serena hotel to the press who would then deliver to their stations for Kenyan consumption. Before the quoted line, Hon. Martha Karua had poured cold water on Kenyan’s electoral process by saying that the country had had six general elections and out of the same, only one was approved by the people as being fair. She therefore concluded that the score does not reflect well with the democratic environment the Kenyan people had been yearning for. She wondered how the BBI process would be of value to Kenyans yet in it, was nothing touching on the electoral process, and the winner takes it all issue.



This example, therefore, shows that she does not believe that BBI is something that would cure the election upheavals experienced in Kenya. She used theoretical rationalization by way of explanation and says; “...*So instead of fixing the electoral process, they are just putting additional seats for people to share at the National level.*” In this example, she uses the verb; *fixing* meaning putting up or repairing that which is not working, which she felt the proponents were not doing but, in its place, something evil was taking place “additional seats”. According to her, “*additional seats*” symbolized the power to dominate the people, power to influence, or power to decide what took place in people’s lives. To her, she reasons that BBI is not for all Kenyans, but rather for a few people who were hell bent on acquiring and retaining power at the top and forgetting the others. She makes the audience believe by giving an example that if that were not true, then the same seats would have been added at the count level. This is theoretical rationalization that she wanted the audience to reason and understand critically in the sense that the BBI process is not for them hence delegitimizing it. She believes that sharing of seats (power) should cut across other elective posts in the country.

The strong implicature of this is that Hon. Martha Karua wants to appear as a person who reads between the lines and knows when something is wrong or right. All through her views are right but debatable, which is a little bit beyond the current study’s objectives and aims. For example, one would seek to know whether other elective posts were contentious and in need of national dialogue. Which level of elections has been disputed and lacked a solution to it or warranted the creation of more seats? The weaker implicature on the other hand, is that she wants to be seen as one who is an advocate of the less fortunate or those whose voices have not been heard especially having contested for the gubernatorial seat in Kirinyaga county in 2017 and lost. She feels there would have been a consideration for losers in the same election to have a soft landing by creating more space rather than leave them in political oblivion.

Hon. Martha Karua;

*One further reflection, we ought not to be surprised because the president has not hidden his contempt for the constitution and the rule of law.*

Before saying this, she had mentioned that there had been incidences like bribing MCAs so that they could pass the BBI reports in their counties. Reports in the media had it that the president had allowed the counties to give car grants to MCAs as had been agreed. Many saw this as a bribe to MCAs. However, Hon. Martha Karua also said that those counties like Baringo who did not vote to pass the BBI report in their counties were targeted and referred to as terrorists. She wondered whether rejecting BBI was another way of saying one was a terrorist since most of the MCAs had been recording statements with the National Intelligence services.

This example shows how she used theoretical rationalization to mean that there was no need to be surprised by the events taking place. According to her, the president had on several occasions

disrespected the law by failure to adhere to it. It did not make sense, she pointed out, for someone who neither upheld the law nor followed it, to be the one promoting it. This to her, she considers ironical, thus, delegitimizing the process of BBI in believing that the president is not loyal and not trustworthy.

The strong implicature of this is that she did not understand why the president would promote a constitution or law that he would eventually not follow. She was implying that Kenyans should not waste time making changes to the constitution because the custodian of the same who is the head of state did not believe, follow or uphold it. The weaker implicature is that Hon. Martha Karua wants people to know the president is not to be trusted, thus delegitimizing the BBI that the president was propagating.

Prof. Patrick Lumumba: -

*“..... And then they now say the counties will now have 35% of the budget. Give more functions and it could be even 80% even 100%.”*

Prof. Patrick Lumumba had narrated that the current constitution had not been implemented or put to its task so that Kenyans could see its benefits but some politicians were at the forefront to want to change it mid-way through. He gave examples that were being proposed like Article 10A as saying that we should be good citizens of the East African community, which he said we do not need in the constitution for the sheer reason that this was already in East Africa’s treaty. He also gave another example being introduced as Article 18A and said that it required Kenyans to respect their parents which seemed laughable to even think of. To this end, he categorically pointed out that a lot of religious books like the Bible, Quran, and Torah have sections in them that already said so, and therefore there was no need to mention that in the constitution.

In this example, he used rationalization based on the logical argument in which he acknowledged that the new constitution was proposing to have a 35% increase in government allocation to the counties, but he faults this and said that for it to work the proposals in BBI would have to give function as to what that money would be used for in terms of projects. This is why he says “...give more functions” to delegitimize these allocations further he says that the allocation can be more than 35% hence saying they can be 80% or 100%.

The stronger implication of this rationality based on the logical numbers from Prof. Lumumba is that he wants to indicate that there are things that do not need to be included in the constitution other than finding a way of creating a policy or a guideline for them to be implemented. To him, these were trivial matters only meant to hoodwink the masses and nothing more.

Prof. Patrick Lumumba says: -

*We introduced three hundred and sixty-six seats and if we do not get enough women then we go to the party list and based on the votes that have been cast we top up; we*

*top up until we get a number that allows ensures that no gender is more than 2/3, we will do that for 15 years.*

Through the use of logical rationalization, he seems to mean that this topping up to achieve gender parity question was a fallacy and time-consuming affair. He could not imagine this topping issue lasting for fifteen years which would end up being overtaken by events by the time it is achieved. Prof. Patrick Lumumba is delegitimizing this process of BBI using logic in a manner to show that there would have been another way to implement the said two third majority question than the one which is time consuming. A constitution does not need going back and forth scenario but rather, straightforward wording. It only showed again the interest of the proponent according to him to want to attract women so that they could be tricked into support it.

### **3.1.3 Moral Evaluation**

Majority of the speakers used the moral evaluation strategy to particularly show how their point of view was driven by acts of morality than self-interest. They present themselves, for instance, as serving their voters, and therefore legitimize proposals as a common good that will improve the conditions of a particular community.

