A Critical Discourse Analysis of Power Dynamics in South Africa vs. Israel Case in the International Court of Justice

Eaman Yaseen Thabit   **Afaf Sami Salih**

Department of English/College of Education for Women/University of Anbar/Iraq

emanty@uoanbar.edu.iq   sami.afaf@uoanabr.edu.iq

Abstract

This paper explores the influence of specific linguistic choices on the power dynamics established in the discourse of South Africa's case on 29 December 2023 and Israel's text on 17 May 2024 in the International Court of Justice (ICJ). Critical Discourse Analysis investigates how language is employed as a tool for contesting, negotiating, and asserting power. Although political speeches participate in shaping public opinions and discourse, there is a lack of adequate understanding regarding specific linguistic strategies employed by political leaders to establish and reinforce power dynamics. Therefore, this study attempts to bridge this gap by providing answers for questions like: What linguistic strategies do South Africa and Israel employ to assert their authority and legitimacy? How do certain rhetorical devices function to influence political ideologies? And finally, why do South Africa and Israel employ these linguistic markers?

Drawing on the discourse as text dimension of Fairclough's (1995) Three-Dimensional Model and using a qualitative and quantitative method, the study aims at extracting the linguistic choices that represent power dynamics in the discourse in question. The study findings show that South Africa used declarative negative sentences as a subtle strategy within its framework of polite language to emphasize control and domination maintaining indirectness and social harmony. On the other hand, Israel's used long and indirect sentences and many impolite expressions.

Keywords: Power dynamics, CDA, linguistic markers, Fairclough's model.

تحليل نقديٌّ للخطابِ لديناميكياتِ القوة فيْ قضية جنوبِ أَفريقيا ضد إسرائيل فيْ محكمة العَدل الدولية

إيمان ياسين ثابت   **عفاف سامي صالح**

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/كلية التربية للبنات/جامعة الانبار/العراق

المستخلص

يهدف البحث إلى استكشاف تأثير خيارات لغوية محددة على ديناميكيات القوة التي ترسخت في خطاب قضية جنوب إفريقيا في ٢٩ ديسمبر ٢٠٢٣ ونص إسرائيل في ١٧ مايو ٢٠٢٤ في محكمة العدل الدولية. يبحث تحليل الخطاب النقدي في كيفية استخدام اللغة أداة للتنافس والتفاوض وتأكيد القوة. على الرغم من أن الخطابات السياسية تساهم في تشكيل الرأي العام والخطاب، إلا أن هناك نقصاً في الفهم الكافي للإستراتيجيات اللغوية المحددة التي يستخدمها القادة السياسيون لإنشاء ديناميكيات القوة وتعزيزها. لذلك، تحاول هذه الدراسة سد هذه الفجوة بتقديم إجابات لأسئلة مثل: ما هي الإستراتيجيات اللغوية التي تستخدمها كل من جنوب إفريقيا وإسرائيل لتأكيد سلطتهما وشرعيتهما؟ كيف تعمل بعض الأدوات البلاغية على التأثير على الأيديولوجيات السياسية؟ وأخيراً، لماذا تستخدم جنوب

16

إفريقيا وإسرائيل هذه العلامات اللغوية؟ بالاعتماد على الخطاب بوصفه بعدا نصيا في نموذج فيركلوف ثلاثي الأبعاد (١٩٩٥)، وباستخدام منهج نوعي وكمي، وتهدف الدراسة إلى استخلاص الخيارات اللغوية التي تُمثل ديناميكيات القوة في الخطاب المعني. من بين هذه الخيارات استخدام أفريقيا للجمل السلبية التقريرية إستراتيجية خفية في إطار لغتها المهذبة لتأكيد السيطرة والهيمنة، بالإضافة إلى الحفاظ على الغموض والتناغم الاجتماعي. من ناحية أخرى، استخدمت إسرائيل جملًا طويلة وغير مباشرة، وكثيرًا من التعبيرات غير المهذبة.

الكلمات الدالة: ديناميكيات القوة، تحليل نقدي للخطاب، اختيارات لغوية، نموذج فيركلاف

1.Introduction

Language is generally accepted as the basic humans' means of communication through which they can express their needs, feelings, opinions and thoughts. Certainly, the language employed to express thoughts and attitudes demonstrates certain ideologies and power relations among different social groups or classes fulfilling specific goals of communication. Hence, the role of language cannot be denied in politics and political discourse since it is used as "a tool to shape and manipulate realities."[1]

The present study conducts a CDA on the International Court of Justice's (ICJ) case of South Africa vs. Israel. On December 2023, South Africa filed an application instituting proceeding against Israel before the ICJ concerning alleged violations by Israel of its obligations under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in relation to Palestinians in Gaza Strip. Oral hearings were held on 11 and 12 January 2024, and the Court delivered its Order on the Request for the indication of provisional measures on 26 January.

The study has investigated the linguistic or lexical choices each party of the court's case used to reveal its ideologies and then to explore who has more linguistic power dynamics within the court's hall. This is done by using Fairclough's (1995)Model of Discourse Analysis. Due to the lack of social practices in the ICJ 's hall, the study is restricted only to the first dimension of Fairclough's three-dimensional framework. The two court texts- South Africa's on 29 December 2023 and Israel's on 17 May 2024- extracted from the ICJ recorded documents that are accessible online-Website X, YouTube and LinkedIn- are subjected to a critical discourse analysis based on Fairclough's model. The researchers focus on how the Court's rulings, as well as the decisions of all the states that make up the ICJ court, have affected by the power dynamics that each of these two nations has used to alter language cues in order to gain the support they desire. By identifying the underlying ideologies and power dynamics that have impacted the Court of Justice's handling of the South Africa v. Israel case through this critical discourse analysis, the study aims to shed light on the complex and largely controversial nature of international law.

