بناء "الذات" و " ألاخر" في الصراع العربي–الصهيوني: دراسة في ضوء المنهج التاريخي–الخطابي لخطاب نتنياهو وخطاب حسن نصر الله

الباحثة: شهد سالم مطلك
shahadalmaliki16@gmail.com

أ.د. أمين عكال چيلان
amin.ghailan@uobasrah.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: الصراع العربي الصهيوني، المنهج التاريخي–الخطابي، دراسة الخطاب النقدي، الخطاب السياسي، والأيديولوجيا.

كيفية اقتباس البحث

مطلك ، شهد سالم ، أمين عكال چيلان، بناء "الذات" و " ألاخر" في الصراع العربي–الصهيوني: دراسة في ضوء المنهج التاريخي–الخطابي لخطاب نتنياهو وخطاب حسن نصر الله ،مجلة مركز بابل للدراسات الانسانية، تشرين الثاني 2026،المجلد:16 ،العدد:11.

هذا البحث من نوع الوصول المفتوح مرخص بموجب رخصة المشاع الإبداعي لحقوق التأليف والنشر (Creative Commons Attribution) تتيح فقط للآخرين تحميل البحث ومشاركته مع الآخرين بشرط نَسب العمل الأصلي للمؤلف، ودون القيام بأي تعديل أو استخدامه لأغراض تجارية.

مفهرسة في Indexed
IASJ

مسجلة في Registered
ROAD

Constructing the ''Self'' and ''Other'' in the Arab-Zionist Conflict: A Discourse-Historical Approach of Netanyahu's Speech and Nasrallah's Speech

Researcher: Shahad Salem Mutlaq
Prof. Dr. Amin Ukaal Ghailan
The Department of English, College of Education for Human Science, University of Basra

Keywords : Arab-Zionist conflict, Discourse-Historical Approach, Critical Discourse Study, Political Discourse, and ideology.

How To Cite This Article
Mutlaq , Shahad Salem, Amin Ukaal Ghailan , Constructing the "Self" and "Other" in the Arab-Zionist Conflict: A Discourse-Historical Approach of Netanyahu's Speech and Nasrallah's Speech, Journal Of Babylon Center For Humanities Studies, November2026,Volume:16, Issue 11.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

الملخص

تستكشف هذه الدراسة البناء الخطابي لمفهومي "الذات" و"الآخر" في سياق الصراع العربي الصهيوني من منظور دراسات الخطاب النقدي. وانطلاقًا من المنهج الخطابي التاريخي، تحلل الدراسة خطابين سياسيين ألقاهما حسن نصر الله وبنيامين نتنياهو بلغتيهما الأصليتين، بهدف تحليل كيفية استخدام الخطاب للتعبير عن الأيديولوجيا وعلاقات القوة في هذا السياق المتنازع عليه. يدمج التحليل ثلاثة مستويات ضمن المنهج الخطابي التاريخي: السياق السياسي والتاريخي، والتناص والتداخل الخطابي، والاستراتيجيات الخطابية (الاستراتيجيات المرجعية، والاستراتيجيات التنبؤية، واستراتيجيات الحجاج، واستراتيجيات تحديد المنظور، واستراتيجيات التخفيف/التصعيد). يتيح هذا فهمًا أعمق لكيفية بناء المتحدثين لأيديولوجيات مستقطبة وإضفاء

الشرعية على علاقات القوة المتنافسة. تظهر النتائج ان كلا الزعيمين يشكلان صور الذات والأخر بطريقة تدعم اهدافهما السياسية يعرف كل زعيم جماعته بانها شرعية، بينما يصور الطرف الاخر كمصدر تهديد حقيقي. بالإضافة، توضح النتائج أن هذه الاستراتيجيات لا تعكس الصراع فحسب، بل هي أداة فعالة لتبرير السياسات وحشد الجماهير، مما يسلط الضوء على الدور المحوري للخطاب في تشكيل الأيديولوجيات خلال الصراع. تُسهم هذه الدراسة في دراسات الخطاب النقدي من خلال شرح كيفية عمل الخطاب
كوسيلة فعّالة في تشكيل الأيديولوجيا وإدامة الصراع. كما تُؤكد على أهمية السياق التاريخي في تحليل الخطاب السياسي، لا سيما في سياق الصراع العربي الصهيوني.

Abstract

This study explores the discursive construction of the "self" and "other" within the context of Arab-Zionist conflict through the perspective of critical discourse study. Based on the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), the study analyzes two political speeches delivered in their original languages by Hassan Nasrallah and Benjamin Netanyahu, whose speeches represent contrasting ideological positions in the conflict, with the aim of analyzing how speech is used to express ideology and power relations in this contested context. The analysis integrates three levels within the Discourse-Historical Approach: political and historical context, intertextuality and interdiscursivity and discursive strategies (referential strategies, Predicational strategies, argumentation strategies, perspectivization strategies and mitigation/ intensification strategies). This allow a deeper understanding of how both speakers construct polarized ideologies and legitimizing competing power relations. The findings show that both leaders construct the image of the 'self' and 'other' in a way that
support their political objectives. Each leader defines their own group as legitimate, while portraying the other side as a source of real threat. In addition, the findings illustrate that discursive strategies do not only reflect the conflict but rather, it is an effective tool to justify policies and mobilize the audience, this highlighting the significant role of discourse in the formation of ideologies during the conflict. This study contributes to critical discourse studies by explaining how discourse functions as an effective means in shaping ideology and perpetuating the conflict. It also emphasis the importance of historical context in the analysis of political discourse, especially in the context of Arab-Zionist conflict.

