

**تحليل خطابي لمفهوم "الإرهاب" و"الحقوق"  
اللسطينية في الخطابات الرئاسية الأمريكية منذ ٧  
تشرين الأول/أكتوبر ٢٠٢٣**

**A Discourse Analysis of Palestinian Terror'  
and Rights 'in US Presidential Speeches  
since 7 October 2023'**

م.د. محمد رعد جدوع

Muhammed Raad Jadow

جامعة سامراء – كلية الإدارة والاقتصاد

University of Samarra/ College of Administration and  
Economics

Email: [muhammed.raad@uosamarra.edu.iq](mailto:muhammed.raad@uosamarra.edu.iq)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8351-6381>

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب، الفلسطينيون، الإرهاب، الحقوق، الخطابات الرئاسية

الأمريكية، ٧ تشرين الأول/أكتوبر ٢٠٢٣

**Keywords:** Discourse analysis, Palestinian, terror, rights, US  
presidential speeches, 7 October 2023



## المخلص

هدف هذا البحث إلى تحليل البنية الخطابية للرئاسة الأمريكية منذ بداية الحرب الأخيرة على غزة عام ٢٠٢٣، وذلك من خلال توضيح الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والأيدولوجية المستخدمة في الخطابات لتبرير الموقف السياسي تجاه الحرب والدول العربية، وبيان مدى تأثير هذه الاستراتيجيات في إنتاج علاقات القوة والهيمنة ضمن السياق الدولي. اعتمد البحث المنهج النوعي القائم على تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA)، ولا سيما نموذج فان دايك للتحليل الأيدولوجي للخطاب، لتحليل تمثيلات مفهومي «الإرهاب» و«الحقوق» الفلسطينية في الخطابات الرئاسية الأمريكية منذ ٧ تشرين الأول/أكتوبر ٢٠٢٣

تم اختيار أربعة خطابات ألقاها الرئيس الأمريكي جو بايدن في محطات سياسية مختلفة أثناء الحرب لتمثل محور الدراسة. وأشارت النتائج إلى وجود تحوّل في نبرة الخطاب الرئاسي الأمريكي؛ إذ جرى في بداية الحرب توظيف مفهوم الإرهاب لتحديد الأطر المفاهيمية، بينما جرى لاحقاً، ولا سيما مع بداية عام ٢٠٢٤، توظيف خطاب حقوق الإنسان لتأطير الموقف الإنساني والأخلاقي للولايات المتحدة. ولا يدل هذا التحوّل أو التذبذب في الموارد اللغوية والاستراتيجيات الأيدولوجية بالضرورة على تغيير في الموقف الأمريكي، بل يعكس موقفاً دبلوماسياً واستراتيجية سياسية للتعامل مع الضغوط المحيطة وفرض الهيمنة السياسية الأمريكية على المستوى الدولي

ويوصي البحث بإجراء مزيد من التحليل للخطاب الأمريكي خلال عامي ٢٠٢٤ و٢٠٢٥، بهدف إبراز الفجوة بين مضمون الخطاب والواقع الفعلي للأحداث في غزة، وتقييم ما إذا كان الخطاب المتعلق بالحقوق الفلسطينية قد ظل ضمن إطار شكلي ورسمي أم اتجه نحو مقاربة واقعية وحقيقية

## Abstract

The research aims to analyze the discourse structure of the American presidency since the beginning of the latest war on Gaza in 2023, clarifying the linguistic and ideological strategies used in speeches to justify the political stance towards the war and Arab states, and elucidating the extent to which these strategies influence the production of power relations and hegemony within the international context. The research used the qualitative approach based on the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology, specifically Van Dijk's Ideological Discourse Analysis model to analyze Palestinian 'terror' and 'rights' in US Presidential speeches since 7 October 2023. Four speeches were selected to represent the study population, specifically those proposed by US President Joe Biden at various political junctures during the war. The results indicated that US Presidential speeches involved a shift in tone. At the beginning of the war, terrorism was used to define conceptual frameworks, while later on, specifically by the beginning of 2024, human rights were used to frame the humanitarian and ethical stance of the United States. This shift, or fluctuation, in linguistic resources and ideological strategies does not necessarily signify a change in the American position; rather, it reflects a diplomatic stance and a political strategy for dealing with surrounding pressures and imposing international political hegemony on the entire world. The research recommends further analysis of American discourse in 2024 and 2025, in an attempt to highlight the gap between the content of the discourse and the reality of events in Gaza, and to assess whether the discourse on Palestinian rights remained within a formal framework or adopted a realistic and genuine one.