Generally, the study of discourse is concerned with language, language use, personal communication, and political phenomena. According to Wood, discourse analysis finds out hidden ideologies and relations between text and people [2]. It investigates the text and power relations within, between, and behind the linguistic constructions. CDA is an approach that analyzes the text by breaking it into chunks. It investigates written and spoken texts to reveal hidden relations and ideologies among the parties of power

dominance, racism and inequality[3]. It addresses how texts are organized and restructured within social, political, and historical settings.

In order to study the ICJ's texts from a CDA perspective, the researchers tend to investigate the texts' lexical items, their frequency, and the cohesive devices that would ultimately show the power dynamics employed to serve the two parties' objectives in the ICJ court.

2.1 Historical Background of South Africa Vs. Israel Relations

The complicated relationship between South Africa and Israel began in 1947 when South Africa supported the UN Partition Plan to establish Israel. South Africa recognized Israel de jure in 1949, and formal diplomatic relations were established with it. Only in 1972, however, did South Africa have a formal diplomatic representative in Israel. In 1976, South Africa and Israel signed a cooperation deal, establishing a close connection that lasted for over forty years. This involved cooperation in the areas of military affairs, intelligence, and nuclear weapons development, which South Africa held until 1991 when it deliberately decided to destroy the weapons[4]. Additionally, Israel assisted South Africa in evading restrictions, particularly those imposed by the UN on the sales of munitions [5].

In 1987, Israel announced that it would not sign new military contracts with South Africa and would curtail cultural, diplomatic, and tourist relations. It also imposed economic sanctions on South Africa, including bans on new investments, governmental, scientific, and cultural exchanges. In 1991, Israel lifted its sanctions on South Africa, and the two countries had normalized relations.

In 1994, the year that South Africa had its first democratic election, Nelson Mandela was elected president. Mandela stated his desire to end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and put the apartheid- era and the relationship between South Africa and Israel-South behind seeking a resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian issue.

In 2004, South Africa criticized the construction of the Israeli wall in the West Bank and supported the Palestinian cause in the International Court. In 2012, the African National Congress made an official decision to support the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign. In 2018, South Africa withdrew its ambassador from Israel to protest "the indiscriminate and grave manner of the latest Israeli attack"[6] of Gaza border. Therefore, in 2019, South Africa downgraded its relationship with Israel over the killing of Gazan protesters[6]. In 2023, a lawsuit is filed against Israel in the International Court of Justice on charges of committing genocide against the Palestinians.

2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis

As a term, discourse is broadly used to refer to a range of topics in various different disciplines. Hinkel and Fotos argues that "Discourse in context may consist of only one or two words as in *stop* or *no smoking*. Alternatively, a piece of discourse can be hundreds of thousands of words in length, as some novels are. A typical piece of discourse is somewhere between these two extremes,"[7].

In social sciences discourse does not only involve words or phrases individuals use, but also how these words or phrases are used to convey meanings, express ideas, and engage with others. It is the way in which language is used socially to convey broad historical meanings. Language is identified by the social conditions of its use, by who is

using it and under what conditions. As such, "Language can never be 'neutral' because it bridges our personal and social worlds,"[8]. Related to this, Ogden states that: "Within social science...discourse is mainly used to describe verbal reports of individuals. In particular, discourse is analyzed by those who are interested in language and talk and what people are doing with their speech."[9]

Traditionally, studying discourse means analyzing the use of spoken or written language in a social context. Hence, discourse analysis is used to describe a number of approaches to analyze written, spoken language use "beyond the word, clause, phrase, sentence that is needed for successful communication" [10].

Discourse analysis involves two eminent approaches: language-in-use and socio-political. The former of these methodologies is concerned with language and the interplay between language and social context. It exists usually in the various fields of linguistics and literature studies, and seldom used in social and human sciences [10],[11]. The latter approach is mainly used within the social and human sciences and concerned with how language forms influence the social context. The socio- political approach is often found in the social and applied sciences wherein two frameworks can be manipulated including: Foucualdian discourse analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis[10],[12],[11]. CDA is elaborated depending on the critique of power highlighted by Foucault who takes it a step further.

CDA is mainly concerned with investigating how language can be used in different social contexts enacting, producing and resisting types and levels of social power dominance, inequality and social abuse. As a social practice, language implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s), and social structure(s) which frame it. The main objective of CDA is to make a change of "the existing social reality in which discourse is related in particular ways to other social elements such as power relations, ideologies, economic and political strategies and policies"[13]. Fundamentally,CDA explores ways in which language works within institutional and political discourses in order to reveal inequalities in social relationships. One important goal of CDA is, therefore, to establish a framework of analysis that can be used as a means for people who are suffering against oppression and domination in its linguistic forms. "CDA takes a particular interest in the relationship between language and power …and considers more or less overt relations of struggle and conflict"[14].