Journal of Babylon Center for Humanities Studies: 2026, Volume: 16, Issue: 11

1. Introduction

The Arab-Zionist conflict refers to the political and military dispute and tension between Zionist entity and a number of Arab states. This conflict is not merely about military or political, but rather a comprehensive and multidimensional conflict intertwined with religious, historical and political complexities, extending even to the realm of language and narratives. After the event of October7, 2023, language emerged as a powerful tool for constructing ideology, shaping public opinion, and defining the "self" and "other" between two sides. This study examines the discursive strategies by analyzing two political speeches: one delivered by Hassan Nasrallah in late 2023, representing the Arab side, and the other by Netanyahu in 2024 at UN General Assembly, representing the Zionist side. The study adopts Ruth Wodak's Discourse-Historical Approach, which is considered the most effective approach for this purpose. This approach enables the researcher to connect the conflict to its historical, socio-political contexts, thus enabling a deeper understanding of how ideology is constructed and how identities are portrayed in these speeches. The time difference between the speeches is intentional, as the researcher seeks to examine the evolution of the ideological discourse from an initial reactive phase at the onset of the war to a phase of political justification one year later. The importance of this study lies in its reliance on analyzing the speeches in their original languages to ensure semantic accuracy since translation often loses some subtle meanings, especially concerning ideologically charged vocabulary that cannot be conveyed literally in another language. The research attempts to answer the following questions: what discursive strategies are used to construct the image of 'self' and 'other' in the Arab-Zionist conflict? How do the two leaders differ in their ideological framing and legitimization of their political positions? By examining these questions, the research aims to uncover the
underlying linguistic elements that transform political discourse into an important ideological tool, thereby affecting perceptions and perpetuation of this ongoing conflict.

2. Critical Discourse Study

Critical Discourse Study (CDS) is an interdisciplinary approach that combines linguistic and social theories, integrating textual analysis with these frameworks (Flowerdew, 2013, pp. 178-179). It explores society through discourse, which is perceived and contextualize by analyzing its historical, socio-political and cultural foundations (Wodak &Meyer, 2016). Critical Discourse study has its origins in critical linguistics (CL), which developed in the 1970s (Fowler et al., 2019). It focuses on the

relationship between ideology and power in language use (Flowerdew, 2013, p.178; Flowerdew& Richardson, 2018, p.1). CDS was initially referred to as critical discourse analysis (CDA), a term first introduced by Van Dijk and other researchers in 1991 (Flowerdew, 2013, p. 178). Some scholars in CDA have broaden the scope of this field into what is now known as Critical Discourse studies (CDS). Van Dijk (2009) emphasizes that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has remarkably developed to include philosophical, theoretical, methodological, and practical developments, moving beyond simple applied analysis. Critical Discourse Study (CDS) not only investigates linguistic units but also analyzes, understands, and explains complex social phenomena that require an interdisciplinary approach (Wodak, 2015b, p.2). However, CDS continue to focus on its basic issues concerning language, ideology, and power. CDS analyzes the features of discursive and linguistic social power relations and their operating within discourse in modern societies. (Wodak & Fairclough, 1997, p.272).

Rahimi and Riasati state that the main objectives of Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) is to gain a deeper understanding of discursive structure present in different texts and genres, along with socio-political meanings they convey. In this regard, CDS aims to move beyond the superficial readings by encouraging a more critical analysis of discourse,
emphasizing meanings that may not be easily apparent. Furthermore, it aims to increase the awareness of reader and listener by highlighting the implicit and often neglected aspects of language use, thus promoting a more reflective and informed examination of discourse (Rahimi & Riasati, 2011).

Critical Discourse study (CDS) mainly analyzes the hidden, opaque, and clear structures of power, domination, discrimination and control that are present in language. Its aim is to critically analyze how social injustice are expressed, shaped, and legitimize within discourse (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p.14). Moreover, Critical Discourse Study (CDS) focuses on real instances of language use instead of unnatural ones (Van Dijk, 1993, p.252). It emphasizes the analysis of larger units, such as speeches, by analyzing actions and interactions through discourse analysis (Reisigl, Wodak, & KhosraviNik, 2016). The goal is to recognize the fundamental features of language in use and to explain their claims to authority in order to uncover unjust power dynamics within discourse (Flowerdew& Richardson, 2018, p.1). Practitioners of Critical Discourse Study (CDS) adopt the perspective of marginalized groups and seek to uncover the linguistic strategies utilized by individual in privileged positions to maintain or intensify social injustice (Meyer, 2001).