For example:

Moral evaluation as used by Deputy President William Ruto: -

*Majority of the issues that were canvassed by Kenyans were about ordinary people, jobs business, our agriculture, and your Excellency you have set a perfect program under the big four agenda.*

While delivering his speech on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019 at Bomas of Kenya, he pointed out that there were some gaps, and they were issues to do with the ordinary citizen. His word choice like; “majority”, “ordinary”, and “perfect” are adjectives whose purpose is to make the sentence or that which the speaker is saying sweeter and more appealing, and heap praises especially to a higher rank as he says; “...*your excellency you have set a “perfect” program.*” In this case, it brings with it a different meaning about what the audience thought he was saying. He was sweetening it so that he did not appear to be insulting or abusing or degrading his boss.

When he says; “*the majority of the issues that were canvassed by Kenyans.*” Which is a collective moral evaluation having in it the word “canvassed” and its synonym is “campaigned” means that many people drummed up support on various issues or campaigned for various issues that were appearing in the BBI document, and that already existed in the Big four agenda that the president had already set. This is why he quickly says, “...*and your excellency you have set a perfect program under the big four agenda*” to emphasize that there is nothing new in this BBI document emphatically delegitimizing the document, since the Big four agenda, which was based on four pillars, that is, Manufacturing, Agriculture, Employment creation and Universal health coverage, is already in place. This Big four agenda came before the process of BBI took place and according to the Deputy President, should have taken precedence instead of duplicating it in BBI Report.

Deputy President William Ruto: -

*I dare say your excellency, these are areas that again we must find a mechanism of having a conversation especially the farming community, and matters to do with productivity.*

The Deputy President was speaking at the Bomas of Kenya during the launch of the BBI signature collection on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020 and he made the audience know that there were a lot of gaps that the BBI report had not touched including the agricultural sector which he said had contributed to the economy, that is, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in a big way, manufacturing and employment creation.

In this example, he implied that he had the audacity when he says, “*I dare say...*” meaning he was taking the risk of challenging the BBI supporters including the president to have a look at ways in which farming and productivity should be considered in the document other than how it had been represented and for the reason that its contribution to the GDP is unquestionable. This is the moral abstraction legitimization of his proposal and at the same time delegitimizing the BBI. van Leeuwen & Wodak (2008) posit that moral abstraction legitimization means moral values expressed in immaterial or mental reference. This is the fact since the audience is not sure where he got the percentage representation of how farming as he says; “*...contributing 25% directly to our GDP and through manufacturing another 24% and which employs almost 65% of all people in Kenya is the agricultural sector.*” Despite that, he still appeared to speak for farmers who for a long time had not been well represented in any policymaking or rules or the constitution matters, or even the current BBI document.

The strong implicature of that was he appeared to be advocating for the betterment of the farmers. He used moral evaluation by abstract in the sense that his proposal is not driven by selfish interest but a holistic representation of the minority, in this case, the farmers. He delegitimized the BBI document as lacking the direction on matters farming, manufacturing of their products, and productivity and therefore should not be supported by those same farmers.

Deputy President William Ruto: -

*On the matter of the judiciary allow me to say there is huge space for us to have an improvement on the proposal that has been made.*

The deputy President was making his keynote speech in Bomas of Kenya on November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2020, where he pointed out that the judiciary had not been well funded despite this provision being there in the 2010 Constitution. He wondered why there did not exist enough courts in sub-counties, and

why the ones present were not staffed as required. He said that the small number of courts in the counties had a discrepancy or link on delivery of justice to citizens since the available court especially the High Courts are not or have not been established in many areas.

In this example, he uses the expression “huge space”, meaning there is a disconnect, or there exists a big gap in the matter of the judiciary. Seemingly appearing to be indicating that the judiciary had been left out in terms of staffing, allocation of more courts in every county, and funding. Normally, the use of moral evaluation in connection to the use of adjectives focuses on adjectives such as “normal”, “natural”, “healthy” and “useful” that are a bit moderate which he did not use in his quest to show there was a disconnect or a gap that needed to be filled. van Leeuwen (2007) further cautions by saying that it is important to acknowledge that certain adjectives can be problematic, as they can express concrete qualities about actions or objects, as well as condemn the same actions or objects. However, he provides a remedy by saying that moral order, unlike a natural order, can be changed by human intervention. This is why instead of Deputy President William Ruto saying there exists a “huge space”, in normal circumstance so that he does not seem to be exaggerating his point of view, then he would say there exists a “gap”, “normal space”, “natural space”, which however would not have had the impact he wanted it to.

Vaara and Tienari (2002), observed that politicians use exaggerated language to make it more appealing and hence make the audience see their point of view of delegitimizing or seeking them to vote for them. So instead of politicians using adjectives like normal, they tend to use adjectives like enormous in application to a problem, or massive crowd; – about people who attended their rallies in large numbers; showing how they are liked in the latter and how they are aware of the problem in the case of the former.

This implies that Deputy President William Ruto wanted the audience to see that not only is he a leader who cares for the rule of law, but also someone who knows and understands that for the judiciary to work effectively, it needed proper staffing and funding.

Deputy President William Ruto: -

*My brother Raila Odinga is good at football so let me try to ask, how fair will be a league where the referee is appointed by teams and not all the teams “some teams”?*

The Deputy President William was speaking on the appointment of commissioners in the Independence Electoral and Boundary Commission (IEBC), who oversee matters related to elections in Kenya and boundary allocations, as indicated in the BBI. He informs the audience that the BBI proposed that the commissioners were to be appointed by political parties and not necessarily all political parties.

In this example he is using moral evaluation known as analogies comparisons of the implicit nature in that a league means election, referee means the IEBC, and the teams are the political

parties. Therefore, in this example, he uses rhetorical questions and wonders how it could be possible that parties which are participating in elections were the ones again participating in appointing the people who would oversee the same election. He seemed to say that there would be no fairness whatsoever if a referee was not appointed all the teams.

However, comparison by way of these analogies is implicit in nature. (van Leeuwen, 2007). An activity that belongs to one social practice is described by a term which, literally, refers to an activity belonging to another social practice, and the positive or negative values which, in the given socio-cultural context, are attached to that other activity are then transferred to the original one (van Leeuwen, 2007).