The principal interest of CDA is to focus on aspects like social problems and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions. A critical analysis of social problems is generally versatile in the sense that it operates and contributes to various disciplines. CDA comprises studies from a wide range of perspectives and methods in discourse studies to analyze the relationship between language and power. It doesn't only describe discourse structures, but it attempts to define them in terms of properties of social interaction and social structure. This multidisciplinary type of analysis tries to shed light on the ways relations of dominance, inequality, and power can be enacted, legitimated and reproduced through the use of language in different contexts.

According to Van Dijk, the intensive emphasis of CDA is "on the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance."[3, 283]. Thus, its focus is on the role of

discourse in dominance particularly referring to social power enacted by elites and institutions who produce and practice social and political inequality through discursive forms. For this, it is proposed that the main job of a CDA is to focus on social structures and discursive strategies that play a role in the (re)production of power [3]. Discourse, according to Fairclough, is shaped by social structure and culture [15]. In addition, he suggested three tenets of analysis including:

1. social structure (class, social status, age, ethnic identity and gender)
2. culture (accepted norms and behaviors of a society)
3. discourse (the words/language we use)

3. Power Dynamics & Linguistic Markers of Power

'Power dynamics' describes the ways in which power is distributed and exercised within a particular context or relationship. This term involves understanding who holds power, how it is used, and how it shifts over time [16]. Power dynamics can be seen in various contexts, including social, political, and organizational settings. They encompass a broad range of interactions and power relationships, the linguistic markers of power represent a subset of these dynamics, focusing specifically on how language influences and reflects power. This paper deals with power dynamics in political context, in particular; the ICJ context in the case of South Africa vs. Israel.

Power is "a set of resources and actions which are available to speakers and which can be used more or less successfully depending on who the speakers are and what kind of speech situation they are in" [17]. Power is interpreted as a "discursive control that has access to the various types of discourse, who can and talk to whom, in which situations, and about what. The more powerful the people, the larger their verbal possibilities in discourse become" [17].

The two expressions "power in discourse" and "power behind discourse," can be used to explain how power is related to discourse [16],[18]. "Power in discourse" means that discourse is a site wherein power is exercised and power relations are enacted. For example, powerful participants may use various devices to constrain the contributions of the less powerful ones in face-to-face social interactions. "Power behind discourse" means that the organization of discourses (including their genres, conventions, and standards) is regulated by institutional order and power relations. CDA scholars have produced a large body of research on the strategies of exercising power in their analyses of media discourse, judicial, and political discourse, particularly in relation to racism.

It seems worthy to mention that the terms 'power dynamics' and 'linguistic markers of power' are related but not identical. Linguistic markers of power focus mainly on how language reflects, reinforces, or challenges power relationships. These markers include specific ways of speaking, language choices, speech patterns, and discourse strategies that signal someone's power or social status. For example, using formal language versus informal language, can be seen as linguistic markers of power. They are language features or behaviors that are used by individuals to assert authority, dominance, or influence in communication. These markers can vary across different contexts and cultures, some common examples include:

1. Vocabulary: The use of specialized terminology or language relevant to a particular field or domain can indicate expertise and authority.
2. Complexity and Precision: Power often manifests in the ability to articulate thoughts precisely. Complex sentence structures, certain vocabulary, and expressions that can convey intelligence and authority.
3. Directness and Assertion: Those in power tend to communicate with confidence and assertiveness. They may use declaratives or direct questions to assert control over conversation.
4. Politeness and Formality: politeness strategies and formal language can be used to establish authority. This includes using titles, formal address (e.g., "Sir/Madam"), and deferential language to acknowledge hierarchical positions.

This study will trace and investigate the linguistic markers of power that represent the power dynamics in discourse.

4. Data Analysis

CDA focuses on the variation and relationships between society and power, which is often embedded in the social context, as well as its interest in revealing power relations and ideologies underlying social contexts. Norman Fairclough's (1995) Model of Discourse Analysis consists of three dimensions: text, discourse practice, and social and cultural practice. In the textual dimension, Fairclough studied the relationship between words and analyzed representation and relationships within the text. In this study, the researchers conduct only the textual CDA of the case before ICJ of South Africa vs. Israel to identify who has more linguistic power dynamics.

4.1. Discourse as Text

According to Fairclough' Three-Dimensional Model, 'Discourse as text' represents the first dimension that is concerned with the textual features of the communicative piece of language. In this way, discourse can be looked for as a spoken or written exchange with particular linguistic and structural properties integrated to its meaning. Considering discourse as text, the analysis below will focus on particular aspects like the textual feature of the language including vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure.

4.1.1 Vocabulary

Any text can be analyzed in terms of certain levels like semantic, syntactic, morphological, and cohesion [16]. The words used in the two texts i.e. South Africa case and Israel case show experiential values and themes in themselves. Any word that can be identified directly in the text is known as ideologically contested. Table 1. shows the most frequent words which reflect the themes of the two texts.

Table 1. Word list of the most frequent words in speech

Lexical words of South Africa case	No of frequency	Lexical words of Israel case	No of frequency
Israel	47	Israel	60
Gaza	37	Gaza	29
Palestinian(s)	33	Palestinian(s)	8
Genocide/ genocidal	15	Genocide/ genocidal	23
Killing	15	Hamas	38

Convention	9	Rafah	20
Bomb(ing)	9	Hostages	12
Displacement	4	Armed conflict	10
Provisions	5	Terrorist	8
Destruction	4	Protect(ion)	3
Necessary	3	Captivity	3
Committ(ed)	5	Some	3

From the word list of the African text, it is clear that what is most important for South Africa is the Palestinian suffering in Gaza which is caused by Israel. The massive killing of civilians in Gaza is considered as a genocidal act that requires provisional measures from the ICJ.