3. Political Discourse

Political discourse is a class of a genre that exists within the field of politics, commonly occurring in formal settings such as parliaments, governments, or political parties (Van Dijk, 2002, p.19). it refers to particular of language used in political contexts (Baker & Ellece, 2011, p.6), which relates to the promotion of presentation. A fundamental aspects of representation is the requirement for political speakers to support their statement with evidence, authority, and truth (Chilton, 2004, p.3). This process is referred to as legitimization, in which political speakers aims to persuade their audience by providing justifications for legitimacy of their discourse. Basically, political discourse includes the language employed by politicians in different situations to influence others or explain validate specific actions (Chilton, 2004, p.4). Political discourse is an important area of discourse analysis that examines communication in political domain. This includes analyzing speeches, debates, and hearings (Higgins,2018, p. 393), performed by politicians as they execute their roles within organizations such as parliaments or governments to achieve political objectives such as legislation (Van Dijk, 2002, p.20). Political discourse is distinguished by its political situation and structural characteristics (Van Dijk, 2006b, p.733).

4. Ideology

Political discourse is inherently ideological, operating within a realm where language considerably affects the formation and expression of political realities. In this context, Van Dijk (2006b, p.729) emphasizes the close relationship between ideology, discourse, and politics, affirming that political practice are largely discursive and that political cognition is basically rooted in ideology. In this regard, political discourse functions as a crucial mechanism for the production, reproduction, and dissemination of ideologies to wider audience (Van Dijk, 2006b, p.732). Ideology can be defined as a collection of socially shared mental representation including beliefs, attitudes, evaluations, and opinions that characterize specific social groups (Van Dijk, 1998; Wodak, 2015b). Accordingly, it functions as a notable instrument through which social actors construct and sustain specific interpretations of reality. Furthermore, ideology plays a significant role in establishing and maintaining unequal power dynamics, as it is repeatedly embedded and enhanced through discursive practices. Philip (1964, p.207) defines ideology as a set of attitude and ideas shaped by particular patterns of limitations or functional relationships.

The term 'ideology' can be understand from two perspectives. The first perspective views ideology as a system of beliefs, ideas, social structure, and practice that serves as a symbolic representation within society. The second perspective influenced by Marxist

theory, views ideology as a reflection of the interests and concern of various social classes (Thompson,1990, p.19).
ideologies are often expressed through language, with discourse acting as the main medium for conveying and expressing these ideological meanings. In this regard, language serves not only as a means of communication; rather, it acts as a significant tool that enables ideological forces to function and achieve their social goals. Fairclough (2010, p.56) asserts that ideology can be combined at different levels of language, such as linguistic forms, style, and content. Similarly, Van Dijk (1998, p.26) emphasizes that discourse not only reflect ideology but also reproduces it, implying a mutual relationship between the two. Ideological positions are created and expressed through different linguistic resources and discursive strategies. This study relied on assumption that speaker's language choices in political discourse are formed by their ideology.

5. An Overview of the Arab-Zionist conflict

The Arab-Zionist conflict is a prolonged political and military conflict concentrated on competing claims to land, national identity, and independence in historical Palestine. Since the foundation of the state of Israel in 1948, this conflict has considerably changed the political and demographic structure of the region, especially through the displacement of a large number of Palestinians, an event that remain central to its historical situation. While it roots trace back to the nineteenth century, the conflict amplified with the United Nations Partition Plan of 1947 (Resolution 181) and the following war in 1948 subsequent Israel's declaration. This resulted in the establishment of Israeli state and the removal of around 750,000 Palestinians, which noted the beginning of a long-standing refugee issue and a central dimensions of the ongoing conflict. In the following decades, a series of regional wars further affected the course of the conflict, including the 1956Sez Crisis, the 1967 Six-Day War, and the 1973 October war. The Six- Day War in 1967 was notably substantial, resulting in Israel's occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, Gaza Strips,

Sinai Peninsula, and Golan Heights, which heightened both the territorial and political dimensions of the Palestinian issue. Though the 1973 War

didn't outcome in important territorial changes. It establishes the stage for diplomatic negotiations that eventually led to the Camp David Accords in 1979. However, these agreements did not direct the ongoing conflict Palestinian inquiry. The first intifada in 1987 exhibited an essential moment in Palestinian resistance and laid the way for the Oslo Accords in the 1990s. while these accords established a foundation for limited self-governance, they did not achieve final status issues. In the subsequent year, internal Palestrina divisions, specifically after Hamas presumed control of Gaza in 2006, further intricate the situation and led to repetitive circles of violence, including significant escalations in 2014 and 2021.

At the regional and international levels, alternations in political alliance and diplomatic initiatives markedly influenced the ongoing conflict. These incorporated the normalization agreements Israel and several Arab states under the Abraham Accords, along with changes in U.S. policy concerning the region. However, these developments did not resolve the main Palestinian issue, which remained at the central of the conflict. In the aftermath of the events of 7 October, 2023, the conflict has entered a new and notably intensified phase, defined by broad military operations in Gaza and escalation including regional actor such as Hezbollah in Lebanon. This expansion has intensified humanitarian concern and sustained the circle of violence and retaliation. Ultimately, the Arab-Zionist conflict remains unresolved and endure to evolve, shaped by historical grievance, competing narratives, political fragmentation, and ongoing territorial dispute, all of which impact stability in the region.