The strong implicature therefore is that Deputy President William Ruto appears to be delegitimizing the BBI report by way of moral comparison since it is not fair on the appointment of commissioners because the key players in their appointment were competitors in the elections. Without categorically saying that he and his newly formed UDA party would be disadvantaged, he knew that he had no chance among those going to be appointing the commissioners since the formula to be used would be based on the number of parties represented in the parliament of the previous general election, which the UDA party did not participate in. The weaker implicature is that he wanted to be seen as a victim in that he was the one targeted in this BBI proposal since his party had no one in parliament hence would not get a fair election as a result of him not participating in the appointment of the commissioners.

Deputy President William Ruto: -

*If we are saying in the proposal that women now go to the Senate, they are going to the Senate which has been downgraded which has no responsibilities on matters of resources allocation, are you enhancing the participation of women or are you downgrading participation of women?*

In this speech, Deputy President Ruto had told the audience that the proposal touching on devolution and increase in allocation of resources to the counties was a welcome idea which he supported. He further explained that The Senate was, according to him, a body that should have more powers to be able to discuss the revenue allocation and do checks and balances on the more resources proposed in the BBI report. These powers according to him had been removed from The Senate and given to The National Assembly at the same time more positions for women were created in The Senate but not the assembly for the same gender where matters to do with revenue allocation would take place.

In this example, therefore, he is using rhetorical questions in questioning why women are given more seats in a house that has no power on matters of revenue, and at the same time denied seats where money and revenue is discussed. He means that there is no need therefore for women to be appointed in

positions that would not add value to their participation or seats that have no responsibilities rather, just adding numbers. To him, participation of women in Senate that does not have powers is degrading by making them fence-seaters rather than human beings of equal measure capable of making informed decisions. This kind of argument is based on moral abstraction. According to Rojo & van Dijk (1997), public speakers in particular, as well as all social actors, make sure their proposals do not appear driven only by personal interests. They present themselves, for instance, as serving their voters, and therefore legitimize proposals as a common good that would improve the conditions of a particular community.

In this example, Deputy President William Ruto is portrayed as a leader advocating for women's issues especially on matters of leadership and responsibilities, and not just rubber stamps to political policies or political events. The weaker implicature is that he wants to appear as one who has read and knew that which was or was not hidden in the BBI report and uses it to caution those who wanted to support the BBI report not to do so since it was of no good based on moral grounds.

Prof.Patrick Lumumba;

*I would have loved to see that but I'm not which is sad because the saying goes  
"politicians look to the next elections, not the next generation."*

Prof.Patrick Lumumba had been asked to comment on the state of the nation and what Kenyans were going through during the lockdown. He acknowledged that COVID 19 had brought so much suffering to millions of Kenyans citing that many tourists who used to come to Kenya were no longer visiting. He also picked examples of young men and women who lost jobs in the agricultural sector, manufacturing, and the strain on counties without money. He warned that the country's involvement with IMF to borrow money was bound to have repercussions like devaluing the currency that would then affect imports for the agriculture and hospitality industry. He even wished the parliament could convene to discuss the state of the economy, but then again noted the impossibility of the same.

This is why the chosen example, shows his wish for parliament involvement. He wanted the parliament as the organ that makes laws, to sit and enact laws that can cushion the common Kenyan from the ravages of the COVID 19 pandemic and the economy but none was there. This is why he says, "*Politicians look to the next election, not the next generation*" in a clear moral abstract evaluation of the situation at hand that is involving the BBI process vis –a vis politicians and the economy. In this example, he meant that the priorities of any politician are based on only winning the election. He castigated the BBI process through moral evaluation that politicians (especially those who were proposing the BBI including the current government) had lost the moral ground to their electorates by looking at only the present rather than their future.

The stronger implication of this is that Prof. Patrick Lumumba wants to appear as appealing to the suffering of common Kenyan usually referred to as "*Wanjiku*" He believes that (now that he is not an active politician) the political class had let down their voters by concentrating on the "here" "and"

now events (BBI) rather than the future (economy) which needed to be worked on with urgency. The weaker implication of this line of argument is that he believed that professionals (specifically learned friends, that is, lawyers and economists) like him and David Ndi, had the ability to see what was ailing Kenyans than politicians do, especially those who have concentrated their efforts on BBI.

Prof. Patrick Lumumba;

*“... At the same time my good friend Dr. Fred Matiangi says that forty thousand police officers do not have police uniforms because we have no resources. At the same time, we are borrowing money from the IMF.”*

Prof. Patrick Lumumba had lamented at length about the attempt to amend the constitution by saying that some politicians had such an appetite for doing so, that they would create room for the same even when it was not needed. His other concern was the billions of money, estimated, that had been spent on the BBI and even more that would be spent on the referendum that the BBI was proposing. This had him questioning the order of priorities in the country.

To him, the priority of the government or proponents of the BBI had lost their way because police uniforms, doctors, and children's face masks were a priority than dwelling and spending money on BBI. It is even amazing to him that after spending much money or expected to spend more, the government was borrowing from the IMF which to him came with so many restrictions, and with the burden of repayment shouldered by Kenyans through taxes. This kind of argument from Prof. Patrick Lumumba is based on moral abstraction. Rojo & van Djik (1997) explain that politicians or public speakers put up arguments or speeches to appear like they have no interest but only the interest of others is a major concern. They will do this to either delegitimize a process or legitimize it based on their viewpoint as a common good that will improve the conditions of a particular community.

The strong indication of this is that he wanted to appear as one defending the majority in the society who have no voice of their own and was speaking their minds. To him, this is a practice that is morally incorrect and should not be encouraged to go on at all. In this case, he was delegitimizing the BBI process as consuming government revenue that would have been used to serve Kenyans rather than benefiting a few individuals.