The most frequent words in Israel's text emphasize the safety of Israel itself portraying the genocidal acts upon Palestinians as mere protection of Israelis' innocent citizens. Israel focuses on Hamas as their first enemy who is sacrificing people in Gaza and Rafah to protect its safety. The Israelis hostages represent the powerful pretext in captivity of terrorist Hamas. Israel commits what is called "some" armed conflict (instead of war or genocidal acts) upon its enemy represented by Hamas only faraway from innocent civilians whom it is irresponsible of their safety.

Overall, the table suggests a dynamic in which South Africa focused on Gaza and Palestinians, while Israel focused on giving pretexts to protect Israelis from Hamas more specifically, and the broader context of the conflict. This discrepancy in word frequency may provide insights into the different viewpoints and priorities of the two parties involved.

4.1.2 Cohesion

Cohesion deals with the techniques used to make a link between the components of the sentence. So, rewording, synonyms, antonyms, demonstrating and personal references, function and lexical words and passive voice are used in the texts to enhance cohesion. Examples of rewording in South Africa text are: 'conduct' - 'genocide', 'killing'-'killed', 'Palestinians'-'Gazans', 'civilians', etc. Rewording from Israel's text as: 'the reality'-'the opposite', 'again and again', ' Israeli citizens', 'hostages', 'no genocide'-'armed conflict', etc. These words reflect each side political ideologies that they seek to enforce their discourse.

The main semantic relations in any text are synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy. Synonyms have similar meanings that can be substituted with a little difference. Synonyms in South Africa case as: transgressed, violated, unnecessary, impossible, displacement, evacuation, wounded and maimed are some of the synonyms used to point out its specific ideology defending Palestinian safety. Israel use of synonyms as: conceal, ignores, Hamas, Terrorists, protection, safety, inversion of reality, lie, divorced from the facts, etc. which are also reflecting itself-defense ideologies. Hyponymy is a semantic relation where a particular word is related to a more generic word or class. Examples from the African case: Gaza- Rafah- Palestine, suffering – physical – mental- hunger, dehydration and starvation. Hyponyms from Israel case as: war – armed conflict-struggle- defense, Israelis- hostages – innocent victims, Terrorists – hostilities - Hamas – Gaza –Rafah, etc. Antonyms stand for opposition; in Africa text: joyfully detonating,

deprived of lifesaving medical care, supplies, etc. The Israel antonyms as: law or justice, baseless claims, Palestinians and Israelis, and most importantly this example: 'Armed conflict is not a synonym for genocide' which summarizes all it case. The texts of the speeches have inside references by using anaphoric references and demonstrative pronouns as Table 2. next illustrates.

Table 2. Demonstrative and Anaphoric References

South Africa	Israel
"This conduct renders essentials to life unobtainable"	"This case … suggests an inversion of reality"
"this limited aid while bombs fall"	"This notification came as a great surprise"
"This killing is nothing short of destruction of Palestinian life"	"That proved impossible"
"It was clearly calculated to bring about the destruction of the population"	"that these basic facts must once again be stated in this Great Hall"
"It is inflicted deliberately"	"the reality is exactly the opposite"
"it is clear that at least some if not all of these acts fall within the Convention's provisions"	"the fact remains that the city of Rafah also serves as a military stronghold for Hamas"
"That care is simply not available."	"It is an inherent right afforded to Israel"

Each case refers to what is considered most important to be properly mentioned. These anaphoric references reflect each side political and social ideologies. Both are presenting their referents with suitable claims.

Table 3. Use of Pronouns

South Africa Personal Pronouns	No	South Africa Possessive Pronouns	No.	Israel Personal Pronouns	No.	Israel Possessive Pronouns	No.
I	4	My	1	I	11	My	1
We	4	Our	1	We	36	Our	7
You	2	Their	5	You	10	Their	16
They	10			They	16		

In each speech text, 'I' indicates the speaker's dominance over the audience while 'we' shows the inclusive tendency and sense of intimacy. In Table 3; South Africa used 'I' only (4 times) leaving the dominance to the ICJ, unlike Israel which used 'I' (11 times) in order to assert its dominance on others. Nonetheless, this individualistic style is intentionally equilibrated by the use of the plural inclusive pronoun "we", which lessens the assertive self-representation by calling down a sense of democratic contribution. Israel's high frequency use of 'We' in which it includes itself within the victimized state or within the other states' members of the ICJ. Israel's use of possessive pronouns as 'their' (16 times) represents an attempt to gain all possible sympathy for the Israelis citizens victimized in Israel.

Simile is a stylistic device that links similar things or ideas by saying that something is like or as something else. It is used once by South Africa to gain the support of the ICJ to declare provisional measures against Israel when it referred to the previous decision of

the ICJ in the Gambia-Myanmar case: "In the Gambia-Myanmar case, this court did not hesitate to impose provisional measures in relation to allegations that Myanmar was committing genocidal acts against the Rohingya within the Rakhine state."

