

A Pragmatic Study of Persecution in Selected Presidential Speeches on the Recent Events in the Middle East

Assistant Lecturer

Hawraa Abdulzahra Hamzah

The General Directorate of Education in Al-Najaf Governorate

hawra.hamza84@gmail.com

**دراسة تداولية لخطاب الاضطهاد في مجموعة مختارة من الخطابات
الرئاسية بشأن الأحداث الراهنة في الشرق الأوسط**

المدرس المساعد

حوراء عبدالزهرة حمزة

المديرية العامة للتربية في محافظة النجف الأشرف

Abstract:-

The recent event in the Middle East have been of an obvious concern to many political figures around the world. The purpose of this study is to analyse, from a pragmatic perspective, the persecution in certain presidential addresses about the current events in the Middle East. It is claimed that certain presidents use a variety of language techniques, especially pragmatic ones, in an attempt to influence their audiences and persuade them that the Middle East is antagonistic to Israel and the United States; they do this by indirectly portraying their oppression of the region. Finding the practical tactics used in the manifestations of persecution in the chosen presidential speeches is the goal of the current study. The study is qualitative and is based on an eclectic model, which is based on Culpeper's (1996) theory of impoliteness and Grice's (1975) theory of implicatures. Two presidential speeches have been selected as samples of this study; one is by Netanyahu and the other is by Biden. As a result of the analysis of the selected data, it has been proved that the selected presidential speeches include different forms of impoliteness, such as negative, off-record and bald on impoliteness. In terms of implicatures, the selected speeches are seen to include conventional and conversational forms of implicature. The results prove that the selected speeches contain clear expressions of persecution that have an implied meaning.

Key words: pragmatics, impoliteness, implicatures, politics, events, Middle East.

المخلص:-

أثارت الأحداث الأخيرة في الشرق الأوسط قلقاً بالغاً لدى العديد من الشخصيات السياسية حول العالم. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل، من منظور عملي، خطاب الاضطهاد في بعض الخطابات الرئاسية حول الأحداث الجارية في الشرق الأوسط. يُزعم أن بعض الرؤساء يستخدمون أساليب لغوية متنوعة، لا سيما الأساليب العملية، في محاولة للتأثير على جمهورهم وإقناعهم بأن الشرق الأوسط معاد لإسرائيل والولايات المتحدة؛ وذلك من خلال تصوير قمعهما للمنطقة بشكل غير مباشر. يمثل هدف هذه الدراسة في الكشف عن التكتيكات العملية المستخدمة في مظاهر الاضطهاد في الخطابات الرئاسية المختارة. تعتمد الدراسة على منهج نوعي، وتستند إلى نموذج انتقائي، مستوحى من نظرية كولبير (1996) حول قلة الأدب، ونظرية غرايس (1975) حول التضمينات. تم اختيار خطابين رئاسيين كعينتين لهذه الدراسة؛ أحدهما لنتنياهو والآخر لبإيدن. أظهر تحليل البيانات المختارة أن الخطابين يتضمنان أشكالاً مختلفة من قلة الأدب، كالإساءة، والتلميح غير الرسمي، والتصريح الصريح. أما فيما يتعلق بالدلالات الضمنية، فقد تبين أن الخطابين يتضمنان أشكالاً تقليدية وحوارية منها. وتؤكد النتائج أن الخطابين يحتويان على تعابير واضحة للاضطهاد تحمل معاني ضمنية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التداولية، الفضاضة، التضمينات، السياسة، الأحداث، الشرق الأوسط.

1. Introduction

Van Dijk (1995, p. 13) argued that "the analysis of politics and political discourse should focus on the discourse as it is produced by the main actors in the polity". It, however, should be extended beyond the text to include the context in which the discourse is produced (Fairclough, 2006). This means that the nature of the discourse should be identified within the contexts or the situation in which it is presented and interpreted (Chilton, 2004). In order to examine the process of manipulation and political implications in Biden and Netanyahu's speeches concerning the recent events in the Middle East, the present study provides a comprehensive explanation of the interactions among language and politics from a pragmatic perspective.

The situation in the Middle East is regarded as a political crisis whose origin goes back to 1948 when the Zionists began to settle in Palestine (Aron, 2015). The events in the Middle East are attributed to the United States and Israel, who intend to extend both power and dominance over countries of the Middle East (Batou, 2015). The United States aims at facing and opposing the expansion of Iran, and this is one of the factors that have made Israel announce the recent war against Gaza and Lebanon (McFaul, Mearsheimer & Sestanovich, 2024). Mearsheimer (2024). Thought that when Netanyahu has decided on this war, he wants to protect Israel and the Zionists from any possible and expected threats; he wants to keep the internal stability of the Israeli settlements.