Hon. Raila Odinga;

*...We must give Kenyans the opportunity to create that wealth and this is what we are talking about empowering the youth so that the youth can be able to create wealth.*

Hon. Raila Odinga was delivering his speech during the launch of the BBI signature collection on November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at Bomas of Kenya. He informed the audience that President Uhuru and himself centered their talks on Kenya being bigger than all of them. The aim of shaking hands was not driven



by power-sharing motives, nor declaring him president come 2022 as some of the critics of the BBI would want to tell the audience. He added that their handshake would leave a better Kenya since there were problems about wealth creation which the people of Kenya needed to have a concerted effort towards, then come together and find lasting solutions for them.

In the example picked, Hon. Raila Odinga uses the pronoun “we” meaning them as leaders who had the key to wealth creation needed to give out the chance for that to happen first. To him “empowering youth” that is giving an enabling environment to do business, in form of incentives like moratoria on tax for a period which was enshrined in the BBI report were some of the ways through which the youth would have the capacity to create this wealth. In using them and wealth creation, he employs moral evaluation of abstract about his lineage to the youth. He is aware that they require to be self-reliant, and this could only be realized by having them create their own wealth. By stating so, he is made to appear concerned with the matters affecting the youth and not just his personal gain. This is why he uses the moral abstract to put the interest of others before his. Rojo & van Dijk (1997) posit that this legitimization responds to the wellbeing of other people and is related to the idea of altruism.

The strong implicature of this is presented as being a selfless, and philanthropic leader who is ready to sacrifice his ambition for the betterment of others and in this case the youth. The weak indicator in this is that Hon. Raila Odinga wants to identify himself with the youth and show them that he cares.

Hon. Raila Odinga: -

*Wamalize hiyo kwanza, apana ambia sisi vile mtafanya 2022. Sasa hivi fanyeni mmalize kwanza. Siwako pamoja? Siwako “pair”? Wewe umekuwa na bibi, mmezaa mtoto amekuwa kichaa sasa wewe unasema huyo si mtoto wangu.*

*Let them finish it first. Aren't they together? Aren't they a pair? You have been married and your wife gives birth to a child who later goes mad. Do you deny the child as being yours?*

Hon. Raila Odinga was delivering his speech on the launch of BBI signature collection on November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2020 at Bomas of Kenya. He categorical had given examples of those people or groups, that is, people with disabilities - PWD, and women who had earlier talked, and said their issues would be dealt with in the BBI report and so there should be no course for alarm. He further said that the talk about the 2022 elections should not precede what was currently going on.

He is known for using riddles in his speeches and symbolism, and this example does not fall short of the same. He unconditionally pointed out the presence of the Jubilee government and its leaders (President Uhuru Kenyatta and Dr. William Ruto) who had their four-point agenda to finish. He encouraged them to finish instead of having a blame game and campaigning especially Deputy

president William Ruto who had embarked on an early campaign geared to the 2022 elections after him falling out with the president.

Hon. Raila Odinga sarcastically asks a rhetorical question; “*Aren't they together? Aren't they a pair?*” When Jubilee won the election of 2017, the two (President Uhuru Kenyatta and his Deputy William Ruto) were referred to as a pair, like a couple of some sort since they would even wear the similar outfits. To the audience, it appeared ironic and humorous when Hon. Raila Odinga asked such a question since it was in the public eye that the two (The president and his deputy) no longer saw eye to eye even though they were both present in that meeting.

It is in this connection that he adds salt to injury by equating; “*You have been married and your wife gives birth to a child who later goes mad. Do you deny the child as being yours?*” The “wife” in this case is either of the two President Uhuru or Deputy President Ruto, they gave birth to a “child” – the child is Jubilee or better still the government, the madness is in the many challenges that were facing the government and Jubilee, ranging from corruption, separations and other scandals, which the Deputy President had on many occasions distanced himself from. Meaning Hon. Raila Odinga was telling them to own up, do their work, and fulfill the promises they made to Kenyans especially Deputy President William Ruto and to stop distancing himself since he was still in the government. Hon. Raila Odinga thus uses moral analogies and comparison to legitimize his point of view emphasizing that it's immoral to leave your child just because he had become something other than what you expected.

The strong implication is that Hon. Raila Odinga is to the audience, portrayed as having values and morals and he can be relied upon in terms of leadership and would not change if a government he was a part of encounters challenges. On a weaker indicator, he seemed to be a father figure who would care for his children no matter how they grew or turned out.

Hon. Martha Karua: -

*We urge everyone by word of mouth, by whichever method, to let us come together because a people united shall never be defeated and history has shown us that.*

This was a speech that Hon Martha Karua Leader of Narc Kenya, reacting to the BBI reports on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021, delivered as her press statement. She was also talking as the leader of the Linda Katiba Movement (Protect the Constitution Movement) which is an initiative of people and professionals that are opposed to the BBI. Hon. Martha Karua had earlier on talked about the need to have a united people who could stop the current government from the atrocity of taking away the people's power of choosing their leaders. She also informed the audience that if they were not careful, then President Uhuru Kenyatta would dish out power to his friends who would succeed him after his term in office ended, ensuring he continued to call the shots using them.

Here, Hon. Martha Karua is using an abstract of moral evaluation. Abstraction is another method of expressing moral evaluation. It is about referring to practices in abstract ways and linking them to discourses of moral values, which ‘moralizes’ and therefore legitimizes the practices by highlighting a certain desirable quality. Meaning that coming together, would follow the question why? The answer is in the discourse of moral values which is in this case not being defeated. The audience knew defeat is an act of not winning a contest like a fight in war field but her reference to this defeat was the imposing of values and morals which are not in line with the wishes of people.

It is thus made clearer if one goes back to her line of speech that she says; *“Linda Katiba (Protect the Constitution) is a citizen initiative, to resist the overthrow of the constitution, to resist the taking away our voices as a people and our power.”* Her point of argument is that the movement is much better placed to protect the will of the people who fought hard to give their views on the 2010 constitution that was then being mutilated as a result of few interested groups. The use of the word “resist” calls for defiance from the people as a fight against those she said were out to take away their voice and power. Her delegitimization thus emanates from understanding that the BBI process was a conduit of the two principals to take over power in another way and allocate themselves positions in the next government.

