

9-15-2025

The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict Through Chomsky and Bremmer's Interviews: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Noora Jameel

English Department, College of Arts, Baghdad University, Iraq, noura.Abd2203m@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Sarab Khalil

English Department-College of Arts-University of Baghdad, Prof. in Linguistics and Translation

Follow this and additional works at: <https://alustath.uobaghdad.edu.iq/journal>

Recommended Citation

Jameel, Noora and Khalil, Sarab (2025) "The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict Through Chomsky and Bremmer's Interviews: A Critical Discourse Analysis," *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences*: Vol. 64: Iss. 3, Article 5.

DOI: 10.36473/2518-9263.2422

Available at: <https://alustath.uobaghdad.edu.iq/journal/vol64/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences. It has been accepted for inclusion in Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences by an authorized editor of Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences.



RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Palestinian-Israeli Conflict Through Chomsky and Bremmer's Interviews: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Noora Jameel^{ib a,*}, Sarab Khalil^{ib b}

^a English Department, College of Arts, Baghdad University, Iraq

^b English Department-College of Arts-University of Baghdad, Prof. in Linguistics and Translation

ABSTRACT

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict is seen as one of the most serious and controversial issues in the world. In this paper, the researcher seeks to highlight some crucial points with regard to this conflict by adopting critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the primary means of analysis. Since conflicts are usually accompanied by social wrongs, it is more appropriate to use Fairclough's 2010 approach to CDA in order to get more logical results. However, the study aims to provide a critical analysis of two selected interview by two famous figures; Ian Bremmer and Noam Chomsky in order to highlight the following points: (1) Representative speech acts are the dominant type used by both Bremmer and Chomsky. (2) Metaphors are utilised by the two interviewees in their interviews. (3) Noam Chomsky is an anti-war figure. (4) Hegemony is recontextualised in Bremmer's discourse. (5) Injustice is identified as being the common social wrong in both the interviews.

Keywords: CDA, Fairclough, Chomsky, Bremmer, Social wrong

Introduction

Two interviews, dated to the year (2023), are allocated for this study. The first is with Ian Bremmer under the title "Understanding Israel & Palestine" on "The Daily Show" YouTube channel. And the other is with Noam Chomsky under the title "The Key Problem of the Palestine-Israel Conflict" on "Free Will" YouTube channel. To accomplish this study, Fairclough's (2010) version of CDA is adopted. Since conflicts produce some social wrongs such as injustice and poverty, the researcher chooses Fairclough (2010) model in order to identify those wrongs and to suggest the most possible solution according to the selected interviews. However, CDA and some relevant points are highlighted such as discourse,

Received 10 October 2024; revised 8 December 2024; accepted 27 January 2025.
Available online 15 September 2025

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: noura.Abd2203m@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq (N. Jameel).

<https://doi.org/10.36473/2518-9263.2422>

2518-9263/© 2025 The Author(s). Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences. This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 Licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

discourse analysis, power, ideology, interviews, hegemony, dominance, manipulation, colonialism and racism. Additionally, two social wrongs are selected to be discussed.

Discourse

Fairclough argues that discourses are semiotic ways through which social agents perform daily social tasks and activities such as demanding, ordering, appologising, etc. However, those semiotic ways are charged with standpoints and ideological perspectives representatives of its social users (Fairclough, 2010). Furthermore, Gee tends to believe that discourses are not only representatives of ordinary social communicational needs, but also of those with the most special communicational intentions (Gee, 1986). In other words, discourses are those multiple ways that social actors employ to express the most distinctive communicational purposes like gratitude, love, anger, etc.

Discourse analysis

Discourse Analysis is a broad and interdisciplinary field that involves examining how language is used within the context of its use in order to [...] produce societal meanings and identities (Gee, 1986, cited in Almuslehi, 2023, p. 295). Discourse, according to the formalist school, has to do with the form in which linguistic patterns constitute complete coherent texts. Whereas the functional school concentrates on the functional role of those linguistic patterns. I.e., functional school concentrates on how linguistic units are arranged and used in daily life (Paltridge, 2012). Harris emphasises the need to analyse all types of discourse in order to consider how different ideologies as well as power relations are reflected through and within discourses (Paltridge, 2012). Discourse analysis in Schiffrin's studies is defined as the analysis of the different ways of interaction where language users engage and interact with each other so as to express their intentions and understand the world, in a social communicational process, according to the contexts in which those discourses are used (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 41).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and famous approaches

CDA, a sub-branch of discourse analysis study, is concerned with the enactment, reproduction, and resistance of social power abuse, dominance, and inequality through text and talk within social and political contexts (Van Dijk, 2001, cited in Hassan, 2018, p. 89). Critical discourse analysts are mainly interested in analysing discourses into their basic components to identify social wrongs such as poverty, injustice, and persecution (Van Dijk, 2001). The role of CDA as a theoretical and practical course is emphasised by Rogers as he highlights the profound characteristic role of CDA in focusing on various aspects of social life (Rogers, 2004). Thus, CDA aims to provide researchers and critical discourse analysts with a comprehensive understanding of positive aspects of human life to be enhanced, and negative ones to be avoided.