1.1. Problem Statement

According to Strauss and Feiz (2014), language has the ability to influence and mirror the real environment in which people live and serves as a potent instrument via which individuals may obtain the assistance and support they require during difficult and conflictual times. Different linguistic components found in political language can aid politicians in influencing their audiences to accomplish particular goals. Politicians want to use language to trick people and convey ideas that the average person finds hard to understand (Yuzhakova & Polyakova, 2018). Biden and Netanyahu, as political figures, are believed to adopt different linguistic strategies, particularly pragmatic ones by which they want to manipulate their audiences and convince

them that what happens in the Middle East is against Israel and America; they present their persecution of the Middle East indirectly. They are accused of having certain intentions and hidden ideologies that they do not express publically, but use different pragmatic strategies, such as impoliteness and implicatures, to convey such messages to the addressed people (Dyorina et al., 2024). Because of the pragmatic tactics they rely on, their language is rather ambiguous and has several meanings, messages, and goals that the average person without such pragmatic understanding cannot decipher. Therefore, the goal of this study is to clarify the terminology used by Biden and Netanyahu as well as to identify the practical tactics they use in their speeches to portray the oppression of Middle Easterners.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The current study aims at:

1. Analysing the forms of impoliteness that are used in the expressions of persecution in the selected presidential speeches.
2. Exploring the kinds of implicature strategies that are employed in the expressions of persecution in the selected presidential speeches.

1.3. Research Questions

This study intends to answer the following questions:

1. What are the forms of impoliteness strategies that are found in the expressions of persecution in the selected presidential speeches?
2. What are the kinds of implicatures that are used in the expressions of persecution in the selected presidential speeches?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition of Pragmatics

According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics refers to the investigation of the contextual meaning of an utterance. Yule (1996) defined pragmatics as concerned with the perception of a certain

level of meaning as communicated by a language user and understood by an audience. Grice (1975) showed the main concern of pragmatics is the relationship between language and its meaning. He added it discusses how language understanding is affected by the speaker's level of experience. How speakers utilise and perceive expressions, and how the interaction between participants influences sentence structure.

The importance of utterances is related to the pragmatics and contextual usage of language. According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the study of the utterances that express particular occurrences, or the conscious actions of speakers at particular times and locations, frequently including language. This implies that pragmatics is equivalent to the expressions in which the context-dependent on the particular case consisting of time, place, and language can be drawn. Language is not meant by the form of the basic language, but by language application. It was confirmed by Levinson (1983) that the study of language use is pragmatics. Generally, based on its context and use, pragmatics can be characterised as the analysis of the meaning of utterances.

2.2. Impoliteness

Impolite behaviour is described in this context as "communicative techniques designed to attack face and thus trigger conflict and disagreement" (Culpeper, 1996, p. 350). In the past, established strategies did not adequately address rudeness. Arrogance is used to describe it, and it is dismissed (Eelen, 2001). However, some academics with an interest in rudeness studies think that rudeness is a result of face-attacking communication techniques. Culpeper (2005) updated the term impoliteness to incorporate the listener's rule, making it clearer what the hearer is required to do when judging impoliteness. "Impoliteness happens when: (1) the speaker transmits a face assault purposefully, (2) the hearer believes and generates behaviour as purposely face-attacking, or (3) a combination of (1) and (2)," he claims. Two elements have been taken into account in Culpeper's:

1. The role of the hearer.
2. The intention of the speaker.

In other words, even when the speaker has no purpose of attacking the hearer's face, the hearer invents a deliberate face assault, or the hearer does not see behaviour as a face attack even though the speaker has no intention of attacking the hearer's face. However, (1) and (2) are included in the normal application of impoliteness. As a result, the listener notices when the speaker purposefully transmits a facial attack (Mullany, 2008). Impoliteness can also be seen as having a bad attitude in some situations toward a certain behaviour (Culpeper, 2010).

The researcher looks at the impoliteness tactics and classifications in the current study using the impoliteness definitions put forward by Culpeper (1996) and updated by Culpeper (2005). According to Culpeper (2011a), some verbal behaviours might be viewed as polite in one scenario and unfriendly in another, making it difficult to define impoliteness exactly because it depends on the context and societal values. In this case, the definition of impoliteness is based less on the speaker's actual behaviour and more on how the hearer interprets the speaker's actions.

2.2.1. Culpeper's View (1996)

The first person that comes to mind when thinking about impoliteness is Culpeper (1996) and his model of impoliteness (Orthaber, 2017). One of the first to thoroughly analyse rudeness is Culpeper. The Culpeper model is also flexible and used in a variety of contexts (Mullany, 2008). Because it depends on the speaker using impoliteness methods, Culpeper's impoliteness model is speaker-based (Orthaber, 2017).

Because impoliteness is based on a range of written and spoken data from real life, Culpeper's (1996, 2005) model of impoliteness is selected as the analytical framework for this study (Bousfield, 2008). This makes it more relevant, dependable, and adaptable to varied circumstances. The following are some tactics for being rude which Culpeper (1996, p. 13) suggested:

- 1- Bald on-record impoliteness: This strategy is employed when a significant amount of face is at stake, and the speaker intends to attack the hearer's face. Thus, the face-threatening act is administered in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and short

manner in situations where the face is unrelated or limited (Bousfield, 2008). Example: "Your dress is ugly."