6. Discourse-Historical Approach

Wodak with her colleague developed the Discourse-Historical Approach to Critical Discourse Studies (CDS). This approach highlights the importance of historical and socio-
political context in discourse analysis. The approach is " context-sensitive," focusing on historical ramifications (Reisigl& Wodak, 2001, p. 13). It emphasizes the significance of considering the specific context in which language is used, as well as the historical relationship between various texts. This sensitivity to context reveals that discourse cannot be fully understood in isolation but must be placed within wider historical, social and political contexts. DHA is distinguished from other approach by its emphasis on understanding and analyzing discourses in the context of their broader discursive and historical developments (Sheyholislami, 2001, p.5). According to Wodak (1995, p.209, this factor is important because it incorporate all available background information in the analysis and interpretation of the various layers of written and spoken text. This multi-layered approach allows a thorough examination of how

political leaders, such as Nasrallah and Netanyahu, linguistically construct the image of 'self' and 'other' in diverse and linguistic contexts. The Discourse-Historical Approach involves analysis through various interconnected levels, enabling for thorough understanding of discourse within its broader socio-political context. This study examines the construction of 'self' and 'other' in the Arab-Zionist conflict through the speeches of Nasrallah and Netanyahu. Three main analytical levels are adopted; Political and historical context, intertextuality and interdiscursivity, and discursive strategies. The first two levels illustrate the macro level, highlighting broader contextual and discursive associations, whereas the third level focuses on the micro level, analyzing the specific linguistic realization of meaning within the texts.

The first level addresses the political and historical context, which is an important dimensions of analysis in Discourse Historical Approach, as discourse is always created within specific socio-political and historical situations. This level sets the discourses within its wider political and historical context, including the political requirement, historical events, and institutional systems that influence their interpretation. Discourse is seen not merely as an isolate linguistic element but as a social practice that bot reflects and
influences reality. Analyzing the political context entails a comprehension of the environment in which the discourse is produced, including relevant events and conflicts. Conversely, the historical context provides a deeper perspective by invoking past experiences and collective memory to clarify present events. The integration of these two aspects within Discourse- Historical Approach enable a more thorough understanding of the ways in which discourse is utilized to enhance ideological positions and to interpret current events.

The second level of DHA is founded on two key concepts: interdiscursivity and intertextuality. The former refers to the relationships between various discourse. For example, Wodak notes that " a discourse on climate changes often references issues or subtopics from other discourses, such as finance or health". Discourse are open and often hybrid and new sub- topics can be created at many point (Reisigle& Wodak, 2015, p.90). Conversely, intertextuality refers to the relationship between texts. In this context, the relationship can be established through explicit references to a topic or primary actor; by mentioning the same events through allusion or evocations, by transferring key arguments from one text to another and so forth. For instance, a politician may utilize news articles on a specific topic to strengthen their arguments or they might reference a prior speech made by a political opponent to criticize

them and elevate their own ideas. Intertextuality and interdiscursivity contribute to discourse analysis and can assist in revealing power dynamics.

The third level focuses on the discursive strategies, which serve as basic analytical instruments for investigating the construction of meaning within discourse. Reisigl and Wodak (2001a) identify five discursive strategies – nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization and mitigation/ intensification, that are utilized in both positive and negative representation of the self and the other. Growing on this framework, Wodak (2001, p.72; 2005, p.13) further clarifies on these strategies by presenting a series of guiding methodological questions that organize the analytical process. The first

question examines how persons, objects, events, and actions are linguistically identified and referred, aligning with the referential or nomination strategies. The second question focuses on the qualities and characteristics assigned to social actors and phenomena, which relates to Predicational strategies. The third question explores the types of arguments used in discourse, corresponding to the argumentation strategies. The fourth question inspects the perspective from which these nominations, attributions, and arguments are communicated, aligning with the perspectivization strategies. The fifth question examines whether utterances are conveyed explicitly or implicitly, as well as whether they are mitigated or intensified, which connects to mitigation/ intensification strategies. Collectively, these strategies allow a systematic analysis of how discourse shapes identities, conveys ideological meanings, and justifies power.

6. Methodology

This study adopts the qualitative approach to examine the construction of "self" and "other" within the context of Arab-Zionist conflict. The qualitative approach was chosen for its ability to reveal significant ideological dimensions and to analyze discursive practice in relation to their political and social context. This study adopts Discourse-Historical approach, a system that combines linguistic analysis with an examination of political and social factors, thereby enabling a comprehensive understanding of how political discourse contributes to the reproduction of ideological meanings. This study is grounded in a considerately appointed selection of excerpts from speeches given by Nasrallah and Netanyahu. These speeches were chosen due to their ideological significance in the aftermath of the events of October 7th, as they represent opposing narratives that perform a role in redefining the Arab-

Zionist conflict. These speeches can be accessed via the following links;
https://www.youtube.com/live/iUSI5tQuXys?si=T5ENlHuQJP0wLeRP
https://youtu.be/9pWstr1tJWc?si=HradTxGYTP90S5pv

Methodologically, the analysis of these excerpts were conducted at three distinct levels: the first level is the political and historical context; the second level focuses on intertextuality and interdiscursivity; and the third level examines discursive strategies, which include (nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization and mitigation/ intensification strategies).