Hon. Martha Karua: -

*...This is a very bad score and should remind each one of us of the dire necessity of fixing the electoral process.*

She informed the gentlemen and ladies of the press that that was a historical time because it was the third anniversary of what she termed as political arrangement referred to as the Handshake. She noted that of the six general elections that had been carried out in Kenya, only the one in 2002 was accepted as fair. Hon Karua uses the expression, “bad score” to amplify her dissatisfaction with how elections had been done in Kenya. She pointed out that as a nation we had failed to uphold the tenets of democracy and accept the reality of elections where there is a winner and a loser. Her use of the adjective, “bad” brings about the simplicity of the situation, and in the mind of the audience a bad score is not as simple as it sounds, it means below average, not able to be considered as a good example. In her mind, for a nation with educated people to conduct six elections and only have one meet the threshold on transparency, acceptability and fairness, is immoral and a bad example to emulate. In this score, she saw a country with neither the idea nor the solution to the repetitive problems surrounding elections. She does not believe the BBI contain a cure for the same, hence delegitimizing it.

The strong implicature is that Hon. Martha Karua wants the audience to know she had been keeping records on elections in Kenya and none apart from one had been highly appreciated, accepted as fair and democratic. She pointed out that we tend to break our morals as a nation when it comes to the general elections. A weaker implicature is that she wanted the audience to know she was best placed to know right or wrong as far as the morals of a nation are concerned.

President Uhuru Kenyatta: -

*Lakini kuna kitu tunasahau sisi kama wakenya, hata kama huu utajiri uko hapa Nairobi, uko mikononi ya watu ngapi?*

*“But there is something we as Kenyans forget, though Nairobi is termed as rich, how many people hold the riches?”*

President Uhuru Kenyatta informed the audience that there was high poverty level in Kenya and especially Nairobi as a city. He noted that all government documents on the poverty index showed that Nairobi was rich and hence when the allocation of resources took place, Nairobi was given very little, yet the poorest people in the country are residents of the same county. He noted that flying toilets (the use of plastic bags for defecation which is subsequently thrown away, for lack of proper toilets) were still used, lack of clean drinking water was experienced, yet Nairobi was classified as a rich county or city.

In this example, President Uhuru Kenyatta uses a linguistic device known as a rhetoric question to advance his moral evaluation and legitimize the BBI process. He wondered who held the riches since the government documents were advancing the narrative that Nairobi city was rich. Were the people in Nairobi not poor and living on one dollar a day? He says that majority of the people in Nairobi live from hand to mouth, where the presence of one meal does not necessarily guarantee a next one. He therefore means that the richness of Nairobi is in the hands of a few people.

He posits that equal allocation of resources based on a proper formula that would see wealth distribution on an equal basis needed to be employed otherwise, the situation would only worsen. He pointed out that it was immoral for wealth to be controlled by few individuals while majority live in abject poverty. The President cleverly legitimizes the BBI on moral evaluation by articulating that the document had therein a proper allocation of resources so that everyone in Nairobi would have a job, earn an honest living, drink clean water and create wealth.

President Uhuru Kenyatta: -

*We all want to be ambitious because we are desirous..., ...but I pray and I appeal to you today, don't let those ambitions of yours overshadow our ability to fix those things that will help you achieve your ambitions.*

He was speaking at the Bomas of Kenya on the BBI Report Initiative On 27<sup>th</sup> November 2019. Previously, he had cautioned politicians not to conduct politics that would instill fear on Kenyans. It is this fear he said, that made the country appear unstable leading to disruption in the economic sector since both local and foreign investors no longer felt comfortable conducting their businesses in the country. He pointed out that as a result of the mayhem that comes with elections, people working in different parts of the country far from their ancestral homes get uneasy and majority opt to go back

home until the elections are over and calm has resumed. As a result, money lending institutions become hesitant on giving long term loans to people for the fear of economic disruptions leading to bad debts. This according to the president, was because politicians with their ambitions will do everything including violence to get the positions they want to be elected to.

He used the noun “*ambition*” meaning determination or a goal to reach something with an adjective “*desirous*” meaning eager or longing for or hoping for something in a very deliberate way. This discourse of moral evaluation and moralizing practices shows that “ambition and desirous” are the moral practices. The president is alive to the fact that politicians have the ambition to be elected and are eager to be in this position of power (whatever it takes). About this discourse of moral value, therefore, is that when ambitions are over practiced by people who are ready and willing to do just about anything to get there, the core moral values are corrupted. He pointed out that the things to help one fix this kind of ambition (in elective posts) were already there in the BBI. They should stop looking too far when creating their strategies of being elected as leaders in the country. For example, the BBI would take about 35% allocation to counties or establishment of the Ward Development Fund. He added that the citizens were interested in knowing how those allocations would benefit them directly.

He legitimized the BBI process as a moral tool to be used by those who wanted to be elected to any political position. He added that fixing the BBI process should be considered a priority since it would fix and work in alignment with ambitions and desires in the days to follow. The strong implicature of this is that the president wanted to appear as an intellectual, an overseer, a helper, a considerate man, an adviser, a consultant in matters politics and correct those politicians who had been looking in the wrong direction.

Pres. Uhuru Kenyatta: -

*Additionally, there is a new mechanism for ensuring greater and meaningful participation of women in the National Assembly.*

This was extracted from the speech by H.E. President Uhuru Kenyatta during the launch of the BBI signature collection exercise, on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020. The president was highlighting some of the things that were in the BBI report which were of benefit to different groups and individuals especially touching on gender parity. He said that there was an increase of women's representation in The Senate which would have a 50% representation of all senators and that the resource allocation and determination would be fair, determined by all genders on equal footing.