- 2- Positive impoliteness: this approach is intended to harm the addressee's positive face want (his wish to be accepted). Culpeper (2005) lists positive impoliteness sub-strategies, such as ignoring, isolating oneself from the other, displaying disinterest, seeking disagreement, using taboo terms, and calling the others by a derogatory name.
- 3- Negative impoliteness: harms the recipient's negative face wants (Culpeper, 2005), e.g., "Stop wearing that ugly dress." Culpeper suggests negative impoliteness output strategies: frighten, scorn, and literally or figuratively violate the other's space.
- 4- Sarcasm or mock politeness: refers to situations where civility strategies are used insincerely and only realised superficially. In this instance, the speaker says polite things he does not mean (Culpeper, 1996). For example, your dress is lovely (when it is ugly).
- 5- Withhold politeness: This phrase is used when the lack of etiquette occurs when it is expected to be displayed (Culpeper, 2005). It is the act of remaining silent when politeness is expected, such as not returning a salutation or not expressing gratitude (Culpeper, 1996).

2.3. Implicature

Grice (1975) asserted that a speaker's utterance can be divided into two categories: what he "says" and what he "implies" via an expression. As a result, Grice referred to this as conversational implicature. He felt that indicating anything implies something that goes beyond what is spoken. Implicature is defined as what the speaker can infer, suggest, or intend apart from what the person says (Levinson, 1983). In other terms, implication provides an explicit explanation of how more than what is communicated might be interpreted. The speaker of an utterance may transmit the intended meaning directly or indirectly.

According to Charles (2002), the concept of implicature is a form of interpretation that is made by the audience in relation to one

statement to another prior statement, and such form of relation is always made unintentionally by that audience. Grice (1975) described two types of implicature:

2.3.1. Conventional Implicature. It comes from the normal interpretation of expressions and the context in which they are used. Grice (1975) presented an instance "She was poor but honest," which shows a contrast between destitution and honesty. He claimed as the verse "but" and "and" have the same truth-conditional substance, with the added traditional indication that the conjuncts are slightly contrasted (Grice, 1975).

2.3.2. Conversational Implicature. It arises as a result of broad principles that govern the acts of expression. Grice (1975) explained the phenomena of conversational implicature and establishes the principles that allow individuals to constantly intend more than they speak. Griffiths (2006) defined conversational form of implicature as deductions that depend on the existence of language usage criteria, including such majority agreement that speakers must attempt to communicate the truth. Grice (1975) divided conversational implicature into three types: generalised, scalar, and particularised:

Generalised implicature occurs where no particular knowledge is essential to figure out the additionally communicated level of meaning in the context. In other terms, it takes place in the absence of any precise context for forming necessary inferences. For an example of generalised conversational interpretation, I was walking in a garden one day. In this situation, the garden is not the speaker's, since if it were, he would say (I was walking in my garden) (Haung, 2007).

Scalar implicatures are when information is communicated by choosing a word that conveys one element from a range of possibilities. As observed by the ratios, words are presented from the greatest to the lowest value, which is especially noticeable when expressing certain quantity form, e.g., some, few, all, most...etc. (Haung, 2007).

Particularised implicature implies that most interactions take place in very particular circumstances where inferences are required. Certain inferences are required to recognise the transmitted meanings. According to Yule (1996), this particularised

conversational implicature arises when the speakers state something and the audience replies indirectly.

2.5. Definition and Types of Persecution

The English term "persecution" or "persecute" originates from the Latin word "persecutor". This term in English denotes 'pursuing', 'constantly following', or 'following with hostile intent'. The word signifies 'to chase after', 'to oppress', or 'to cause suffering'. Considering this, persecution encompasses various unfair activities, varying from highly hostile to mildly hostile. At one extreme, intensely aggressive behaviour might be executed using physical, psychological (mental or emotional), or social means. These actions could include physical harm, harsh punishment, isolation, imprisonment, or social exclusion. Such activities frequently impact an individual's fundamental needs (Tieszen, 2008).

Persecution is a situation that involves an unfair or brutal exercise of power or of being burdened down, pressed down, and destroying one's mind or body. According to Barker (2003), the persecuted person or group is undervalued, abused, and denied advantages by the more powerful individual or group. This suggested that those who persecute are generally those with a lot of power or influence.

Young (1990) distinguishes seven categories of persecution: exploitation, marginalisation, cultural imperialism, powerlessness, violence and racism. They are as follows:

1. Exploitation: Exploitation is a type of persecution encountered by Blacks during slavery by Whites seeking to profit from slaves. Exploitation is a structural relationship that exists between groups of people. Social norms governing what work is, who does what for whom, how work is reimbursed, and the social process by which work outcomes are appropriated all function to enact power and unequal relations.
2. Marginalisation: Young (1990) described marginalisation as persons whom the labour system is unable to or will not employ. In some respects, marginalisation is worse than exploitation since society has determined that these individuals cannot or will not be used for labour. Marginalisation excludes

or drives a large group of individuals from meaningful involvement in social life. As a result, these populations face extreme material deprivation (lack of access to essential resources) and potential elimination (genocide).