However, the most famous approaches to CDA are; (a) Van Dijk's cognitive model in which he discusses the relationship between cognition, social context, and discourse, (b) Fairclough's relational model in which Fairclough focuses on the relationship between discourse creation and utilising, social structures, and the text itself, (c) Wodak's historical model in which she demonstrates how discourse, historical practices, and discursive practices affect each other (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

Constitutive terms and concepts

Ideology

The French philosopher Tracy maintains that ideologies are certain perspectives associated to controversial political, social, or religious issues (McLellan, 1986). Significantly, ideologies are more widely activated in societies where “power” dynamics or abuse are identified. For instance, societies controlled by capitalism or ruled by colonialism (Machin & Mayr, 2012, p. 220). The term ideology is an umbrella term under which mental and conceptual viewpoints are listed and are utilised selectively by speakers and writers of the societies (Hall, 1996).

Power

Although power is seen as a core concept in critical discourse studies, it is approached and understood differently by different scholars. Fairclough tends to believe that power is either achieved or lost through disputes and conflicts (Fairclough, 2015). Another viewpoint is given by Paltridge in which he says that power is an act of imposing “one’s will on others”. Power is the ability of an individual or group to assert their superiority and impose their will on another individual or group forcing them carry out orders (Paltridge, 2012, p. 244). A third viewpoint on power is referred to by Sara Mills who thinks that power appears through social “relations” rather than through coercion (Mills, 2004, p. 33).

Hegemony

Gramsci and Forgacs argue that hegemony is an inherent characteristic of capitalism where society is forced to submit to the hegemonic ruling class. One of the most important means utilised to obtain hegemony is through the use of discourse. Discourses may be used distinctively by focusing on specific textual, discursive, and social characteristics so as to highlight ideological concerns (cited in Fairclough, 2003, p. 218). Hegemony, as Fairclough states, is the relentless pursuit of imposing control over all social aspects, including social activities (Fairclough, 2010). Furthermore, hegemony involves providing society with levels of education that is consistent with the interests of the hegemonic classes (Fairclough, 1992).

Dominance

Dominance, unlike hegemony, is associated with the desire to disregard laws, ignore international conventions and everything that might undermine the interests of the dominant classes. Consequently, classism appears and social wrongs phenomena spread (Van Dijk, 2009). Critical discourse analysts are concerned with the identification of some crucial discursive aspects, for example, “dominance”, power relations, ideology, and racism (Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p. 10).

Racism

Van Dijk explains that racist practices may be figured out through discourse in many ways including; media, and political platforms (Van Dijk, 1993). Racism by definition is any action, statement, gesture, or hint that causes material or moral harm for groups or members of the society. Herzog clarifies that there is a reciprocal relationship between discourse and racism, as discourse has the ability to generate racism and racism can produce racist discourse (Herzog, 2016).

Imperialism and colonialism

Both imperialism and colonialism share the idea of dominating other countries, whether politically, economically, or educationally. Yet they differ in that the second, i.e., colonialism involves seizing the lands and properties, and oppressing the indigenous people of the colonizing country in order to force them to migrate or leave their homes. Thus, colonialism has a greater impact on the lives of the population than Imperialism does (Heller & McElhinny, 2017). Moreover, colonialism grasp people's "dignity and privileges" (Hassan, 2024). Imperialism, on the other hand, means imposing control over economic resources in particular, for example, oil and water resources without directly affecting the lives of the population (Heller & McElhinny, 2017).

Manipulation and persuasion

Persuasion and manipulation are two core concepts in CDA. Adam Sorrel posits that Persuasion is the ability of a language user to influence the intended audience with the aim of changing opinions, attitudes, and beliefs regarding a specific topic. Persuasion is obtained through intellectual stylistic practices based on logic, wisely and intelligently chosen methods by the speaker or writer (Janam, 2019; Sorrel, 2020). Manipulation is based on persuasion, but it may take different forms, including lying or deception. However, manipulation does not always have to be a negative phenomenon. For example, manipulation is used by doctors to create a positive psychological effect on their patients (Sorrel, 2020).

Interviews

An interview is one of the methods used by the media to discuss or introduce an issue. An interview is a dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee(s) in which the interviewer directly questions the interviewees, who in turn try to state their perspectives and ideologies concerning the topic of the interview. Fairclough suggests that interviews fall into types following the topic being discussed, such as the interviews related to politics or those related to applying for a "job" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 69). Interviews are fertile areas in which power dynamics, ideologies, and themes of dominance, manipulation, and so on are figured out (Wodak & Krzyzanowsky, 2008).

Previous studies

Some researchers have tackled the Palestinian issue, for example, Mubdir Ahmed's work "The Israeli-Palestinian Struggle: A Critical Discourse Analysis" views how the Palestinians are seen through British and Americans' articles. This work covers the period from (2001) to (2012) and adopts model. However, the present work is unlike Mubdir's work since the present work selects interviews from the year (2023) and adopts Fairclough (2010) approach in which the researcher focuses on social wrongs and suggests the possible solution.

The adopted model of Fairclough (2010)

This model is distinguished by four stages. In the first stage, the analyst looks for "social wrongs". In the second stage, the analyst lists the difficulties that prevent the desired change in an attempt to vanish the identified social wrong. Within this stage it

is inevitably that the analysis should be based on three levels; textual level, discursive practices, and social practices. Each level in turn contains some interrelated phases. In the third stage, the analyst discusses the legitimacy of the social wrong and the ability to avoid it. Consequently, in the fourth stage, the analyst invokes, out of the discourse, the best realistic solution based on the available data (Fairclough, 2010, p. 235).