In this example, he uses two adjectives: “*greater*” meaning; superior, ordinate, unlimited, boundless, impressive among others and “*meaningful*” meaning that which is expressive, significant, or carrying greater weight or having an important effect. These are evaluative adjectives that as van Leeuwen (2007) emphasizes, play a key role in the legitimization of the speaker’s intentions. The 2010 constitution, as was pointed out by some of the BBI critics, did not have women issues addressed, and

that they had also been left out since and played no part in the BBI proposal. The president, therefore, meant that the new BBI report had in it, new procedures that would enable women to be in the National Assembly and participate in the debates since their number of representations had been increased and their voices would be heard in a superior and significant way unlike before.

He therefore legitimized the BBI process by showing that the more the female gender's participation in the National Assembly matters the more it became moral as a practice in itself. The strong implicature is that the president appears to have listened to the plea of the female gender as well as the critics of the BBI painting himself as a leader capable of listening to women's issues.

This is clearly brought out by a line in his speech in the same instance when he says; *“To ensure that every Kenyan enjoys the democracy that the 2010 constitution so ably promised, the bill cures the problem of under-representation.”* The weaker implicature however is that the president appears to be alluding to the fact that women can be swayed and convinced easily to accept change.

### 3.1.4 Mythopoeic

The speakers on the issue of BBI believed that when one uses narrative, stories or some kind of myth the audience are brought to believe in what is being spoken since mythopoeic is a language used to express something through a myth or poem or a tale of some event. It might be a warning, or an encouragement to follow what is being said as true or falls.

Here is how they used it;

Hon. Martha Karua: -

*This is a project to overthrow the Constitution of Kenya 2010; it's a coup. And you will realize in the present time military coup are not fashionable so coups of overthrowing the constitution appear to be the in-thing.*

Hon. Martha Karua had given a story of how the BBI is a revisit to the judiciary. After the election of 2017 having been nullified, the president in his political pronouncement had said that he would revisit the judiciary. A term which would have been taken to mean, he would in future seek to understand the working of the judiciary since they had overturned his election. Yet in Hon. Karua's eyes the revisit was something else other than seeing and correcting faults in the judiciary and the constitution.

From this example, she brought out a cautionary tale, which is hatched on an emotion of fear. These types of tales amount to creating or bringing the mind of the audience a hypothetical or mythical future of doom and bloodshed. A coup is a sudden, violent, and illegal seizure of power from a government. It is overthrowing of a government by the military or organized people. This does not come cheaply, there are always collateral damages. The audience is given a scenario of military

hijacking (an act of unlawfully seizing an aircraft, vehicle, or ship while in transit) the constitution by force. The plane, vehicle, or ship is symbolic, meaning the constitution, while the hijackers are the people in the government who wish to emboss Kenya to fit their own design.

It thus turns out to be ironic how the same government can begin its coup by overthrowing itself and retaining power. She used the adjective, “fashionable” when she says, “.... *present military coup is not fashionable*” metaphorically to paint a picture of the new trending way of overthrowing the government without force or violence. This helps the perpetrators according to her, to smoothly take over the government and keep power without bloodshed or any collateral damage. This basis gives her a moral standing ground for delegitimizing the BBI process and terming it a selfish venture.

The stronger implication of this is that Hon. Martha Karua wants to appear as an overseer of events that are taking place in the world and Kenya through the pretext of constitutional change. The change according to her is not meant for the citizen but is a ploy for those who hold high political ranks to keep power. She was cautioning the audience that unless they resisted the takeover, the President would hold all the power, taxes would be high, and all the problems in the country would escalate.

Prof. Patrick Lumumba: -

*“The constitution had been dismembered from 1964, so dismembered that in the year 1969 the constitution had changed character and had to be reorganized and reissued a new.”*

He had been asked if he considered the BBI a constitutional moment. His response was that Kenya had known only one constitutional moment and that was in 1980 after conducting a mlolongo election. In this kind of election, voters would queue behind their preferred candidate and a head count would be done and the winner would be declared at the polling station. The government under the leadership of the late former President Arap Moi, realized the need to change the constitution, since like Prof. Lumumba says, it had been so dismembered that its character had changed so much that it needed reorganization. He pointed out that, such a need to revive and restore the constitution, would be termed a constitutional moment, and went on to say that the current political leaders were using the BBI to manufacture a constitutional moment.

In this example, he used the verb “*dismembered*” meaning dissected, mutilated, disarticulated, or torn apart, hence “changed character.” In simplicity, he uses this “*change character*” metaphorically to mean the constitution as a result of being changed so many times, had lost its original thought-out (character) law to something new and unrecognizable, calling for its reconstruction. This is the reason he embarked on this narration to show why a constitution should or should not be changed. This kind of tale falls under the mythopoeic de-legitimization kind of tale that Barthes (1995) says, is a story or an event taken as a piece of evidence for a general norm of behavior. In other words, mythopoeic involves telling stories about what good or bad may happen when one does or does not do what is expected.

According to him the process of changing the constitution requires all the concerned groups to come to a consensus about the specific parts of the constitution that needed amending or reorganizing. He added that the BBI did not seek for input from major stakeholders, including himself, and for that reason it cannot be said to represent the views of citizens regarding the constitution.

The strong implication is that Prof. Lumumba wanted to portray himself as someone who had a hand in the previous attempts of constitutional change and knew what it took to amend one successfully. He blamed politicians and the political systems for failed attempts but acknowledged that those were milestones involved in a constitutional change that gave birth to the 2010 constitution.

Prof. Patrick Lumumba;

*“I think that in the eyes of several politicians the BBI is Trojan horse ...”*

He had earlier on narrated a story about how the BBI came to be. He said that it came in after the 2017 election in which Hon. Raila Odinga the head of NASA had petitioned in court and won the case and that court declared a repeat of the presidential elections, which the Raila-led opposition refused to participate in. He said that the opposition had weaponized its followers to a point that nothing was moving economically. The world press was keenly watching the situation and reporting negatively on the country. In his wisdom, President Uhuru Kenyatta sought to have a truce which gave birth to the handshake in 2018, and from it came the BBI. Prof. Patrick Lumumba pointed out that for the handshake to be given some flesh, and muscle, BBI was brought into the picture, although to him it was a Trojan horse. He went ahead and narrated the story of the Trojan horse, that was created by the Greeks, made it hollow and hid their soldiers in it. They then presented the horse as a gift to the Trojans whom they were at war with. The Trojans received the gift and took it inside the walls of the city allowing the soldiers access from inside, and that was how the Greeks managed to conquer them. Prof. Patrick Lumumba added that a certain Trojan woman called Hellen, had warned them not to accept gifts from Greeks but they did not listen.