3. Powerlessness: Young (1990) believed that the powerless are people who lack authority or power even in this mediated sense, those over whom power is exercised without their consent; the weak are placed in such a way that they must receive commands and seldom have the right to give them. The concept of powerlessness is related to Marx's notion of socialism: some people "have" power while others "don't". The ruling elite dominates the helpless, who are positioned to accept instructions but rarely have the authority to issue them.
4. Cultural Imperialism: Young (1990) assured that cultural imperialism entails establishing the ruling class's culture as the standard. Cultural imperialism is defined as the industrialised nations' economic, technological, and cultural supremacy, which sets the direction of both economic and social progress, defines cultural ideals, and standardises the civilisation and social context across the world.
5. Violence: Violence is most likely the most blatant and visible manifestation of those persecutions. Those in authority, on the other hand, frequently punish or humiliate the lower classes. (Young, 1990) classified less severe acts of harassment, intimidation, or mockery as demeaning, humiliating, or stigmatising group members. He (1990) adds that in American culture, women, Blacks, Asians, Arabs, and hate crimes are common instances of violent persecution.
6. Racism: Young (1990), said that race is defined as physical traits that differentiate one race from another, such as colour, skin pigmentation, lip shape, and so on. As previously stated, certain racial categories are frequently recognised: Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid. However, these disparities frequently resulted in specific stigmas, which eventually led to the elimination or discrimination of race. According to him (1990), racism is the conviction that certain groups are intrinsically, physiologically, socially, and morally superior to other groups

depending on their racial composition. Without a doubt, the thought that had been implanted in the mind cannot be refuted; they treated various groups unjustly, made prejudiced comments, and provided poor services.

2.6. Political Language

The idea of political language with a distinct identity occurs in the middle of the 21st century, along with the realisation of the importance of logos in the construction of the political power balance. The issues addressed, the organisational methods, and the creativity of the processes utilised in initiating and amplifying the audience's state of mind distinguish political language from other sorts of languages (Wen & Taylor, 2021). Coyle (2008) identified the following characteristics that lend distinctiveness to political speeches: deliberate ambiguity that aims to affect a broader group of receivers; the message's dissimulated nature, assuming that there is never a complete connection between the speaker's intents and what he says and does, with certain strategies staying continuously concealed from the receptor; the imperative tone, which seeks to elicit a reaction from the listener to legitimise the power group embodied by the emitters; the political speech's apparent polemical foundation, which expresses the emitter's goals and objectives while contrasting them with those of the political opponent. Conducted among a sequence of liberties and restrictions founded, on the one side, by the target aimed and, on the other side, by the characteristics of the variables of the communicative context, the discourse symptom from the political field stands to gain distinct physical features due to the particularity of its features.

Approaching large and diverse audiences, political language is distinguished by an elevated level of accessibility at the level of the content distributed in addition to the level of verbal expression. Accordingly, "a balance is essential between academic or legal precision and the vagueness of the contemporary language, of the ordinary language, as between seriousness and familiarity" (Coyle, 2008, p. 52). The growth of political language is achieved through colloquial, conversational, and excessive simplicity, particular features of populist discourse.

The propensity toward stereotypy, the rigorous use of fixed, pre-set expressions, the adoption of reiterative syntactic structures, and

the presumption and multiplication of certain favoured icons and analogies are characteristics that convert political language into a sort of artefact able to serve the politician's preference, so this needs only the upgradation of symbolic meanings that the discourses practise to correspond to all these indications from the listeners (Lilleker, 2006). The employment of rhetorical strategies and the preference for words with high emotive substance provide a greater effect at the receptor level, and the use of political myths permits the addition of an evaluative component.

In the context of political language, euphemism is a strategy for recreating the political referential by presenting an image based on the speaker's objectives and goals (Lilleker, 2006). As a language of a specialised sphere of communication, political language has its unique peculiarities.

2.7. Recent Events in the Middle East

In 2024, the months that followed of Hamas's October 2023 attack on Israel had a profound impact on the Middle East. More than 45,000 people were killed in Israel's ongoing battle in Gaza, which also left northern Gaza in danger of starvation. Israel's strategic objective of eliminating Hamas remained elusive despite its numerous tactical successes, including the killing of Yahya Sinwar, the head of Hamas and the architect behind October 7. Iran launched an unprecedented missile and drone attack on Israel in April after Israel destroyed what it said was its embassy in Damascus. Israel repulsed the onslaught with help from the United States and the West. Israel's response to Iran's air defences was limited attacks. Israel's retaliatory attacks in late October hindered Iran's missile production and seriously damaged its air defences. Iran conducted another missile strike on Israel two months later, but it was again heavily repelled (Lindsay, 2024).