Methodology

The methodological process consists of four different stages. Within these stages, the researcher follows a certain order. The first stage is characterised by the identification of one particular social wrong in its semiotic manifestation to be analysed and studied. Pointing out the problems that prevent the desired change is the core of the second stage. Within this stage, a dialectical-relational analysis is needed. Hence, the analysis is directed within the following three levels: (a) The micro-level has to do with vocabulary investigation, and grammatical relations in which voice, modality, transitivity, and rhetorical strategies are discussed. (b) The meso-level comprises speech acts and intertextuality. (c) The macro-level tackles theme and ideology. Then, the third stage questions the validity of the selected social wrong and clarifies some related ideological concerns. Ultimately, the fourth stage discusses the available solutions to bring about the expected change.

Data analysis, discussion and associated results

The analysis of the first interview with Bremmer

The first stage

Injustice is the selected social wrong in the first interview. Ian Bremmer talks about the Palestinians who are either forced by Israeli occupation forces to leave their lands and properties or remain within relatively small areas (under the siege), and the subsequent struggle to get the basic daily needs. However, this social wrong, i.e., injustice is inconsistent with human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The second stage

The second stage has to do with the obstacles hinder the desired change. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate how the interlocutors manage their discourse within dialectical-relations framework.

The micro-level

Vocabulary

Over-wording is concerned with the identification of certain types of words and phrases as in the case of synonyms, antonyms, etc. (1) The phrases [his settlements/his illegal settlements] are used by the interviewee to denote Netanyahu's policy in the occupied territories. (2) Another distinctive use of vocabulary is seen in [evacuate] where the Israeli government orders the Palestinians to leave their homes. (3) A further point is noticed in [destroy (and) remove] when the interviewee refers to the Israeli government's attitude towards Hamas. (4) [A border (and) the border], the interviewee refers to Egypt, the only country that has borders with Palestine. Those borders are described as being [shut]. (5) The word [those] is repeatedly used by the interviewee to refer to Palestinians. (6) Furthermore, the Palestinians are described as [homeless (and) displaced]. (6) Whereas, Hamas fighters are described as [terrorists]. (7) The interviewee assures that the world is

about to witness [human destruction] as he, the interviewee, repeats the illustrated phrase twice. (8) The opposites [the guest (and) the host] are used by both the interviewer and the interviewee respectively. (9) The interviewee assures the fact that the Israelis have to live side by side with the Palestinians utilising terms like [Israel and Israelis and Jews in Israel]. (10) Vocabulary such as [reservists] is repeated twice since these terms are relevant to the status quo. (11) Social media is seen by the interviewee as being [dehumanising, disinformation, (and) actively destroying democracy]. (12) Moreover, social media tends to make people [angrier and more hateful]. While the audience applauds, the interviewee repeats the word [so]. (13) To continue, Bremmer repeats [not because] to say that Americans do care about others. Bremmer strongly stresses the profound influence of the US in world leadership when he says [short, medium, and long term], that is, The US can distinctively offer what others cannot do. (14) Now, the interviewer repeats the word [Right] four times to indicate that he entirely agrees with the interviewee. (15) Finally, the interviewee refers to the status quo in The Middle East utilising vocabulary, like [unfinished business, hurting, (and) explosive]. (16) In addition, the word [hurting] is emphasised by the interviewee to indicate how the status quo in the Middle East is bad.

Grammatical patterns

Passive/Active voice

In this interview, active voice accounts for (130) out of the whole number of the sentences which is (142) and has a percentage of (91.54 %). On the other side, passive voice accounts for (12) out of (142) and has a percentage that equals (8.45%). However, the interlocutor prefers to use complex, long sentences more than short ones. Bremmer tends to use compound sentences in the active voice to demonstrate some facts about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. For example, [they're creating diplomatic deals with other countries around the region that want to work with them on investment and trade, and tourism, and even national security]. In this sentence, Bremmer refers to Israeli relations with some countries in the region. But, in the following example, [water has been turned on, but the power to make that occur is really spotty, and a lot of it's been blown up], a complex sentence in the passive voice is used by the interviewee that is followed by an active simple sentence in which the interviewee gives a conclusion that describes the miserable humanitarian conditions in the occupied territories saying that [it's a horrible situation].

Modality

Extrinsic modality accounts for (49 out of 51) and has a percentage of (96.07%). This type includes: (1) Ability which accounts for (22 out of 51) and has a percentage of (43.13%). For example, [you can't actually forget about Palestinians]. (2) Necessity accounts for (11 out of 51) and has a percentage of (21.56%). For instance, [it is true that Israel and Israelis and Jews in Israel must live with Palestinians for the foreseeable future]. (3) Prediction accounts for (16 out of 51) and has a percentage of (31.37%). For instance, [it's making them angrier and more hateful than anything they would experience in real life]. The other type is intrinsic modality which accounts for (2 out of 51) and has a percentage of (3.92%). This type includes: (1) Volition accounts for (1 out of 51) and has a percentage of (1.96%). For example, [I would say spend less time on social media]. (2) Obligation accounts for (1 out of 51) and has a percentage of (1.96%). For example, [that's what we have to do]. To conclude, extrinsic modality is a dominant aspect of this interview. Besides, ability is used above all.