In this example, Prof. Patrick Lumumba believed that BBI and Trojan horse were the same. The hidden soldiers in the wooden horse are politicians who wanted to be president or governors whose terms had ended and who wanted to elevate themselves to higher positions. He is quoted as saying, *“...we create too many offices to massage people’s egos.”* That BBI is one of the places where too many offices would be created to appease (massage) people’s individualism. Hellen of Troy represents all those people opposed to the BBI, to him they are warning Kenyans of what was hidden in the BBI and only the clever people like him knew what it was. The BBI purports to take over the work of independent institutions; parliament, AG’s work, and reform commission, these are hidden things that Kenyans were not aware of. To him, BBI was a means for some politicians to gain leadership unconstitutionally.



The strong indication in this is that Prof. Patrick Lumumba wanted to appear as an overseer of things; those that are hidden from the view of common people. Just like Hellen of Troy, he was warning Kenyans and delegitimizing the BBI since it was a gift given by the Greeks (politicians) who had a vested interest in conquering the Troy (Kenyans by leading them). Politicians who wanted to conquer and be in power were compared to the Greeks, but clever people like Hellen (Prof. Lumumba and others opposing the BBI) know a thing or two that is coming and are warning Kenyans against accepting the BBI. That is why in his parting shot he says, *“Choose you now, whether you shall vote it, read it but in its present form it is a document that is only fit for one thing; fit for rejection”*

Hon. Raila Odinga;

*Your Excellency that same year, we gathered here as we were in the final stages of completing the document and a group of delegates here walked away from us and went away because they did not agree with some of the provisions of that draft constitution.*

Before saying this in his part of speech, he had narrated to the audience how he respected Hon. Nzamba Kitonga who was among the committee of experts that delivered the 2010 constitution and who had just passed away a few days before. He even pointed out that during the making of the 2010 constitution he was delegate no. 155 and that the late Dr. Mbaye stunned the audience by his eloquent speech that all the delegates appointed him to be the chairman of the devolution committee. The sad part, said Hon. Odinga, was that Dr. Mbaye died in cold blood not to see the fruits of the 2010 constitution.

In this example, Hon. Raila Odinga starts with a narrative *“Your excellency that same year,”* Meaning he picked from where he had left to narrate to the audience how and what happened. He says that some of the delegates in that last stage of the constitutional making walked away because they did not agree with some of the provisions in the proposed constitution. He wants to mean that the constitution making process is not a walk in the park. He noted that sometimes things will work out as expected and other times they will not. He continues to say that people have in the past lost their lives, both mysteriously and naturally, in the constitution making process but although departed, they leave a mark in the books of history.

In a nutshell, he is legitimizing the BBI process since it has given everyone a chance to talk about it through citizen participation. The strong implicature is that Hon. Raila Odinga wants the audience to know that constitutional change is a journey that involves diehards and not the faint-hearted. There are dissenting voices on the same who would do anything to stop it like going to court or trash it all the same. The weaker implicature is that he wants to show the audience he was there in the first one and knows what it takes.

Hon. Raila Odinga

*That was the essence of that conversation that we had and after we talked, we put this team (Task Force Committee) together and tasked them to go around the country and collect views of our people. They then came up with this proposal which we brought here last year.*

Hon. Raila Odinga had just narrated to the audience the reason the BBI was born. He said that the BBI was born because he and President Uhuru Kenyatta had a talk to identify that which ailed the country after every general election. Having identified the issue, they tasked a committee to look for other views from Kenyans which might help to ease the circumstances they found themselves in during the election period.

In this example, he tried to show how the task force which was mandated to collect views managed to go around the country as commissioned. He used a linguistic device known as mythopoesis based on narration and storytelling to communicate to the audience. He reminded them that the task force went to various places in the country and later came up with the report being launched that day. This was to show that the BBI was endorsed by many Kenyans. It was not a matter of him and President Uhuru Kenyatta but the inclusion of many. He is therefore legitimizing the document as the true representative of the views of the people, unlike the earlier 2010 Constitution which was based on delegates.

The stronger implicature of the same is that Hon. Raila Odinga wanted to appear as one with better understanding of what it took, the journey it traveled, the places it went, and what it meant for the people who contributed to its making. He put legitimacy on the document by the fact that many people were called upon to give views that needed to be implemented. The weaker implicature is that he wants to appear as a person considerate of the plight of Kenyans

Hon. Martha Karua:

*...If you look at it that is what has been at its warning shot to all of us that if we stand silent and do nothing, we will not have elections as we know them in 2022.*

While releasing a statement to the press, Hon Martha narrated how in the previous week there had been a by-election for Members of Parliament in Matungu, Kakamega County, and in Kabuchai, Bungoma County. She noted that cases of violence were reported in the two areas, which she believed were state-initiated because it had a goal to achieve based on reinforcing regional kingship, which The State could easily manipulate to do its bidding.

In this example, Hon. Karua means that the silence of the people will allow the state to do whatever they want. She uses the expression “...warning shot” in her narrative meaning that the government was giving notice of intent on what it wanted to do, through violence sponsorship. It is not clear how she knew that the government was sponsoring the violence to create the narrative she was

advancing. This narrative is qualified as a cautionary one by the statement “...we will not have elections as we know them in 2022”. To the audience, this creates a hypothetical future and leaves them wondering of the kind to expect. With the uncertainty and fear of the future that the BBI could bring Hon. Martha Karua delegitimized it.

The stronger implicature is to create a mythical future where people have fear. This fear according to her would reinforce their resistance in the state’s endeavors based on the process of BBI and any other activities since it was not sincere and could not be trusted. The weaker implicature is that Hon. Karua wanted the audience to know that having been in the government before as the minister of the constitution, she understood how the government works.