Moreover, Israel used simile as a persuasive strategy where it claimed false all South Africa's claims and that this war is not like genocide "These allegations levelled at Israel are patently untrue and emphatically denied. Like many of the claims in South Africa's Application and Requests,"- "This war, like all wars, is tragic and terrible for Israelis and Palestinians, and it has exacted a terrible human price. But it is not genocide"

4.1.3 Tense

Fairclough's (1995) exact arrangements of grammatical features help to introduce an ideology through words and deal with different types of processes and participants in the text. The current two texts are combinations of tenses. Present and past tenses are dominant in the speech, showing the speaker's authority and control over the audience by keeping the current present and past events. It also has a broader collection of sentences such as SVO (which involves two participants and shows actions), SV (involves just one participant which is the subject and deals with events and it is called intransitive), and SVC (takes one participant, verb and attribution for the same participant).

Table 4. Types of sentences

South Africa	Type	Israel
"South Africa contends that Israel has transgressed article 2 of the convention"	SVO	"This case, …suggests an inversion of reality."
"Israel deployed 6,000 bombs"	SVO	"Israel received notification"
"Israel has killed an unparalleled and unprecedented number of civilians"	SVO	"Israel was preparing its written observations"
"Israel's attacks have left close to 60,000 Palestinians wounded and maimed"	SVOC	"Calling something a genocide… does not make it genocide."
"Palestinians in Gaza are being killed"	SV	"The equality of the parties and the administration of justice have been severely undermined."
"The first Genocidal act … is the mass killing of Palestinians in Gaza"	SVC	"Israel is engaged in an intense armed conflict with a ruthless jihadist terrorist organization"
"They are also at immediate risk of death by starvation"	SVC	"Israel is acutely aware of the large number of civilians that are concentrated in Rafah."
"There is nowhere safe for them to flee too"	SVC	"It is under attack"
"the level of Israel's killing is so extensive that nowhere is safe in Gaza"	SVC	"Rafah in particular is a focal point for ongoing terrorist activity"
"there have been acute shortages of clothes, bedding, blankets and critical non-food items"	SVC	"I am compelled to restate once again that there is a tragic war going on But this is no genocide"

Israel is mostly using SVC type of sentences which have intensive verbs that describe the subject or identify it with a noun phrase or an adverb. By this type of sentences, Israel is trying to portray itself as being attacked from terrorists and is only defending itself

24

without committing any genocidal acts. While South Africa's use of SVC type of sentences is deliberately intended to describe the difficult situation of Palestinians, how Israel violated all legal and human rules in Gaza.

Table 5.1 Types of Process in South Africa's case

Processes	Example Sentences	No. of frequency
Material	"These bombs have also decimated the north, including refugee camps"	66
Relational	"The level of killing is so extensive"	26
Mental	"The devastation, we submit is intended"	13
Existential	"There is nowhere safe for them to flee too"	5
Verbal	"The Special Rapporteur to the Human Rights of Internally Displace Person explains that Housing and infrastructure "have been razed to the ground,"	8
Behavioural	None	0

Table 5.2 Types of Process in Israel's case

Processes	Example Sentences	No. of frequency
Material (positive)	"the dates fixed by the Court significantly impacted Israel's ability"	78
Material (negative)	"Repeating a lie does not make it true"	4
Relational(positive)	"Rafah in particular is a focal point for ongoing terrorist activity"	24
Relational(negative)	"Israel is engaged in a war it did not want and did not start"	27
Mental	"Israel expects that the Court will appreciate the predicament"	23
Existential	"there has not been "a large-scale assault" on Rafah"	6
Verbal	"They have vowed to try and repeat the atrocities of 7 October 2023 many times"	25
Behavioural	"Israel's Co-Agents have nonetheless travelled to appear at this hearing"	6

From the tables above, one can notice the high frequency use of material process verbs which denote doing actions usually expressed by a verb expressing some action, either abstract or concrete. The two states are using material process in an attempt to accuse each other of previously mentioned accusations. In Israel's text, there are negative use of material process and relational process in contrast to their absence in South Africa's text, where it tries to abandon being doing any crimes against Gazans, or it has no relation to genocidal acts.

4.1.4 Mood

Mood is the speaker's attitude in conversation, where the speaker can declare, give orders and ask something about facts or reality. In the two sample speech cases, the declarative mood is used excessively, especially negative declarative sentences and there are only three grammatical questions in Israel's text, and few imperatives.

Table 6.1 Examples of mood in South Africa's Case

Mood	Sentential Examples
Imperative	1- "It is not necessary for the court to come to a final view on the question of whether Israel's conduct constitutes genocide. It is necessary to establish only whether at least some of the acts alleged are capable of falling within the provision of the convention."
	2-"The fighting must stop"
Declarative (positive sentences)	1-"The actions show a systematic pattern of conduct from which genocide can be inferred"
	2- "Israel continues to exercise control over the space, territorial waters, land crossings, water, electricity, electromagnetic sphere, and civilian infrastructure in Gaza"
Declarative (negative sentences)	1-"Nothing will stop the suffering except an order from this court."
	2- "Without an indication of provisional measures, the atrocities will continue"
Interrogative	No use at all for interrogative sentences

Observing the types of mood used in the speech of South Africa indicates a strong standpoint by using indirect imperative mood. Vividly, indirect imperative mood is used by South Africa in order to avoid looking apparently overbearing control over others when using direct imperative. The use of indirect imperative in sentences like "It is not necessary for the court to come to a final view on the question of whether Israel's conduct constitutes genocide. It is necessary to establish only whether at least some of the acts alleged are capable of falling within the provision of the convention." helps the speaker construct the speech in a more diplomatic and polite way. People who are in positions of power authority often use polite language in order to indirectly affirm control and, to a certain extent, maintain positive interaction and mutual consideration. Therefore, politeness, here, is used as a tool for gaining control and domination in an indirect and subtle way. This way enhances South Africa's position and reinforces its authority in a way that doesn't come off as rude or authoritarian.