Transitivity

Transitivity has to do with the types of processes used in the discourse selected for analysis, and the types of participants involved. Processes include: (1) Material processes constitute (62 out of 170) which equals (36.47%). For example, [you help people like me make sense of the world]. (2) Relational processes take (40 out of 170) which equals (23.52%). For example, [it is a horrible situation]. (3) Mental processes take (40 out of 170) which equals (23.52%). For example, [you can't actually forget about the Palestinians]. (4) Verbal processes take (27 out of 170) which equals (15.88). For example, [they're not talking about how we can eventually find peace]. (5) Existential processes take (1 out of 170) which equals (0.58%). For instance, [the frog just dies]. Consequently, material processes account for more than a third of the total number of processes. Whereas relational processes and mental processes each represent approximately a quarter of the total number.

The other concern is Participants where the next types are seen: (1) Actors and goals are the participants involved in material processes. Actors score (55) and goals score (37). Thus, there are (92) participants out of the total number which is (307). These have a percentage which equals (29.96%). (2) Within relational processes, identifiers and identified or carriers and attributes are the types of participants involved. The first pair scores (41) and (38) respectively, whereas the second pair scores (11) for each type of participants. So, there are (101) participants. This number makes a percentage of (32.89%). (3) Sensors and phenomena are the types of participants found within mental processes. Sensors have (37) participants, and phenomena have (29). Hence, there are (66) participants out of (307) which equals (21.49%). (4) Sayers and the receivers (or instances of verbiage) are figured out as the participants involved in verbal processes. The first has (22) participants, and the second has (25). To sum up, verbal processes have (47) participants out of (307) which equals (15.30%). (5) Each existential process has only one participant. So, there is only (1) participant which makes a percentage of (0.32%). Ultimately, relational processes have the largest number of participants, and the material processes follow with more than a third of participants. These results indicate that elements of power and agency are reflected in this interview since actors and identifiers have the highest score.

Rhetorical strategies

Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions are used to attract the attention of the listener or reader and do not require an answer. The present interview has five questions. (1) When the interviewee refers to the status quo saying that the explosion is bound to happen due to the deteriorating conditions in the occupied territories [was it going to happen these last two weeks, or was it going to happen in another month or three months?] (2) When Bremmer refers to the besieged area inhabited by the Palestinians [is it an open-air prison?] (3) When Bremmer says that the fighting between Hamas and Israel will leave many dead and injures among civilians [how many civilians do you think, with Hamas ensuring they operate in the midst of those civilians, how many are going to get killed?] (4) Also, when Bremmer talks about the role played by the US as a country that represents democracy in the world [maybe America, first, doesn't quite say that?!] (5) The last rhetorical question also has the same indication as the fourth question [how can we not care when that is falling apart right now in the most tragic, possible way in front of our eyes? How can we not care about that?].

Metaphors

[The frog in the boiling pot [...] doesn't move, doesn't jump out, just dies [...] that story has never been to Gaza]. The interlocutor likens the situation of the Palestinians to that of the frog in the boiling pot, saying that the Palestinians are never the same as that frog. A further instance is [but the Status of Liberty does]. The speaker wants to say that America is the representative country of democracy in the world and that the Liberty Monument is a proof of that.

The meso-level

Speech acts

Speech acts found in the first interview are: (a) Representatives account for (81 out of 144) and have a percentage of (56.25%). (b) Directives account for (38) and have a percentage of (26.38). (c) Expressive speech acts account score (18) and they have a percentage of (12.5%). (d) Declaratives score (5) and have a percentage of (3.47%). (e) Commissives score (2) and have a percentage of (1.38%). However, Bremmer uses representative speech acts to enrich the minds of followers with facts and information. While the use of directive speech acts is meant to direct the audience to do some action. Lastly, expressive speech acts are used to influence the audience psychologically.

Intertextuality

Intertextuality is either direct or indirect. Within this interview only indirect intertextuality is found. Thus, this type makes a percentage of (100%). The indirect cases are distributed as follows: (a) The topic itself is one instance because the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is one of the topics that is discussed from time to time. (b) The story of the frog is another case. (c) The integration of politics with history introduces an example of indirect intertextuality. To summarise, Bremmer tends to paraphrase things in his own style.

The macro level

Theme

Dominance

[I hear it's an open-air prison. Is that a safe description of how it's controlled by Israel?] The speaker talks about the siege where the Israeli occupation forces force the Palestinian population to live under dire humanitarian circumstances.

Colonialism

[Netanyahu, the Prime Minister, has only been expanding his settlements, his illegal settlements on the ground in the West Bank]. Colonial practices are implemented by the Israeli government represented by its Prime Minister, Netanyahu, who supports illegal settlement in the Palestinian territories.

Hegemony

[We're the one country with leverage], and [Because in principle, we, the United States, stand for something beyond just ourselves]. In these two examples, Bremmer expresses the hegemonic attitude of the US which consider itself the first and the only influential superpower in the world.

Manipulation

[It's dehumanising. It's disinformation. [...], it's taking people and it's making them angrier and more hateful than anything they would experience in real life]. The speaker uses manipulation and tries to convince the public to stay away from social media in an attempt to prevent them from getting to the truth about what is happening in the occupied Palestinian territories.

Violence

[So, you have a unity cabinet, and everyone agrees, we must destroy Hamas], and [we're going to go and attack Hamas. We're going to destroy them, we're going to remove them]. These examples are indicators of violence. The speaker refers to the Israeli government's determination to destroy Hamas.