Israel used exploding pagers to murder scores of Hezbollah personnel in a covert operation in mid-September as retaliation for Hezbollah's missile and rocket assaults against northern Israel. Long-time Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah was assassinated two weeks later in an Israeli attack. Hezbollah troops were then driven back by Israeli ground forces when they entered southern Lebanon. Iran was further isolated in the region after Turkish-backed forces in

Syria overthrew Bashar al-Assad's government in December as a result of Hamas and Hezbollah's decline. Whether these events have created the foundation for future peace or have planted the seeds for even greater chaos is the question at hand (Lindsay, 2024).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The purpose of the current qualitative study is to examine how presidents have used language in their remarks about recent Middle Eastern events. It describes the pragmatic strategies used in the language of presidential speeches on the recent events in the Middle East. The researcher employs a qualitative approach to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the subject under investigation rather than merely connections between variables (Moleong, 2009).

Denzin and Lincoln (2011) defined qualitative research as "a sort of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning" (p. 5). According to this definition, the term "systematic" denotes organization and adherence to predetermined guidelines approved by the community of qualitative researchers. On the other hand, the term "empirical" denotes that this type of research methodology is supported by specific knowledge and experience, in a way that allows the researchers to make sense of their own experience. Qualitative researchers, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2011), "examine objects in their natural environments, trying to make sense of or to explain events in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (p. 3).

3.2. Data Collection and Description

Data collection is defined by Wang (2006) as the process by which the researcher extracts valid information from extensive data. Researchers employ specific methodologies to collect and analyse data. The researcher must use analytical reasoning, inquire about relevant aspects of the data to gain comprehension, and finally conduct comparisons among the data items to identify those related to the study. In qualitative research, the researcher is the main instrument in collecting and specifying the data, analysing inductively, and observing the utterances delivered by the speakers or writers. Qualitative data collection methods are important because they provide information that can be used to evaluate shifts in

people's perceptions of their well-being and to understand the processes that lead to observed results. This study employs qualitative content analysis as its methodology. As defined by Silverman (2000) as a research method for reaching accurate and replicable conclusions regarding the meanings and contexts of particular words or other significant material. The aim is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of verses that contain anti-persecution expressions found in the Glorious Qur'an.

3.3. Data Selection

The researcher selected two presidential speeches, one of Biden and one of Netanyahu. The samples for the present study have been selected after considering the significance of persecution and the simple nature of analysing the selected data. In qualitative research, sampling can occur multiple times, encompassing collecting data, interpretation, and reporting. Consequently, it is claimed that probability-based sampling is ineffective, as is random sampling (Hancock, Ockleford, & Windridge, 2009).

Based on what has been said regarding the sample size and reliability, a sample of presidential speeches that adequately illustrate the criteria employed in analysing the concept of persecution of spoken texts has been selected. The researcher believes that selecting additional sample texts beyond the ones included in this representative sample would lead to some redundancy and would not provide further information. The sample size of the chosen verses is determined based on the criteria of saturation and sufficiency (Nakhilawi, 2016; Neama, 2025).

When selecting the speeches that combat persecution, the researcher relies on a set of principles that guide the selection process. Ary (2010) argues that the trustworthiness of data can be achieved by following certain criteria as follows:

1. **Credibility:** In qualitative research, credibility refers to the truthfulness of the results of the study. The extent to which the researcher establishes confidence in the findings by considering the research design, participants, and context constitutes credibility or truth-value. The researcher conducts this study by examining the selected speeches with a specific

emphasis on the texts that contain various persecution expressions.

2. **Transferability:** This criterion refers to how the findings gathered through a qualitative investigation can be adopted or generalised to different contexts, groups, or individuals. In the current study, the researcher carefully observes different presidential speeches then selects the samples that include various types of persecution.
3. **Dependability:** This entails the researcher's comprehension of the meaning of the text. For an accurate interpretation, the researcher must regularly and carefully read and observe the data. The researcher engages in this activity while reading the presidential speeches. Multiple readings of the selected texts are conducted to ensure that the researcher comprehensively understands their meanings, which is necessary for linguistic analysis and investigation.
4. **Conformability:** It is a method for evaluating the objectivity of the analysis through consideration and debate with other researchers, advisors, specialists, and experts regarding the validity of the data. The researcher employs an eclectic model in this study to facilitate data analysis and address the research questions. The selected data have been analysed according to an eclectic model that includes Culpeper's (1996) theory of impoliteness and Grice's (1975) theory of implicatures.

4. Data Analysis

4.1. Analysis of Biden's Speech

This speech was delivered on Oct. 19, 2023 and has been recorded by The New York Times.

4.1.1. Pragmatic Analysis of Biden's Speech

Extract (1)

" I met with Israelis who had personally lived through the horrific horror of the attack by Hamas on the 7th of October. More than 1,300 people slaughtered in Israel, including at least 32 American citizens. Scores of innocents, from infants to the elderly, grandparents, Israelis, and Americans, were taken hostage."

From the pragmatic point of view, the above extract is seen to include some form of impoliteness and implicature. In terms of impoliteness, the above extract is noticed to include a negative form of impoliteness which appears in the expression "the horrific horror of the attack by Hamas on the 7th of October". Biden is found to express his contempt of Hamas and accuses them of killing innocent people. Biden speaks of Hamas impolitely by accusing them of being terrorists who kill American citizens regardless of their age. He, however, thinks that Hamas does not have the right in their attack on the Zionist settlements and considers it a terrorist attack.