## 1. Introduction

On October 7, 2023, Hamas factions breached the Gaza border in an operation known as “Al-Aqsa Flood”. The Al-Aqsa floods came as a shock to the international community, particularly to the United States and Israel. Following the start of the Al-Aqsa floods, Israel launched intensive aerial military attacks within the Gaza envelope, leading to a deterioration of the situation (Orhan, 2024).

The United States, through its subsequent speeches, affirmed its direct support for Israel in various aspects. On October 18, 2023, former US President Joe Biden visited Tel Aviv, where he affirmed his full military and political support for Israel (Jackson, 2024). Khalifa (2023) indicated that the United States provided Israel with financial, political, military, and media support during the war on Gaza. The United States consistently affirmed, through speeches by US presidents, Israel's right to defend itself and protect itself from Hamas attacks, which were repeatedly described as ‘terrorist’.

On the American media front, coverage Gaza war became a top priority for the American press and media. The United States displayed a clear bias in its presidential speeches and media reports toward the Israeli side, and it justified the Israeli offensive in various parts of the Gaza Strip. In many of its statements, the United States asserted that Hamas was responsible for the continuation of the conflict and the war in Gaza, and that it used civilians as human shields to carry out its military operations and exploited infrastructure for its own military purposes (Thomas, 2023).

As the war continued, international demands and interventions to end it intensified. Consequently, a noticeable shift emerged in the tone of American rhetoric, characterised by a more flexible stance, while simultaneously emphasising that Israel was not responsible for the continuation of the conflict and that its actions were merely self-defence against attacks. American discourse focused on Israeli human and material losses, while completely ignoring Palestinian casualties. American speeches can be seen as a vehicle for expressing diverse intellectual frameworks and viewpoints, upon which state policy (both foreign and domestic) is determined (Al-Khouli, 2023). The speeches proposed by American presidents during the Gaza war reflected the American perspective on both the Palestinian and Israeli sides. These speeches directly expressed the United States' position on the war and the policies it adopted to respond to the surrounding political and global circumstances. Linguistic concepts reflecting American orientations emerged in these speeches, directly influencing the expression of the United States' domestic policy. Therefore, reviewing and analyzing the speeches proposed by

American presidents during the war on Gaza can contribute to shaping the intellectual frameworks of the American vision, and clarifying the linguistic and conceptual dimensions within the American speeches. These dimensions can express the American strategy and the military and political perspective that necessarily serves the American interest and puts it at the forefront of efforts seeking to stop the war.

Van Dijk developed the critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a systematic analytical method (Van Dijk, 1998). CDA is used to analyze linguistic discourses and clarify the concepts, expressions, and implications contained within them (Van Dijk, 2006, 2008). Through critical discourse analysis, social practices that express the collective image of society can be revealed. CDA can also clarify how the “other” is expressed, thus elucidating the relationship between the linguistic concept and the social perception (Van Dijk, 2000). Given the nature of this research and its connection to analyzing the linguistic discourses of American presidents’ speeches during the war on Gaza, CDA is considered the most appropriate approach for the current research topic. Based on this critical methodology, the current research seeks to clarify the image through which American discourse during the war on Gaza portrayed Palestinians as ‘terrorists’, in contrast to the image of the ‘victim’ presented by the Israeli occupation.

### **1.1 Research Problem**

The speeches provided by American presidents during the last war on Gaza (starting on October 7, 2023) included many rhetorical shifts to describe the war on Gaza and to explain the disastrous effects resulting from it. The term ‘Palestinian terrorism’ has been used extensively, while concepts of ‘rights’ related to the Palestinian people have been less frequently employed (Al-Khouli, 2023). The linguistic approach within these discourses reflects the ideological discourse structure that influences political decision-making.

Therefore, the current research problem lies in analyzing the discourse structure of the American presidency since the beginning of the latest war on Gaza in 2023, clarifying the linguistic and ideological strategies used in speeches to justify the political stance towards the war and Arab states, and elucidating the extent to which these strategies influence the production of power relations and hegemony within the international context.