Ideology

Bremmer's perspectives about the world in general, and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in particular are those of hegemony and dominance. He considers the US to be the representative of democracy and liberty in the world. Furthermore, he believes that the US are the key to the solution through their influential role on the parties to the conflict, i.e., the Palestinians and the Israeli government. Bremmer does not support a ceasefire. Instead, he thinks that war is necessary for stability and peace. Consequently, Bremmer is a warmonger as he says [now, if Israel is saying, and they have every reason to want to destroy Hamas]. The speaker maintains that Hamas is the reason for the collapse of the situation as a whole; whether in the occupied territories or in Israel. There are some contradictory ideologies here. In spite of his admission that the siege has negative effects on the lives of the Palestinian population as he says [50% hungry, 90% without access to clean water, and that was before bombing], yet Bremmer supports a comprehensive war against Hamas. A farther point is related to power dynamics. Power relations are obviously seen in this interview; the US and Israel, one the one hand, stand for the strong side that has power and influence. On the other hand, the Palestinians are described by the speaker as being forgotten and powerless. Lastly, the interlocutor distinctively uses the personal pronouns. For example, [we] is used to mean either the US or Israel. But, [they] is used to mean either the Palestinians or the Israelis.

The third stage

To question the legitimacy of the selected social wrong is the aim of the current stage. Bremmer admits that Israel's policy in the occupied territories causes injustice and suffering, but he turns to blame Hamas. Bremmer shows some sympathy with the Palestinians, but consequently, he thinks that Hamas is primarily responsible for the injustice and suffering that happens. Justice is a legitimate and realistic requirement that is recognised by divine laws, global charters, and international conventions. Thus, it is necessary to put an end for all forms of injustice.

The fourth stage

The interlocutor assures that the best solution lies in the decisive role practised by the US in the region, though direct and serious negotiations, led by the latter, between the Palestinians and the Israelis. Bremmer tends to believe that since America represents freedom and democracy in the world and is the first sponsor of human rights, as Bremmer claims, then it could be the key to the solution.

The analysis of the second interview with Chomsky

The first stage

One identified social wrong in this interview is injustice. The Palestinians undergo poor treatment and they cannot move freely from one area to another instead, they suffer from harassment [you have your boot on somebody's neck]. In this expression, the speaker emphasises that the Israeli army deals with the Palestinians in a hostile way. Moreover, the Israeli siege imposed on the Palestinians has had a significant impact on the deterioration of living and health conditions.

The second stage

The goal of this stage is to identify the challenges to the potential change. In order to either vanish or restrict the selected social wrong, it is intelligible to follow a dialectical-relational analysis.

The micro-level

Vocabulary

The interview begins with (1) terms like [narratives, claims, (and) issues] to highlight how important and serious the topic under discussion is. (2) Then, the usage of terms like [the key, the key problem, the key problem of] and again [the key, root cause, root problem] is an attempt to direct the interview to find out the main causes of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. (3) Furthermore, phrases like [all the questions, all the problems; political, religious, economic, (and) land] are demonstrated to investigate all the aspects related to the conflict. (4) A further point is found in the word [temporary] when it is repeated twice in reference to the fragile ceasefire. (5) However, the key problem in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is visualised as being [a disavowed question]. (6) Chomsky believes that the key question has been [recognised, formulated, and discussed] since the last century. (7) Moreover, this key question is discussed by [leading figures, leading analysts, commentators, (and) people like the great essayist Assam]. (8) Another point is [Jewish culture and language] which is mentioned by the interviewee as he reviews the ideas of a great Jewish essayist. (9) The interviewee differentiates between the history of the Middle East before and after 1967 and considers history [a complicated] issue. (10) A further point relates to the United States' [decisive role] in the region and the [massive support] to Israel. (11) The terms [radical Islam] represented by Saudi Arabia and [secular nationalism] represented by Egypt are utilised by Chomsky as antonyms. (12) Other antonyms are [prior to 1967 (and) post-1967] where the interviewee tries to highlight how this date, i.e., 1967 is a crucial point in the history of The Middle East and the world as a whole. (13) Then, [the Holocaust, Holocaust museums, (and) Holocaust studies] are mentioned by Chomsky to point out that this event, the Holocaust, is recalled by Israel post-1967. (14) At the same time, Chomsky highlights that Israel practices a [systematic expansion] as it, i.e., Israel, is [taking over] worthy areas and [leaving out] Palestinians and highly populated areas. (15) Moreover, the opposites [take (and) expel] refer to the previously mentioned idea. In other words, what Israel does in the occupied territories. (16) To continue with the same line, the systematic expansion aims to [surround (and) ignore] the Palestinian population. (17) In the 1970s, Israel had the opportunity to choose either [expansion (or) security]. However, Israel decided to choose expansion. (18) The terms [resolution (and) several resolutions] are mentioned in reference to the Security Council, which Israel (19) [strongly [objected] to it, [refused] even to attend the session] that called for a two-state solution. (20) The occupational practices in 1967 are referred to by the opposites [predictable (and) unpredictable], which, (21) then, are seen as [harsher

(and) more brutal]. (22) As a result, young people in Israel become [more reactionary, more extreme, nationalist, and racist] than the older generations.

Grammatical patterns

Passive/Active voice

Active voice in this discourse accounts for (91) out of the total number which is (94) and makes a percentage of (96.80%). Then, passive voice accounts for (3) and has a percentage of (3.19%). So, activation is primarily used in this interview. This means that the speaker aims to convey his perspectives straightforward. Additionally, he prefers to focus on the doer of the action more than other elements in the sentence.