Seemingly, even the declarative negative sentences can be viewed as having indirect imperative flavor. In the sentence "Nothing will stop the suffering except an order from this court.", the negative notion is expressed through the use of "Nothing" which clearly implies the absence of any way to put an end to the Palestinians' agony but an order from the International Court of Justice. Exclusivity and position are emphasized in this sentence because it conceptualizes the International Court of Justice as the only decision-maker. In this way, language is employed as a power strategy based on authority and finality and as a controlling dynamic which confirms South Africa's control over the issue under discussion.

The negative declarative mood appears in another sentence- "Without an indication of provisional measures, the atrocities will continue". The prepositional phrase beginning with "without" presents a reasoning behind the consistency of Israel's brutality. It tells what will happen if the condition of indicating the provisional measures isn't practically realized. In this context, the sentence is used by South Africa as an attempt to persuade or influence the court members to indicate the provisional measures in order to avoid more

additional" atrocities". Avoiding to look forceful, South Africa tries to appeal to the court's members rationality and consideration of the probable consequences by adhering to an effective approach in order to convince the listeners rather than directly command them. Similarly, the sentence focuses on the inevitability of the problem continuing if the provisional measures are not indicated.

In the two mentioned sentences South Africa reinforces the significance of "an order from this court" and "an indication of provisional measures" using different power dynamics; the first is determinative and controlling, and the second is informing and persuading based on obvious repercussions. The sentences are clear and direct. There's no ambiguity in what South Africa is stating; only " an indication of provisional measures" and "an order" from the court can put an end for the Palestinians. In this sense, no room is left for misunderstanding south Africa's suggested solutions.

Absence of interrogative mood indicates that South Africa doesn't need to ask any question since all information is certain and reliable. There is a considerable use of positive and negative declarative sentences in this text. It is remarkable to note that the ideology behind using positive sentences is that the speaker does not want to involve obscure or non- assertive language.

Table 6.2 Examples of mood in Israel's Case

Mood	Sentential Examples
Imperative	1-"these basic facts must once again be stated in this Great Hall."
	2- "Words must retain their meaning."
Declarative (positive sentences)	1- "It is under attack and fighting to defend itself and its citizens."
	2- "More than 130 children, women and men, including the sick and elderly, have now been held in Gaza for *224 days*, incommunicado and in inhumane conditions"
	3- "This is an unthinkable outcome that would tell Israeli citizens and the hostages that they are not deserving of protection, of life itself"
Declarative (negative sentences)	1- "Repeating a lie does not make it true." 2- "We do not wish harm to these civilians,"
	3- "The regrettable result is that Israel is not represented today by its chosen team of counsel and advocates."
Interrogative	1-"Does Israel face complex operational challenges in Gaza?" 2- "And can we imagine a court of law telling a State that the law prevents it from defending itself from attack?" 3- "At what point do we say enough to South Africa's repeated attempts to exploit the provisional measures procedure of this Court in such a vile and cynical manner?"

It is obvious from these examples that Israel is trying in all available moods to state its innocent actions towards Palestinians. Israel is just defending the safety of Israel's hostages who are very few in number and are still alive in contrast to vast number of Palestinian causalities. In the sentence "these basic facts must once again be stated in this Great Hall.", necessity and obligation are expressed through the use of "must" which indicates a sense of high urgency and recommendation. Thus, Israel discloses both authority and command despite the fact that the sentence is not constructed as direct

imperative. It tries to assert the importance of stating the basic facts in the Great Hall rather than directly ordering others to do that. Here, the phrase "once again" suggests stateing these "basic facts" was precedingly essential and it is so now. Additionally, Israel uses the sentence **"Words must retain their meaning."** which represents the **indicative mood** due to its declarative nature. The modal verb **"must"** implies **necessity** or **obligation**, but the mood is still indicative because Israel, here, is presenting it as a factual assertion about what words are required to retain, rather than giving a direct command. The tone is authoritative, implying that retaining words' meaning is essential, but it isn't an explicit order i.e. imperative. It claims that South Africa's words are only lies and they should retain their meaning. In the interrogative mood, Israel is asking three superficial questions which are implicitly being answered. These questions only mock the whole case in court.

4.**1. 5 Modality**

   The concept presents two types of modality: relational (showing the level of authority) and expressive (deals with the probability of truth). Modal verbs are: can, could, shall, should, may, might, must, ought to, will, would, etc. These show the relation of ability and degree of probability to speaker or writer authority and ideological interests and deal with the suggestion, advice, possibility, obligation, necessity, capability, and probability. The use of must, can, and would shows the solidarity between the speaker and participants [13]. A glance at table 7. shows the amount of solidarity that Israel has over all parties and states.