7. Data Analysis

1. The analysis of Nasrallah's speech

Excerpts 1

"لقد قرأت في بعض وسائل الاعلام الاسرائيلية كلاماً يقول ان الاسرائيليين أنفسهم باتوا يؤمنون أكثر من أي شخص ان اسرائيل اوهن من بيت العنكبوت. وهذه حقيقة ثبتتها عملية طوفان الاقصى، سارعت الادارة الامريكية برئيسها

ووزرائها وجنرالاتها لتمسك بهذا الكيان الذي كان يهتز وكان يتزلزل من اجل ان يستعيد بعض انفاسه يستعيد بعض وعيه ويقف على قدميه من جديد وليستعيد زمام المبادرة وهو لم يتمكن حتى الان من استعادة زمام المبادرة".

1. Political and historical context

Politically, the discourse presents the operation as intended at producing a psychological effect by depicting Israel as vulnerable. Historically, it employs a narrative of resistance that identifies Israel as a fragile power rather than a permanent one, placing a conflict a broader anti-imperialist setting that emphasizes its independence on U.S. support.

2. Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity

The excerpts mention the Quranic metaphor "اوهن من بيت العنكبوت," which has been reinterpreted to depict Israeli's vulnerability. They also mention Israeli media as an exterior perspective, combining themes of resistance with psychological and political narratives to challenge the opponent's reliability.

3. Discursive Strategies

In referential strategies, Nasrallah refers to Israel as "بهذا الكيان" a term that delegitimizes the state by avoiding any acknowledgment of it as a state rather representing it as an abstract entity. He also uses predicational strategies to describe Israel as " اوهن من بيت العنكبوت " and a system that "كان يهتز وكان يتزلزل " implying instability, fragility, and an absence of control. Conversely, the resistance is indirectly portrayed as capable of exposing

Journal of Babylon Center for Humanities Studies: 2026, Volume: 16, Issue: 11

these weaknesses through its action. Argumentation is mainly structured around the topos of reality, with the "Al-Aqsa Flood" presenting as concrete evidence of Israel's vulnerability. The mention of U.S. interference reveals the topos of dependency, suggesting that Israel's endurance depends on external support. Furthermore, the use of reported speech" لقد قرات في بعض وسائل الاعلام الإسرائيلية " enables perspectivization strategies by including an evidential aspect that enriches the observed credibility of the statement. Mitigation is limited in these excerpts, but it appears through the use reported discourse " قرات " serves to distance Nasrallah from the direct authorship of the claim. In addition, intensification strategies are noticeably evident through the repetition of "يستعيد بعض، يستعيد بعض" as well as through metaphoric amplification " يهتز و يتزلـزل", these strategies collectively enhance the awareness of systematic collapse.

Excerpts 2

" النقطـة التاليـة، كيـف تصـرف العـدو تجـاه حادثـة طوفـان الاقصـى. كـان واضـح مـن السـاعات الاولى ان هذا العدو كان ضائعآ وتائهآ وشاردآ لأنه كما تعرفون يوم السبت كان ليلة العيد وهي كان طبعآ التوقيت العظيم الذي تم اختياره من قبل المقاومة وليس فقط في غلاف غزة حتى في تل ابيب وفي القدس، ولذلك عندما ذهبوا لاستعادة المستعمرات في غلاف غزة من ايدي المقاومين الفلسطينيين هم الذين ارتكبوا المجازر بحق المستوطنين الاسرائيليين وليس ما يتهمون به حماس وبقية فصائل المقاومة".

1. political and historical context

Politically, Nasrallah characterizes the Israeli reaction during the initial hours of the event as confused. He exhibits the operation as a deliberately organized initiative by the resistance, which displayed the instability and weaknesses of Israeli mange in several sites. Including region along Gaza border, Tel Aviv, and Jerusalem.

2. Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity

The excerpts slightly engage with the conflicting narratives surrounding the war that are dominant in media discourse, especially those linked to responsibility for civilian victims. They reshape these narratives to contest prevalent Israeli perspectives, while simultaneously embodying resistance discourse that emphasizes the strategic planning and military advantage.