Modality

Extrinsic modality scores (19) out of (22) which means (86.36%) distributed as follows: Necessity scores (6) and makes a percentage of (27.27%). For example, [it's our responsibility, and we should not forget that]. Then, Prediction scores (3) and makes a percentage of (13.36%). For example, [it would become harsher, more brutal]. Ability scores (8) and makes a percentage of (36.36%). For example, [only somebody like Leibowitz could have gotten away with saying that]. Finally, possibility scores (2) and makes a percentage of (9.09%). For example, [there's an interesting article you might look at in today's edition of Haaretz]. Thus, intrinsic modality constitutes about (3 out of 22), that is, about (13.63%). Intrinsic type of modality, in this interview, has permission and obligation. The first scores (1) which makes a percentage of (4.54%). For example, [as long as it has US support, it feels it can go ahead]. The second scores (2) which makes a percentage of (9.09%). For example, [you have to find a way of justifying it]. Conclusion, extrinsic modality is mostly used by the interlocutor.

Transitivity

Since transitivity is about processes; the types of verbs used in the target interview, and participants involved in each of these processes, then, the researcher needs to focus on both the processes and participants respectively. Concerning processes, five types are figured out: (1) Relational takes (59) out of (144) which equals (40.97%). For example, "it's our responsibility". (2) Material constitutes (50) which equals (34.72%). For example, "it destroyed secular Arab nationalism". (3) Mental scores (25) which equals (17.36%). For example, "we 've seen it happen and the dynamics are pretty straightforward". (4) Verbal scores (9) which equals (6.25%). For example, "the United States voted the resolution". (e) Then, existential scores (1) which equals (0.69%). For example, "the recognition of the right of each state to exist in peace and security within secure and recognised borders". So, relational processes make the largest proportion which means that the speaker is interested in the relationships between the Palestinians and the Israelis more than, for example, the actions they do or the results of those actions.

Now, participants are classified as follows: (1) With regard to relational processes; identifiers have (43), identified scores (37), carriers score (5), and attributes score (5). This makes (90) out of (213) and equals (42.25%). (2) With regard to material processes; actors score (41), and goals score (30). This makes (71) out of (213) and equals (33.33%). (3) As for mental processes; sensors score (20) and phenomena score (21). This makes (41) and equals (19.24%). (4) Concerning verbal processes; sayers have (6) and receivers (or verbiage) score (4). This makes (10) and equals (4.69%). (5) Finally, with regard to

existential processes; only (1) participant is found which makes a percentage of (0.46%). Consequently, identifiers and actors as representatives of power and agency have the highest score in this discourse.

Rhetorical devices

Metaphors

Metaphors utilised by the interlocutor are: (1) [Competing narratives] in which the speaker sees the various narratives of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as a set of competitors, each one strives to take the lead. (2) [The key issues] in which the speaker considers issues related to the conflict as the key that used to open closed doors and lead to the required solution or understanding. (3) [The US essentially took over the mantle of global domination] here, the speaker talks about the US hegemony and dominance over the world. (4) [Israel [...] started a love affair with the United States] the speaker wants to say that there are strong and solid relationships between the US and Israel. (5) [Others were saying similar things in more muted tones] in this metaphor, the speaker means that no one can blame or criticise Israel frankly.

The meso-level

Speech acts

Representative speech acts are mostly used in this discourse as they score (65) out of (99) and have a percentage of (65.65%). Declaratives score (17) and have a percentage of (17.17%). Directives follow with (11) cases and a percentage of (11.11%). Expressive speech acts score (6) and have a percentage of (6.06%). Ultimately, the speaker is able to convey his perspectives and beliefs directly and has the knowledge that enables him to reveal some facts related to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Intertextuality

Five instances of indirect intertextuality are figured out in this interview. (a) When the interlocutor indirectly quotes the article published in [Haaretz] in which the Israeli journal makes a comparison between the Turkish society and the Israeli one. (b) When the interlocutor talks about the Israeli author who says that occupation better be through cultural centres. (c) When the interlocutor mentions the Israeli intellectual, who rejected the occupation. (d) The integration of politics with history is a fourth instance of indirect intertextuality. (e) The topic being discussed, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, is a fifth instance of indirect intertextuality, since this topic, in core, is not a new one. On the other hand, one instance of direct intertextuality is figured out when the interlocutor mentions the two-state solution according to the Security Council resolutions. UN Security Council resolution which calls for a two-state settlement. Besides, some examples of interdiscursivity are defined. Firstly, when Chomsky refers to the great essayist, known by the pseudonym Assam, who suggests that Palestine be occupied through cultural rather than military conquest since Palestine is not a land without people. Secondly, when Chomsky mentions the Jewish sage Leibowitz's view about the Israeli occupation. Thirdly, when the interviewee talks about an interesting article in one of the main Israeli newspapers called "Haaretz" where a comparison between Israel and Turkey is established. As a result, direct intertextuality accounts for (1 out of 6) and has a percentage of (16.66%). On the contrary, indirect intertextuality accounts for (5 out of 6) and has a percentage of (83.33%).

The macro-level

Theme

Dominance

Chomsky provides some instances to assure the dominant role of the US, such as [it's the United States that vetoes Security Council resolutions calling for an end to illegal occupation], and [the US essentially took over the mantle of global domination from Britain, and the Middle East was a central component]. In the second instance, Chomsky speaks about the mutual roles played by Britain and the US in controlling the world and the Middle East in particular.