Table 7. Relational and Expressive Modality

Sample	Relational	Frequency	Expressive	Frequency
South Africa	Shall	None	Will	5
	Must	1	Would	1
	Should	None	Can	2
	May	1	Could	2
	Relational	Frequency	Expressive	Frequency
Israel	Shall	None	Will	12
	Must	7	Would	23
	Should	6	Can	8
	May	4	Could	4

4.1.6. Passive Voice as a Cohesive Device

   Passive voice involves the deletion of the subject or deemphasizing it within a long passive, that which incorporates a by-phrase. The effect is usually regarded as impersonal prose, precisely because the agent is deleted. Reilly et al. stated that ''such agentless actions serve to distance the writer or speaker from the text'' [19]. Sometimes, the subject is deleted because the object is the topic of discourse. Beside issues of pragmatic focus, however, there is a need to mention examples in which a passive might be used simply because the subject is implicitly understood in the first instance, or is not important.

   Evidently, passive voice can aid in textual cohesion. Cohesion is achieved within writing of any kind when it can be determined that the text is easy to follow; more than achieving correct syntax, the writer must ensure that the reader is guided from one idea to the next, with the end result being textual comprehension. O'Brien uses the analogy of a thread, saying that ''as we read a text, we need to feel that we are following a thread of

meaning. The thread has been placed there by the writer and if it has been well placed it can be followed by the reader''[20].

Table 8. Passive Sentences

Passive sentences in South Africa's case	Passive sentences in Israel's case
"Palestinians in Gaza are being killed by Israeli"	"Israel is engaged in a war it did not want and did not start"
"Palestinians in Gaza are subjected to relentless bombing"	"Israel is not represented today by its chosen team of counsel and advocates"
"Many Palestinians have been displaced multiple times"	"Damage of an unprecedented scale has been caused to Israeli civilian homes and infrastructure"
"no humanitarian assistance was permitted"	"criminal investigations have been opened"
"Those wounded by Israel in Gaza are being deprived of lifesaving medical care"	"an improved mechanism was adopted by the police and the IDF to ensure the safety of the convoys"

It is evident from South Africa's examples that the Palestinians are mostly emphasized, so they are shifted initially forward, that Palestinians are the object upon whom huge deadly military actions are made. Using passive remarks the implicit, although the well-known subject is "Israel". We can summarize the use of passive here because South Africa talks on behalf of Gazan people.

While Israeli's passive sentences emphasize that Israel is being victimized in a war it did not want or start. Israel is shifting forward the word "damage" to state the vast destruction enhanced upon its citizens. Israel is trying to lessen the devastative effect of its actions by alleging to open some investigation for the incidents that may occur within the military operations. In sum, Israel is using passive structures to denote that it is not the active doer of any genocidal acts, rather; it is acted upon by the terrorists.

4.1.7 Negation as a Logical Connector

Using negation in a discourse is one of different types of logical connectors employed to create cohesive links within a discourse. It is frequently used by politicians as a rhetorical strategy to declare control over discourse and set up power hierarchies. Reading the case of South Africa vs. Israel reveals many negative sentences that carry powerful implications; they defined the boundaries of political acceptability and fortify their ideological stance. Here are only some examples from South Africa's case:

1- "No one is spared, not even the newborn babies"
2- "Nowhere is safe in Gaza"
3- "no humanitarian assistance was permitted"
4- "Nothing will stop the suffering except an order from the court"
5- "without an indication of provisional measures, the atrocities will continue"
6- "Israel has deliberately imposed conditions in Gaza that cannot sustain life"
7- "The care is simply not available"
8- "There is no indication at all that Israel accepts responsibility for rebuilding what it has destroyed"

It seems that using negation in this discourse represents one of the most important power dynamics used by South Africa. By declaring that no one is spared, no safe place to live in, no human rights for Gazans, no health care, etc.; South Africa is assuring the

ICJ that it has to make an order of provisional measures to stop Israel from what it is doing, and there was such an order. The ICJ has made this order against Israel and followed it by another court order to assure the cease of fire against Gaza; although not obeyed and was neglected by Israel.

Other examples from Israel's case:

1- "But this is no genocide."

2- "Repeating a lie does not make it true."

3- "Israel is not represented today by its chosen team of counsel and advocates"

4- "This is an unthinkable outcome … tell Israeli citizens and the hostages that they are not deserving of protection"

5- "Hamas, with whom Israel is engaged in this armed conflict, is not a party to these proceedings"

6- "South Africa is not interested in the truth,"

7- "This reality is not unique to Israel. No State is infallible."

8- "Armed conflict is not a synonym for genocide."

In fact, in examples 7 and 8 above, Israel has admitted its murderous actions in Gaza, justifying that "No State is infallible", and committing murder against Palestinians i.e. "Armed conflict " is not genocide.

5. Results

1- South Africa's language in the aforementioned case has more power dynamics than Israel in ICJ since the court ordered the demanded provisional measures against Israel followed by another order of additional provisional measures, although not obeyed by Israel.

2- South Africa was more successful in its language portraying the critical situation in Gaza with evidence through the use of clear and direct statements.

3- Israel's use of language in ICJ was less powerful; it used many long and indirect sentences to justify its illegal actions in Gaza.

4- South Africa's use of language in ICJ is more powerful; this seems clear through its polite language, while Israel uses many impolite and harsh vocabularies such as brutal, lie, vile, etc. expressing its strong negative connotations and judgments towards the people of Gaza.

5- South Africa was successful in using simile i.e. Gambia-Myanmar case in ICJ to gain the same support from the court, while Israel accused South Africa of being an ally for Hamas.