3. Discursive Strategies

In referential strategies, the Israeli side is repeatedly identified as "العدو ", which generate a unified adversarial identity. Predicational strategies portray this entity as "ضـائع، تائـه، شـارد" ", implying confusion, a lack of

control, and strategic failure. Conversely, the resistance is indirectly depicted as strategically competent, specifically through reference to well-timed actions and organized efforts. In argumentation strategies, he uses the topos of responsibility, where Nasrallah assigning civilians victims not to resistance or Hamas but to Israeli forces. This serves as a counter-narrative designed to undermine opposing claims and reframe responsibility. The perspectivization strategies manifest through direct involvement with the audience using expressions like "كما تعرفون ", which improves shared understanding and enhances reliability. Mitigation strategies are limited in these excerpts, with only slight softening realized through shared audience involvement via "كما تعرفون ", while the general discourse remains highly profound and evaluative. Intensification strategies are presented through the terms "ضائع، تائه، شارد ", and in the emphasis on the vast operational effect across several cities, which intensifies the awareness of systemic confusion with Israel.

Excerpts 3

" ايها الاخوة والاخوات النقطة التالية، كل هذا الذي يجري في قطاع غزة ويراه العالم يكشف لنا من جديد ويؤكد لنا من جديد اولآ الطبيعة المتوحشة والهمجية لهذا الكيان الإسرائيلي الغاصب الذي زرعوه في منطقتنا في فلسطين. بناءآ على

وعد بلفور المشؤوم الذي كان ذكراه بالأمس. ليتمضى بناره وحروبه منذ 75 عاما شعوب المنطقة واولها الشعب الفلسطيني ومصر والاردن وسوريا ولبنان وكل المنطقة"

1. political and historical context

Politically, the excerpts are situated within the current escalation in Gaza, where Nasrallah deciphers recent event as evidence of a persistent design of aggression. Historically, the discourse positions the Israeli entity within a 75- year historical context related to Balfour Declaration, representing the conflict as an ongoing regional issue that effects various Arab state.

2. Intertextuality and interdiscursivity

The excerpts obviously reference the Balfour Declaration as an important historical point, reinterpreting it as reason of continued regional instability. Interdiscursively, it defines the conflict as resulting from historical injustice and extended occupation throughout the Arab region.

3. Discursive Strategies

In referential strategies, Israel is referred to as "الكيان الصهيوني الغاصب ", a phrase that undermines its legitimacy as a state and depict it as occupying force. Predicational strategies portray this entity as "متوحش وهمجي", attributing severe brutality and moral decline to it, while also portraying diverse Arab communities, including those from Lebanon, Syria, Jordan,

Journal of Babylon Center for Humanities Studies: 2026, Volume: 16, Issue: 11

Egypt, and Palestine, as victim. The argumentation strategies are based on the topos of history and topos of injustice, indicating the current violence is a persistence of past colonial decisions, specifically referencing the Balfour Declaration. This historical perspective is employed to legitimize resistance by shaping it as part of an ongoing conflict against systemic repression. Perspectivization strategies are achieved through formal address, as observed in the phrase "أيها الاخوة والاخوات", and through collective shaping, which increase audience involvement and emotional connection.

Mitigation strategies are limited in these excerpts and primarily through collective address "يوكد لنا ", which promotes an inclusive viewpoint that shares emotional responsibility among the audience. Intensification strategies are manifest in the use of emotionally charged adjectives such as " متوحش و همجي", beside with the cumulative listing of affected nations, which intensifies the perceived extent of conflict and suffering.

2. The analysis of Netanyahu's speech

Excerpts 1

" these savage murders, our enemies, seek not only to destroy us, but they seek to destroy our common civilization and return all of us to a dark age of tyranny and terror. When I spoke here last year, I said we face the same timeless choice that Moses put before the people of Israel thousands of years ago, as we were about to enter the Promised Land. Moses told us that our actions would determines whether we bequeath to future generations a blessing or a curse".

1. Political and Historical Context

Politically, these excerpts are placed within the context of the escalation after the event of October 7, where the Arab-Zionist conflict is defined as an existential conflict. Historically, Netanyahu portrays the ongoing violence as part of a greater historical conflict concerning identity and endurance. The discourse frames the current event as a significant turning point, justifying political actions through the notion of threats.

2. Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity

The excerpts use religious intertextuality by referencing Moses and the "Promised Land," positioning contemporary conflict within a historical sacred background. In addition, they connect within broader interdiscursive narratives, such as civilizational discourse and the " war on terror," constructing the conflict in terms of civilization versus chaos. These references place the regional conflict within a larger global discourse concerning security and legitimacy.

3. Discursive Strategies

These excerpts create a polarized image of social actors through systematic process of referential and Predicational strategies. The out-group is marked with collective and dehumanizing terms such as " our enemies and murders", which serve to eradicate individual differences and present a unified hostile group. Predicational strategies enhance this negative representation by using adjectives and evaluative phrases such as " savage, dark age, tyranny, and terror," connecting the out- group to radical violence and moral decline. Conversely, the in-group is implicitly connected with civilization, moral responsibility, and historical persistence. Argumentation strategies is mostly arranged the topos of threat, history, and religion. The out-group is represented as threat not only to specific community but also to common civilization, which broaden the rationale for political action. The reference to Moses invokes the topos of religious authority, while the historical context of ''thousands of years" links ancient narratives with current political resolutions. Perspectivization strategies occur through the active participation of the speaker, particularly when pointing previous speeches, which helps to enrich responsibility and continuity. Intensification strategies are apparent in the use of repetition and hyperbolic expressions such as " destroy our common civilization," which intensify the perceived severity of the threat and reinforce persuasive effect of the discourse.