Colonialism

During the 1967 war, the Israeli government made a decision to expand and occupy some Palestinian territories; Gaza, and The West Bank, and the Syrian Golan Heights [in 1967 Israel conquered Gaza, the West Bank, the Golan Heights]. Besides, [Israel at that time was expanding into the Egyptian Sinai].

Hegemony

Some Israeli intellectuals and writers suggest that since Palestine is not a land without population, then it is more useful and practical that Palestine be occupied cultural and educational modes [Jews should set up a cultural centre in Palestine which would reinvigorate the diaspora].

Manipulation

Manipulation appears when Chomsky mentions the contradiction in the position of the US, which adopt Security Council resolutions and ignore them at the same time [the US joined the Security Council imposing it but then went on to ignore it].

Racism

Racism is noticed in some expressions and phrases, for example, [young people are more reactionary than their parents, more extreme, nationalist, and racist]. The interviewee refers to young people in Israel who are more racist than their parents and other elder generations. Another example is when Chomsky talks about the Israeli society that become more extreme and racist due to the rise of the far-wing party [the country has shifted pretty far to the right].

Violence

Violence is a core theme when it comes to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict [you have your boot on somebody's neck]. The interviewee wants to say that the Israeli practices towards the Palestinian people are rejected and unjustified. Likewise, [Israel destroyed secular nationalism], this is when Israel expanded towards Egyptian lands, which caused a political crisis at that time.

Ideology

Noam Chomsky is a liberal, democrat, and anti-war figure. He is one of the most prominent advocates of peace and commitment to international laws. Additionally, Chomsky is a supporter of human rights organisations. He calls for respect for human rights and support for the oppressed people. Noam Chomsky as an intellectual scientist, thinker, acknowledgeable and wise political commentator has a comprehensive, deep vision which

helps him link the past with the present so as to draw inspiring lessons. For Chomsky, the US attitude of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, and the massive, unconditioned support for Israeli governments is the primarily cause for the selected social wrong, i.e., injustice. He says [it's the United States who provides the massive support for everything that goes on. It's the United States that vetoes Security Council resolutions calling for an end to illegal occupation and so on]. What makes the situation even more complicated is Israel's intransigence and continued rejection of UN Security Council resolutions, which emphasise the two-state solution. However, Chomsky maintains that what happens in the occupied territories is because everyone is silent, and that confronting injustice is everyone's responsibility without exception [whatever Israel does, it's because you and I permit it to happen]. A further point is power dynamics, Chomsky talks about the powerless Palestinians who have two options; either live under the siege or leave their lands and properties. The other side of power relations is represented by the US and Israel, which have the power to oppose and violate international resolutions, hence, the concept of hegemony is recontextualised in this interview. In addition, the interlocutor clarifies that Israel is an anti-democratic state [a religious nationalist element is the majority which is opposed to democracy]. This in fact, leads to more racism and extremism. Finally, the characterisation of identities is obviously noticed in the distinctive use of the pronouns [we] and [it]. The first, [we] represents the interviewee, Chomsky, and all of humanity who are supposed, according to Chomsky, to care about, and support the Palestinian population. On the other hand, the second pronoun [it] represents the US which, the interlocutor considers are the main cause for all that happens in the occupied Palestinian lands.

The third stage

The validity of the selected social wrong is the current task of this stage. Social justice is one of the first rights called for by human rights organisations and is unanimously approved by all heavenly religions. The pursuit of justice and the elimination of injustice is an eternal human demand. Accordingly, to stop injustice, which is one of the worst social wrongs, Chomsky suggests that adherence to Security Council resolutions on the two-state solution, and respect for human rights in accordance with international conventions should be imperative to avoid the identified social wrong.

The fourth stage

This last stage represents the solution as it is portrayed by the interviewee. The solution necessarily requires Israel's and the US' full commitment to the UN and Security Council resolutions and to proceed with the two-state solution. In addition, Israeli government has to stop its expansionist settlement project in the occupied territories.

Results and discussion

By adopting Fairclough (2010) approach to CDA, the study adopts the next conclusions: (1) Over-wording is utilised by Bremmer and Chomsky in their interviews. (2) Active voice is the main type of voice for both Bremmer and Chomsky. (3) Extrinsic modality is the obvious type of modality seen in Bremmer's interview, as well as, in Chomsky's interview. But while Bremmer tends to use grammatical structures that indicate ability, Chomsky tends to use structures that indicate necessity. This reflects Bremmer's power

and ability to do something, in contrast to Chomsky's rational human attitude as he cares about the Palestinians who live under the siege. (4) With regard to transitivity, material processes are mainly used in Bremmer's interview. By contrast, relational processes are mainly used in Chomsky's interview. Consequently, Bremmer is more interested in agents and events, while Chomsky is more interested in the relationships between those agents and events. (5) With regard to rhetorical strategies, Bremmer uses rhetorical questions and metaphors, while Chomsky uses only metaphors. (6) Both Bremmer's discourse and Chomsky's discourse contain indirect intertextuality, but only Chomsky's discourse contains direct intertextuality. Thus, Bremmer tends to put things in his own style. While Chomsky tends to quote others to give his talk more credibility. (7) Chomsky uses representative speech acts more than Bremmer does. This reflects the fact that Chomsky has more experience, and information than Bremmer. (8) Bremmer as well as Chomsky speaks about violence, hegemony, dominance, colonialism, and manipulation, but only Chomsky speaks about racism. (9) Bremmer represents the US ideology of hegemony, since he strongly believes that the US are the advocate of liberalism and democracy in the world. Moreover, Bremmer asserts that America is the one country that has the leverage to do something concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. By contrast, Chomsky represents the anti-war humanitarian point of view. Chomsky believes that the Palestinians suffer from harsh humanitarian conditions, because the US support Israel. (10) Finally, injustice is the identified social wrong. Firstly, Bremmer thinks that Hamas is responsible for the status quo. By contrast, Chomsky thinks it is because of the US support for Israel. Secondly, Bremmer believes that the solution lies in the decisive role played by the US in leading peace negotiations. On the contrary, the solution lies in respecting human rights principles and adhering to Security Council resolutions that call for peaceful coexistence and the two-state solution as Noam Chomsky puts it.