Regarding implicature, the above extract is believed to comprise a conversational form of implicature which is employed in the phrase "Scores of innocents from infants to the elderly, grandparents, Israelis, and Americans taken hostage." In this phrase, Biden conversationally implies that Hamas do not attack Israel as a political regime, nor do they want to defend their homeland. He, however, wants to say that Hamas is nothing more than a terrorist organisation that attacks the innocent people in Israel. Biden, moreover, implies that Hamas has killed, injured and kidnapped a number of American citizens, and this is a crime that they have to be punished for. Biden means that he, as the president of America, must act immediately to defend and save the American citizens everywhere around the world.

Extract (2)

"Like so many others, I'm heartbroken by the tragic loss of Palestinian life, including the explosion at the hospital in Gaza, which was not done by the Israelis. We mourn every innocent life lost. We can't ignore the humanity of innocent Palestinians who only want to live in peace and have an opportunity."

This extract is thought to have a pragmatic meaning which is constructed by the use of certain pragmatic aspects such as impoliteness and implicature. Regarding impoliteness, the extract is found to include an off-record form of impoliteness which is used in the expression "I'm heartbroken by the tragic loss of Palestinian life, including the explosion at the hospital in Gaza, which was not done by the Israelis." In this expression, Biden is found to exonerate Israel from the crime of attacking the hospital in Gaza and killing innocent children. He tries to show his sympathy with those innocent

Palestinian people who got killed in the attack on the hospital. That is to say, he speaks impolitely when he does not tell the truth and does not admit that it was the Israeli who attacked the hospital and killed those innocent people.

As far as implicature is concerned, the above extract is seen to encompass a conversational form of implicature which appears in the phrase "We can't ignore the humanity of innocent Palestinians who only want to live in peace and have an opportunity." Biden, in this expression, is noticed to conversationally imply that he stands with the Palestinian people and feels sorry for what happens to them in this war. This is a kind of hypocrisy where Biden publicly announces his support for the Zionists in their war in Gaza, and he surely knows that the Zionists are attacking Gaza, killing the people, including women and children, and preventing the aid deliveries from getting to Gaza. He knows that the Zionists are committing a genocide in the city, and yet he tries to exonerate them from the crimes they are committing against the unarmed civilians.

Extract (3)

"' Hamas' stated purpose for existing is the destruction of the state of Israel and the murder of Jewish people. Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people. Hamas uses Palestinian civilians as human shields, and innocent Palestinian families are suffering greatly because of them."

As far as the pragmatic meaning of the above extract is concerned, it is believed that it comprises some type of impoliteness and implicature. Concerning impoliteness, the extract is seen to include a negative form of impoliteness, which appears in the expression, "' Hamas' stated purpose for existing is the destruction of the state of Israel and the murder of Jewish people." Biden, in this expression, is seen to impolitely speak of Hamas and considers them as terrorists that intend to destroy Israel and kill the Jews. He does not respect the Palestinians' will in defending their homeland and does not admit that the Zionists are nothing more than invaders who have occupied the Palestinian cities. Biden is seen to give the right to the Zionists to attack Hamas and says that Hamas does not resemble the Palestinian people. He acts as if he has the right to decide who resembles Palestine and who does not.

Implicature is believed to have a basic role in constructing the pragmatic meaning of the above extract. The extract is found to contain a conversational form of implicature which is utilised in the expression " Hamas uses Palestinian civilians as human shields, and innocent Palestinian families are suffering greatly because of them." In this expression, Biden is assured to conversationally imply that the Zionists do not attack the Palestinians, but they attack Hamas, which he considers a terrorist organisation, but Hamas uses the civilians as human shields. Biden is seen to justify what the Zionists are doing in Gaza and gives them the excuse to do everything they want in their war against Hamas. Biden is realised to contradict himself where he sees that the Zionists' war in Gaza is justified, but Hamas's defence of their homeland is a crime that has to be dealt with.

4.2. Analysis of Presidential Speech (2)

This speech was delivered on 27 September 2024 at the UN General Assembly in New York,

4.2.1. Pragmatic Analysis of Netanyahu's Speech

Extract (1)

"To speak for my country, to speak for the truth. And here's the truth: Israel seeks peace. Israel yearns for peace. Israel has made peace and will make peace again. Yet we face savage enemies who seek our annihilation, and we must defend ourselves against them."

The pragmatic meaning of the above extract is constructed via using some pragmatic aspects, particularly impoliteness and implicature. In terms of the impoliteness strategies, the extract is noticed to include a negative form of impoliteness which is employed in the expression "Yet we face savage enemies who seek our annihilation, and we must defend ourselves against them." Netanyahu is seen to speak impolitely about Hamas by describing them as savage enemies who want to destroy Israel. In spite of the fact that the Zionists have been attacking Gaza, destroying everything in the city and killing the unarmed civilians, including women and children, yet they pretend to be seeking peace. Netanyahu speaks as if he is not responsible for the death of thousands of innocent children in Gaza.