Excerpts 2

"Ladies and gentleman, the curse of October7th began when Hamas invaded Israel from Gaza, but it didn’t end there. Israel was soon forced to defend itself on six more war fronts organized by Iran. On October 8th, Hezbollah attacked us from Lebanon. Since then, they have fired over 8,00 rockets at our towns and cities, at our civilians, at our children. Two weeks later, the Iran-backed Houthis in Yemen launched drones and missiles at Israel, the first of 250 such attacks, including one yesterday aimed at Tel Aviv. Iran's Shiite militias in Syria and Iraq have targeted Israel dozens of times over the past year as well".

1. Political and Historical Context

Politically, Netanyahu employs a strategy that reinforce an existential threat by highlighting regional tension to create a dramatic narrative of an extensive and complex conflict, presenting Israel as a victim forced to confront various parties. This projection serves a crucial purpose: it creates a sense of necessity, reframing violent military responses as inevitable acts of defense.

2. Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity

These excerpts indicate a purposeful rhetorical connection intended to include regional threats, such as Iran and its allies, into the wider context

of global conflict. The focus of the conflict is shifted from its limited regional scope to the realm of international geopolitics, enabling military actions to be framed within a framework informed by global security literature and international counter-terrorism protocols.

3. Discursive Strategies

These excerpts reflect a sharp representation of social actors, constructed through referential strategies designed to support a particular ideological interpretation of the ongoing escalation. Netanyahu employs an effective way to categorize the world into "us" and "them", uniting all of Israel's adversaries, including Iran and its allies. He depicts them as a unified force with the aim of destroying Israel. Predicational strategies reinforce this perception by relying on verbs with violent meanings, such as " attacked, launched, and targeted", which portray the out-group as an aggressive entity engaged in offensive actions. Additionally, he uses numerical escalation, such as " over 8,000 rockets and 250 such attack," serving as a rhetorical tool that not only reflect reality but also emphasizes the scale and persistence of the threat, thereby fostering a sense of urgency for adopting stringent defensive measures. In argumentation strategies, uses the topos of threat and responsibility, creating a comprehensive narrative that highlights ongoing attacks from various sources. This portrayal positions Israel as a besieged nation, framing military action not as spontaneous response but as an unavoidable necessity in the force of a prolonged existential threat. Netanyahu employs perspectivization strategies to shape this perspective, evident in his formal public addresses " Ladies and Gentleman." This choice establishing the discussion within the formal international context, enhancing its official tone. Furthermore, by presenting himself as a direct witness to the events, Netanyahu adds a layer of credibility to the narrative. Intensification strategies involve the repeated occurrences of violent acts and the ongoing collaboration among various actors in carrying out these attacks. This combination not only heightens the rhetorical tone but also reinforces the perception of threat, resulting in a situation that feels both permanent and increasingly severe.

Excerpts 3

" I said to the people of Lebanon this week: Get out of the death trap that Hezbollah has put you in. Don’t let Nasrallah drag Lebanon into the abyss. We are not at war with you. We are at war with Hezbollah, which has hijacked your country and threatens to destroy ours"

1. Political and Historical Context

Politically, Netanyahu clarifies in these excerpts that their war is not with Lebanon but with Hezbollah. The main objective of this statement is to legitimize the military attacks and convince the international community that Israel avoids war with countries and focuses only on confronting its enemies, in order to ensure the continuation of operation without strong international opposition.

2. Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity

These excerpts reflect a discourse centered on security and counterinsurgency issues, highlighting the distinction between state and non-state actors in accordance with broader international narratives surrounding the conflict. Moreover, the term "abyss" serves as a persuasive rhetorical tool, helping to shape the perception of the crisis and strengthen the rationale for implementing defensive measures.

3. Discursive Strategies

These excerpts employ referential strategies to create a clear distinction between two group; "you," which refer to the citizens of Lebanon, and "Hezbollah," depicted as a separate entity. This separation fosters an internal division within the context of the out-group. Furthermore, Hezbollah is characterized as an external force that has "hijacked" the nation, a representation that delegitimizes its standing and portray it as an unauthorized force acting against national interests. Predicational strategies depict Hezbollah with deeply negative characteristics, such as " put you in a death trap, drag Lebanon into the abyss, and hijacked your country," depicting the group as destructive, coercive, and accountable for the nation's decline. In contrast, Israel is tactfully represented as not engaging in conflict with the Lebanon citizens, which forms the image of restriction and particular opposition. Argumentation strategies are structured around the topos of responsibility and threats. Hezbollah is depicted as the source of threat to Lebanon, while Israel's action are characterized as targeting solely an aggressive group rather than the broader population. This distinction serves to justify military operations while attempting to mitigate moral and political condemnation. Perspectivization strategies are employed through direct address " I said to the people of Lebanon" alongside imperative forms " Get out and Don’t let", which create a sense of immediacy and emotional urgency while position the speaker as an authoritative figure. Intensification strategies are further reinforced by metaphorical expressions such as "death trap and the abyss," which amplify perceived severity of the situation and create a dramatic portrayal of existential threat.

8. conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that language in political discourse is not limited to representing reality, but plays a crucial role in shaping and influencing it through
deliberate linguistic choices. The findings reveal that political discourse in intrinsically non-neutral, as both speakers rely on specific linguistic strategies aimed at producing a duality of self and other, which reinforce the state of ideological polarization. Specifically, Nasrallah's discourse highlights the importance of resistance and emphasizes the historical oppression of the Palestinian people, focusing on the need to confront Zionist colonialism. In contrast, Netanyahu's discourse emphasizes civilization and the existential threats to their nations. Despite the variations in these speeches, both sides converge on a significant aspect: portraying the opponent as the main source of global insecurity. Furthermore, the findings also indicate that both sides engage in dehumanizing the opposing entity and undermining its moral standing be employing ideological terms like savagery, brutality, and barbarism. This linguistic strategy serves to provide moral justification for violent confrontational actions. In addition, each side invokes historical narratives to confirm its political positions and reinforce collective identity. In conclusion, this study confirms that the distinction between the "self" and "other" is not an invariable reality; rather, it represents a dynamic linguistic construct designed to reframes political disagreement as a historical existential conflict. Likewise, these discourses play a crucial role intensifying this conflict and illustrating its criteria.

References

AFP News Agency. (2024, September 27). Benjamin Netanyahu gives speech at UN General Assembly [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mkoM-SKa2VY

Al-Manar TV. (2023, November 3). Speech by Hassan Nasrallah on Al-Aqsa Flood operation [Video) YouTube. https://youtu.be/9pWstr1tJWc

Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). Key terms in discourse analysis. Continuum.

Blackledge, A. (2005). Discourse and power in a multilingual world. John Benjamins.

Chilton, P. A. (2004). Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Flowerdew, J., & Richardson, J. E. (Eds.). (2018). The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies Routledge.

Fowler, R., Kress, G., Hodge, R., & Trew, T. (Eds.). (2019). Language and control. Routledge.

Higgins, M. (2018). Mediatisation and political language. In R. Wodak & B. Forchtner (Eds.), The Routledge handbook of language and politics (pp. 383–396). Routledge.
Philip, E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. E. Apter (Ed.), Ideology and discontent (pp. 206–261). Collier-Macmillan.
Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.),
Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 87–120). Sage.
Thompson, J. B. (1990). Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication. Stanford University Press.
Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). News as discourse. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
van Dijk, T. A. (1998). What is political discourse analysis? Belgian Journal of Linguistics, 11, 11–52.
van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Political discourse and ideology. Doxa Comunicación, 1, 207–225.
van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Ideology and discourse analysis. Journal of Political Ideologies, 11(2), 115–140.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908
van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In K. Brown (Ed.), Encyclopedia of language &
linguistics (Vol. 9, pp. 728–740). Elsevier.
van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk. Cambridge
University Press.
Wodak, R. (1995). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In J. Verschueren, J.-O. Östman, & J.
Blommaert (Eds.), Handbook of pragmatics (pp. 204–210). John Benjamins.
Wodak, R. (1996). Disorders of discourse. Longman.
Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), Methods of critical discourse analysis (pp. 63–94). Sage
Wodak, R. (2005). Critical discourse analysis: Discourse-historical approach.
Wodak, R. (2008a). “Us” and “Them”: Inclusion/exclusion—Discrimination via discourse. In G. Delanty, P.
Jones, & R. Wodak (Eds.), Migration, identity, and belonging (pp. 54–78). Liverpool University Press.
Wodak, R. (2008b). Introduction: Discourse studies—Important concepts and terms. In R. Wodak & M.
Krzyżanowski (Eds.), Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences (pp. 1–29). Palgrave Macmillan.

Journal of Babylon Center for Humanities Studies: 2026, Volume: 16, Issue: 11

Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2011a). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In J. Zienkowski et al. (Eds.), Discursive pragmatics. John Benjamins

Wodak, R. (2011b). The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2013). Discourse-historical approach. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), The Bloomsbury companion to discourse analysis (pp. 38–53). Bloomsbury.

Wodak, R. (2015a). Critical discourse analysis: Discourse-historical approach. In K. Tracy (Ed.), The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction. Wiley

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). Methods of critical discourse studies (3rd ed.). Sage.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2001). Discourse and racism. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.),

The handbook of discourse analysis (pp. 372–393). Blackwell.

Wodak, R., & Richardson, J. E. (2013). European fascism in talk and text. In R. Wodak & J. E. Richardson

(Eds.), Analysing fascist discourse: European fascism in talk and text (pp. 1–17). Routledge.

Wodak, R., & van Dijk, T. A. (Eds.). (2000). Racism at the top: Parliamentary discourses on ethnic issues in six European states. Drava Verlag