Conclusions

1. Injustice is the identified social wrong in Bremmer's discourse as well as Chomsky's discourse.
2. Metaphors are utilised by both Bremmer and Chomsky in their discourse.
3. Hegemony is obviously seen in Bremmer's interview as he repeatedly uses phrases like "we are the one country".
4. Representative speech acts are the most commonly used type of speech acts by both the interviewees; Ian Bremmer and Noam Chomsky in their interviews.
5. Noam Chomsky is an anti-war figure since he supports a comprehensive cessation of war and calls for the implementation of Security Council resolutions concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Author contribution

Noora Jameel Abed Ali: Conducted all aspects of the research, including conceptualisation, methodology, data collection and analysis, and writing the manuscript. Prof. Sarab Khalil Hameed PhD: Supervised the research process, provided academic guidance, and reviewed the final manuscript. Both authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

References

- Almuslehi, M. (2023-12-15). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hate Speech directed toward Iraqi TV Series Performers' on Social Media. *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences*, 62(4), 292–311. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36473/ujhss.v62i4>.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and Power* (3rd ed.). UK: Routledge.
- Gee, J. (1986). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996). *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Hassan, H. (2024-3-15). Human Rights in Jamaica Kincaid's A Small Place. *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences*, 63(1), 20–32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36473/xpxerf26>.
- Hassan, N. (2018). Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Inaugural Speech. *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences*, 1(226), 87–110.
- Heller, M., & McElhinny, B. S. (2017). *Language, Capitalism, Colonialism: Toward a Critical History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Herzog, B. (2016). *Discourse Analysis as Social Critique: Discursive and Non-Discursive Realities in Critical Social Research* (1st ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Janam, I. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Language of Persuasion Used in the Election Campaign by American Parliaments. *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences*, 58(4), 33–46.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*. Sage Publications.
- McLellan, D. (1986). *Ideology*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Mubdir, A. (2022). *Israeli-Palestinian Struggle: A Critical Discourse Analysis*. Baghdad University. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/577336/>
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum Publishing Corporation.
- Rogers, R. (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse: Language as Social Interaction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sorrel, A. (2020). *Manipulation or Persuasion: How to Win Everything*. New York: Solis Lux, Inc.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352–371). Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Krzyzanowsky, M. (2008). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. London: Red Globe Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Appendix

The First Interview with Ian Bremmer

<https://youtu.be/picfmk1NU3g?si=0Q27j3pXvQx8Q8mj>

The Second Interview with Noam Chomsky

https://youtu.be/zKQOrAyXM5U?si=UxeTHReBiUFUA_s0

الصراع الفلسطيني الإسرائيلي من خلال مقابلات تشومسكي وبريمر: تحليل نقدي للخطاب

نورا جميل، سراب خليل

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة بغداد.

المستخلص

يُعدُّ الصراع الفلسطيني الإسرائيلي من أكثر القضايا أهميةً وإثارةً للجدل في العالم. يتناول هذا البحث موضوع الصراع الفلسطيني الإسرائيلي من زاوية مختلفة إلى حدِّ ما. إذ تسعى الباحثة إلى تسليط الضوء على بعض النقاط المهمة من خلال اعتماد نهج فيركلاف (2010) للتحليل النقدي للخطاب لأجل الحصول على نتائج منطقية. تؤدي الصراعات عادةً إلى ظهور عدد من المشكلات الاجتماعية، مثل الفقر، والظلم، والتهميش، وغيرها. نظراً لذلك، تعتقد الباحثة بأن نهج فيركلاف (2010) هو الإطار النقدي التحليلي الأنسب لمعالجة مثل تلك المشكلات. ووصولاً إلى الهدف المرجو من هذا البحث، تم اختيار مقابلتين لأجل الدراسة والتحليل. الأولى للعالم السياسي المعروف إيان بريمر، والثانية للفيلسوف المفكر والعالم الأكثر شهرة في مجال اللغة واللغويات نعوم تشومسكي. على أي حال، يهدف البحث إلى إثبات الفرضيات الآتية: (1) أفعال الكلام التمثيلية هي النوع السائد في مقابلات كل من بريمر وتشومسكي. (2) استخدام الاستعارات في المقابلات المختارة للبحث من قبل بريمر وتشومسكي. (3) يُعدُّ نعوم تشومسكي شخصيةً مناهضةً للحرب. (4) يتكرر مفهوم الهيمنة في خطاب إيان بريمر. (5) تم تحديد الظلم باعتباره الخطأ الاجتماعي السائد في كلتا المقابلتين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التحليل النقدي للخطاب، فيركلاف، تشومسكي، بريمر، الخطأ الاجتماعي