Concerning implicature in the above extract, it is believed that the extract contains a conversational form of implicature which appears in the expression "Yet we face savage enemies who seek our annihilation, and we must defend ourselves against them." This expression conversationally implies that Netanyahu accuses Hamas of being the savage enemies of Israel. He wants to say that the Zionists have not attacked the Palestinians, killed the innocent people or destroyed the Palestinian cities. He pretends that the Zionists want nothing other than peace; they do not want to have war against anyone. He tries to convince his audience that Hamas is the only one who is responsible for this war in Gaza, which caused the death of the Zionists.

Extract (2)

"We're committed to removing the curse of terrorism that threatens all civilised societies. But to truly realise the blessing of a new Middle East, we must continue the path we paved with the Abraham Accords four years ago."

The above extract is found to include a pragmatic meaning which is based on certain pragmatic aspects such as impoliteness and implicature. Regarding impoliteness, the expression "we're committed to removing the curse of terrorism that threatens all civilised societies" is realised to comprise a bald on record impoliteness. Netanyahu is seen to directly speak of Hamas impolitely as being a terrorist cure for Israel. Netanyahu tries to exonerate the Zionists from any crime or terrorism in Gaza or any other Palestinian city, and yet he keeps accusing Hamas of being the direct threat to Israel. He justifies the Zionists acts in Gaza as being processes of self-defence, but he considers the processes of Hamas acts of terrorism.

As far as implicature is concerned in the above extract, the expression 'we're committed to removing the curse of terrorism that threatens all civilised societies' is noticed to include a conversational form of implicature. Netanyahu speaks the language of peace in front of the UN General Assembly to convince them of his false and unreliable claims concerning the war in Gaza. Netanyahu is seen to keep pretending that Israel does not want to have such a war against the city of Gaza, but they want to have a peaceful and prosperous

relationship with all their neighbouring countries. In fact, his speech conversationally implies that he tries to persuade the entire world that his administration is not an evil actor in the Middle East and does not want to cause any harm to any individual or any state. He, at the same time, wants to represent Hamas as the source of terrorism not only against Israel but against all humanity all around the world.

Extract (3)

"Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas. This is the man who claims he wants peace with Israel, yet he still refuses to condemn the horrific massacre of October 7th. He is still paying hundreds of millions to terrorists who murdered Israelis and Americans."

Pragmatically speaking, the above extract is found to encompass certain pragmatic aspects, including impoliteness and implicature. As far as impoliteness is concerned, the expression "He's still paying hundreds of millions to terrorists who murdered Israelis and Americans" is noticed to comprise a bald on record form of politeness. In this expression, Netanyahu publicly and directly accuses the Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas of being a supporter of the terrorists. Netanyahu claims that Abbas pays hundreds of millions to the terrorists who attack Israel and America. This means that Netanyahu does not have any good intention towards any Palestinian individual. In fact, he considers Israel as the source of peace and goodness and Palestine as the source of evil and terrorism which threatens the entire world.

Implicature is seen to have a vital role in constructing the pragmatic meaning of the above extract. The expression "This is the man who claims he wants peace with Israel, yet he still refuses to condemn the horrific massacre of October 7th" is believed to include a conventional form of implicature which is represented by the use of the word "yet". The expression, furthermore, is found to contain a conversational form of implicature. This expression conversationally implies that Netanyahu regards anyone who acts against his wish as an enemy; that is why he considers Abbas a supporter of the terrorists. Netanyahu wants to show that not only Hamas, which is an enemy of Israel, but the entirety of Palestine, including their administration, represents a direct threat for America and Israel.

5. Discussion of Results

The pragmatic analysis of President Biden's and Prime Minister Netanyahu's speeches reveals a systematic use of impoliteness strategies and implicature to construct ideologically loaded political narratives. Across both speeches, negative impoliteness, bald on-record impoliteness, and off-record strategies are recurrently employed to delegitimize opposing actors, particularly Hamas and, by extension, Palestinian political representation, while legitimizing Israeli military actions.

In Biden's speech, negative impoliteness is predominantly used to portray Hamas as morally reprehensible and illegitimate through lexical choices that emphasize brutality, terrorism, and the killing of innocents. This strategy functions to erode any political or resistance-based framing of Hamas and to justify U.S. political and military intervention. Simultaneously, Biden's use of conversational implicature allows him to imply U.S. moral authority and responsibility, particularly through references to American victims, without explicitly stating policy intentions. This indirectness enables strategic ambiguity, allowing expressions of sympathy toward Palestinians to coexist with explicit political and military support for Israel.

Notably, Biden's off-record impoliteness in discussing the Gaza hospital incident illustrates how pragmatic ambiguity is employed to absolve Israel of responsibility while maintaining an appearance of humanitarian concern. This dual discourse creates an ideological tension between expressed empathy and implied political alignment, revealing a pragmatic contradiction that reflects broader geopolitical interests rather than neutral humanitarian positioning.