6- South Africa's use of passive voice indicates a powerful dynamic which proved suitable in filming clear pictures for the Palestinian suffering, where they were victimized by Israel.

7-The use of negative sentences signifies a power dynamic manipulated by South Africa and Israel as well.

8- Israel's use of the pronoun "I" signifies its political dominance and powerful relations although it tried to mitigate this by using the inclusive plural pronoun "We" in order to add a democratic tone. While South Africa was moderate in the use of pronouns.

6. Discussion

South Africa is said to have more linguistic power dynamics in the case that is delivered on 29 December 2023 in the ICJ against Israel. On 26 January 2024, the ICJ made a ruling of six provisional measures against Israel. Depending on the facts delivered by South Africa, the court decided six provisional measures on Israel. The decision was by the majority of the ICJ judges (about 15 to two or 16 to one). Although the ICJ judges come from different nationalities; some of them hold positive views towards Israel, but they managed to deliver the order. Another victory for South Africa was when the court on 28 March 2024, indicated additional provisional measures, following a request from South Africa, dated 6 March 2024, for the indication of additional provisional measures and/or the modification of its order of 26 January 2024. The linguistic power dynamics of South Africa are strong in the sense that makes it gain support from more than ten states which stand with it and signed other demands for provisional measures against Israel due to the sever military actions in Gaza, although everyone knows who supports Israel in whatever it did.

On the other hand, Israel's use of language in the ICJ indicates that its power is less than the Africans'. On May 17, the ICJ heard oral argument from Israel where the latter used too long indirect sentences with multiple adverbial clauses in which it tries to justify its acts in Gaza as not genocidal. Israel started the hearing by giving too much sentences pretexting its difficult situation, the fast proceeding of the court and absence of its powerful legal representatives. Israel was just defending itself throughout the whole session. Reading the text of the two parties of the study shows no use of impolite expressions for South Africa, which signifies another linguistic power dynamic. On the other hand, lacking of politeness or perceived rudeness leads to lessen Israel's credibility and authority via its use of impolite and harsh expressions such as (brutal, lie, vile, etc.) expressing its negative judgement towards the people of Gaza.

7.Conclusions

The study has demonstrated the significant role of using language as a tool for declaring, negotiating, and contesting power. By examining the lexical choices and the different grammatical structures used in the discourse of South Africa case on 29 December 2023 and Israel's text on 17 May 2024, this study concludes that the two states employed certain linguistic choices as power dynamics to assert their authority and legitimacy. Conversely, lacking of politeness or perceived rudeness might lead to lessen a politician's credibility and authority. Therefore, the strategic use of politeness is essential in shaping how political messages are received and interpreted by the public. It helps building harmony and command in a political setting where power is realized via influencing others instead of forcing them to agree. South Africa deliberately employed this strategy in its discussion about Gaza, using direct and clear statements. On the other hand, Israel prominently used long, indirect sentences with many extra parts to justify its military actions in Gaza claiming that they are not genocidal. The study is hoped to contribute to the broad field of CDA by revealing ways in which political discourse can be analyzed to discover the covert power relations that impact various political issues. The study findings provide valuable insights for critically investigating language as a

means of power and control, and illuminates the need for more comprehensive and unbiased representations in political interactions.

CONFLICT OF IN TERESTS
There are no conflicts of interest

References

[1] N. Chomsky (2004). Language and politics. AK Press.

[2] N. Woods (2006). *Describing discourse: A practical guide to discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge.

[3] T. A. Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis* http://doi.org/10.1002/97811584194.ch22

[4] S. Polakow-Suransky (2010). *The Unspoken Alliance: Israel's Secret Relationship with Apartheid* South Africa. Random House.

[5] Z. Levey (2004). "Israel's Strategy in Africa, 1961–67". *International Journal of Middle East Studies36(1):71-87*

[6] https://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/sa-pulls-ambassador-out-of-israel-over-gaza-violence-20180514

[7] Hinkel, Eli, and Sandra Fotos, editors(2001). *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

[8] Henry, Frances, and Carol Tator (2002). *Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press*. University of Toronto.

[9] Ogden, J. (2002). Health and the Construction of the Individual. Routledge,

[10] B. Paltridge (2007). Discourse analysis: An Introduction. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

[11] S. Taylor (2001). Locating and Conducting Analytic Research', in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S.J. Yates (ed.), *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage/The Open University.

[12] C. Stevenson C (2004) *Theoretical and methodological approaches in discourse analysis.* Nurse Researcher, 12 (2)17-29

[13] N. Fairclough (2014) What is CDA? Language and power twenty-five years on. https //www.academia.edu/8429277/What_is_CDA_Language_and_Power_twenty five_years_on

[14] G. Weiss, and R. Wodak (2002) Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis. In G. Weiss and R. Wodak (eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis:* London: Palgrave, pp. 1-32.

[15] N. Fairclough (2001). *Language and power*. Essex: England. Pearson Education.

[16] N. Fairclough (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

[17] R. Wodak, (2015) *Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280621881

[18] N. Fairclough (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Rutledge.

[19] Reilly, Judy, Zamora, Anita, McGivern, Robert, (2005). Acquiring perspective in English: the development of stance. Journal of Pragmatics 37 (2), 185–208.

[20] T. O'Brien (1989). Teaching Writing in a Second Language, Discourse Types and Coherence, University of Manchester, School of Education.