President. Uhuru Kenyatta;

*Miaka hairudi nyuma, nilikuwa naambia viongozi wa Kisii sikuvingine walikuja kunitembelea, race ni hii ni ile ya ku hand over. Inaitwa relay, unakimbia, unakimbia ule mwingine anakungojea pale anatakikana kukungojea ndio ashike aendele. Lakini my brother William hapa amepinduka anakimbia nyuma! Nikasema moss! moss tutafika tu!*

*...Years don’t go backwards. I was telling some leaders from Kisii another day who had come to visit me that this race is that of handing over. It is called a relay, you run and the other partner is waiting for you at a distance. He is required to wait for you to give him the baton then he goes on. But my brother William here turned and is running in the opposite direction. Then I said, slowly by slowly, we will get there.*

Earlier on, President Uhuru Kenyatta had urged the audience to foster peace. He said that it was from the provision of peace that there would be a resolution of the issue on jobs for the youth. The President was full of praise for Hon. Raila Odinga, who he said was not selfish to ask for a position in the government, but sought to solve issues affecting all Kenyans. He also extended his appreciation to different leaders who were with Hon Raila Odinga in the NASA coalition by pointing out their names; Hon. Kalonzo, Hon. Mudavadi, and Hon Wetangula. He also appreciated his Jubilee counterparts for having the patience and walking with him through the difficult time. However, he pointed out they had worked together nicely, but with the 2022 general election drawing closer, some leaders changed course.

This example, exposes the use of a narrative by the President based on mythopoesis an element of the story grounded on modern narration of a well-known tale. According to Martin and Wodak (2003), a story or an event is taken as a piece of evidence for a general norm of behavior. In other words, mythopoesis involves telling stories about what good or bad may happen when one does or does not do what is expected. Mythography allows us to consider how generic decisions, rhetorical

maneuvers, and formal devices can also be used to lend authority and credibility to a speaker's underlying message.

The President gave a narration based on one type of athletics; a race called relay. The relay race, as the audience knows, involves handing over a baton to the next individual until the last person who goes with it to the finish line. If successfully handed over the teams involved have a high chance of winning the race if all factors remain constant. For example, how quickly did the first person run, or was the baton handed over in the correct manner, among other factors.

Symbolically, therefore, the team is Jubilee, with President Uhuru Kenyatta and his Deputy William Ruto, while the race was presidential elections and the baton symbolizes leadership to be handed over to the next individual. The President, therefore, shows the audience that while he was running to give the leadership to Hon. William Ruto, the latter is running in the opposite direction, "... *Lakini my brother William hapa amepinduka anakimbia nyuma!*" meaning he was engaged in doing other things instead of waiting for the baton to be handed to him.

On numerous occasions, the deputy president had been accused by pro-BBI that while the president was campaigning for the BBI, his deputy was openly politicking for the 2022 presidential elections. This seemed abnormal to the president that he was expecting the deputy to work, support and encourage him to soldier on but the second-in-command was seemingly doing other things contrary to the team spirit they had before.

The president wondered aloud how handing over leadership to a person running a different race in the opposite direction would be possible. The stronger implicature of this was that the president was openly telling the audience that Deputy President William Ruto would not get his support in being the next president of Kenya because he had defied him as the boss. This was because his second-in-command was behaving in a manner contrary to his expectation thus making it difficult for him to give leadership or support him. The weaker implicature is that the president wanted to show that his deputy was not to be trusted. Therefore, the views carried by Deputy President William Ruto regarding the BBI, could not be trusted either.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

Political actors use (de) legitimization strategies in their discourse to support or oppose ideologies. The political actors used all the (de) legitimization strategies proposed by van Leeuwen (2008) to legitimize their points of view. Rationalization and moral evaluation were used to a large extent in their discourse.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and the State. Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London: NLB

2. Atieno, C. P., Mukuthuria, M., & Muriungi, P. (2016). Thematic Choice as a Discursive Formation Used to Create Socio-Political Dominance in Kenyan parliamentary Debates between 1992 and 2010.
3. Bradley, H., Erickson, M., Stephenson, C., & Williams, S. (2000). *Myths at work*. Polity.
4. Braet, A. C. (1992). Ethos, pathos and logos in Aristotle's Rhetoric: A re-examination. *Argumentation*, 6(3), 307-320.
5. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge
6. Demirdöğen, Ü. D. (2010). The roots of research in (political) persuasion: Ethos, pathos, logos and the Yale studies of persuasive communications. *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 3(1), 189-201.
7. Kiguru, G. (2014). *A critical discourse analysis of language used in selected courts of law in Kenya*. Kenyatta University
8. Lynch, G. (2006). *Negotiating ethnicity: Identity politics in contemporary Kenya; Review of African Political Economy*
9. Miring'u, P. W. (2020). *The Persuasive Devices in William Ruto's Political Speeches a Relevance Theoretic the Persuasive Devices in William Ruto's Political Speeches a Relevance Theoretic Approach Demerge* (Doctoral dissertation).
10. Mulhern, R. K., Wasserman, A. L., Friedman, A. G., & Fairclough, D. (1989). Social competence and behavioral adjustment of children who are long-term survivors of cancer. *Pediatrics*, 83(1), 18-25. f
11. Rahimi, A., & Sahragard, R. (2007). *Critical discourse analysis*. Tehran: Jungle Publications.
12. Rojo, L., & Van Dijk, T. (1997). "There was a Problem, and it was solved!" Legitimizing the Expulsion of Illegal' Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse. *Discourse & Society*. London: Sage.
13. Stambovsky, P. (2021). *Myth and the Limits of Reason*. Brill.
14. Stankiewicz, W. (1976). *Aspects of political theory: classical concepts in an age of relativism*. Transaction Publishers.
15. Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Handbook of discourse analysis. In *Discourse and dialogue*.
16. van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91-112.
17. van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford university press.
18. van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford university press.
19. Widdowson, H. (2007). *Discourse analysis* (Vol. 133). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1, 63-94. Sage