Similarly, Netanyahu's speech demonstrates a more direct and confrontational pragmatic style. Bald on-record and negative impoliteness strategies are extensively used to categorise Hamas, and, at times, Palestinian leadership as a whole, as terrorists and existential threats. This framing is reinforced through conversational implicatures that consistently present Israeli military actions as defensive, necessary, and morally justified, while erasing or minimising Palestinian civilian suffering. The repeated use of evaluative terms such as "savage," "curse of terrorism," and

“annihilation” serves to morally polarise the conflict into a binary opposition of civilisation versus barbarism.

Furthermore, Netanyahu’s use of conventional implicature, particularly through contrastive markers like yet, functions to undermine the credibility of Palestinian leadership by implying hypocrisy and bad faith. This strategy pragmatically constructs a narrative in which any Palestinian political actor opposing Israeli policy is implicitly aligned with terrorism, thereby delegitimizing Palestinian political agency on an international stage.

Overall, the findings indicate that both leaders strategically exploit pragmatic mechanisms to shape audience interpretation, justify political stances, and manage international perception. Impoliteness and implicature are not incidental but central rhetorical tools in political conflict discourse.

6. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that pragmatic strategies, specifically impoliteness and implicature play a crucial role in the political discourse of both Joe Biden and Benjamin Netanyahu. The analysis shows that these leaders systematically employ pragmatic devices to legitimize Israeli actions, delegitimize Hamas, and frame the Gaza conflict in morally asymmetrical terms. While Biden relies more on indirectness and strategic ambiguity through conversational implicature, Netanyahu adopts a more explicit and confrontational approach using bald on-record and negative impoliteness.

Despite differences in rhetorical style, both speeches converge pragmatically in portraying Israel as a victim acting in self-defence and in representing Hamas, and, implicitly, Palestinian political structures, as the primary source of violence and instability. This convergence highlights how political power is exercised through language, where pragmatic choices serve ideological functions rather than neutral communication.

In conclusion, the study confirms that pragmatic analysis is an effective tool for uncovering hidden meanings, power relations, and ideological biases in political speeches, particularly in contexts of conflict where language functions as a form of political action rather than mere representation.

References:-

- Aron, L. (2015). How to change Putin's mind. The Wall Street Journal, 11, 15. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/how-to-change-putins>.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Sorensen, C., (2010). Introduction to research in education. Wadsworth.
- Batou, J. (2015). Putin, the war in Ukraine, and the far right. New Politics, 15(3), 62-67. Retrieved from <http://newpol.org>
- Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in interaction. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Charles W. (2002). Introducing English semantics. London and New York.
- Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing political discourse. Routledge.
- Coyle, J. (2008). Why political leaders' speech matter. Toronto Star.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 99, no. 1 (2007): 103-115.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show. Sage.
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalized impoliteness formulae. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 99, no. 1 (2007): 103-115.
- Culpeper, J. (2011a). Impoliteness: Using language to offend. Sage.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2011). The sage handbook of qualitative research. University of Illinois.
- Dyorina, N.V., Savinova, T.A., Zalavina, T.Yu., Zerkina, N.N., Kisel, O.V., Bosik, G.A., Polyakova, L.S., Yuzhakova, Yu.V., Suvorova, E.V. & Savinova, Yu. A. (2017). Multi-Discursive Space: the Word, the Text, the Communication. Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, 2017. Available at: <http://catalog.inforeg.ru/inet/GetEzineByID/317268>.
- Eelen, G. (2001). A critique of politeness theories. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. Harvard University Press.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Haug, V. (2007). Pragmatics, Oxford University Press.
- Lilleker, D. (2006). Key concepts in political communication. Sage Publications.
- Lindsay, J. M. (2024). Ten Most Significant World Events in 2024
<https://www.cfr.org/article/ten-most-significant-world-events-2024> December 23, 2024 5:33 pm (EST)
- Levinson, S. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

- McFaul, M., Mearsheimer, J. J. and Sestanovich, S. (2014). Faulty powers: Who started the Ukraine crisis? Foreign Affairs, 93(6). Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com>.
- Mullany, L. (2008). Stop hassling me! Impoliteness, power, and gender identity. Blackwell.
- Nakhilawi, H. A. M. (2016). Ethnosemantic, pragmatic, and textual analysis of kinship terms in Arabic and English discourse. Doctorate Thesis. University of Sains Malaysia.
- Neama, I. M. (2025). A pragma-semiotic analysis of persecution in the language of selected American newspapers on the Iranian protests after Mahsa Amini's crisis". International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Sciences. December 26,2023.9:11:17
- Orthaber, S. (2017). Impoliteness at a Slovenian call centre. Blackwell.
- Strauss, S., & Feiz, P. (2014). Discourse analysis: putting our worlds into worlds. Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. I. Wenden (Eds), Language and Peace (pp. 17-36). Aldershot.
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
- Yuzhakova, Y. V. and Polyakova, L. S. (2018). Ethnic stereotypes in English political Discourse. Philological science. The Theory and Practice, № 7-1(85), 199-202.