## 1.2 Research importance

The importance of this research is evident in several aspects. From an academic perspective, it enriches the field of political discourse analysis with a contemporary study that reflects the realities experienced by countries since October 7, 2023. It is hoped that this research will contribute to understanding American political discourse on the Palestinian issue through language and the shaping of linguistic concepts in ways that serve American policy.

From a practical perspective, this research enhances the ability of those interested in media and discourse analysis, as well as decision-makers, to understand the impact of the US president's speeches on shaping public opinion regarding the Palestinian issue and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This research also contributes to enhancing the knowledge of discourse analysts and researchers on how to use specific tools and a structured methodology to analyse political discourses. The importance of this research is further highlighted by the recency of the period it targets, which encompassed one of the largest and most significant political events globally, thus giving the research added temporal significance. Furthermore, the current research provides an in-depth critical analysis of the intellectual and linguistic frameworks through which the Palestinian people are represented in American global discourses.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 The Political Discourse

Discourse expresses a set of meanings and concepts used to produce a coherent text that includes numerous linguistic concepts. Schools of discourse analysis emerged in the early 1980s and have become notably widespread in various studies (Thomas, 2023). Discourse refers to expressions and judgments, and the way in which linguistic behaviour and its meanings can be understood (Youssef, 2019).

Discourse also expresses the relationships and connections between discursive practices that necessarily reflect social structures (Van Dijk, 2008). Van Dijk (2006) defined discourse and linked it to ideological contexts, emphasising that ideology expresses the systems through which social attitudes are organised, and control is exerted over the discursive context. Discourse analysis allows for the identification of contradictions within ideological contexts (Gyawali, 2020).

Political media discourse is considered one of the media strategies whose use has become essential in recent crises. Political discourse refers to a human activity that uses language as a means of persuasion through

arguments and justifications, relying on diverse communication methods (Taubaldiyev et al., 2024). The primary goal of political discourse is to persuade a specific audience or group of a particular idea or stance (Youssef, 2019). Sichi and Chaib (2024) described the philosophical dimension of political discourse, which is embodied in the method of constructing the discourse and producing the ideological text by relying on prior knowledge to influence global opinion.

Alduhaim (2019) argued that the importance of media discourse has increased in light of the numerous challenges and changes facing the world on various economic, political, cultural, environmental, social, and other levels. Consequently, political discourse has become the most important means of expressing issues and matters that influence international decision-making. Political media discourse clearly expresses contemporary realities and issues (Taubaldiyev et al, 2024). Youssef (2019) emphasized that media discourse has political and economic power, as it conveys events to the audience and influences their attitudes and orientations.

Therefore, discourse is a verbal text composed of a set of written, spoken, or visual linguistic units. These linguistic units carry information, knowledge, ideas, concepts, and inclinations that the speaker aims to convey to the listener within a social, political, scientific, religious, or other framework. The study of discourse analysis aims to uncover the meanings that constitute the text through explanation and interpretation.

## 2.2 Related Previous Studies

The existence of the multiplicity of the discourse tools and strategies utilised in American discourses regarding the Palestinian issue has been confirmed in the previous studies (Alduhaim, 2019; Youssef, 2019; Al-Khouli, 2023; Bhowmik and Fisher, 2023; Sichi and Chaib, 2024; Jackson, 2024; Damanhoury and Saleh, 2024; Jamil, 2025). Majority of the earlier researches have identified a bias in political coverage of the US on Israeli side, and the minimization of Palestinian casualties (Bhowmik and Fisher, 2023; Al-Khouli, 2023; Jackson, 2024). Al-Khouli (2023) carried out a study of American speeches in the 2023 Gaza War. The research indicated the US standpoint of bankrolling Israel and blaming Hamas of the human and material casualties and prolongation of the war in Gaza. The speeches further pointed out that the war in Gaza would only end after destroying Hamas and ousting it out of power in Gaza, Hamas was the source of the current war and the consequential loss of life. Moreover, the American rhetoric introduced Israel as a country that was defending itself by attacking Gaza without taking into account the number of civilian Palestinians killed in the attacks.



The findings of the study of Al-Khouli (2023) were supported by those of Jackson (2024). As it was claimed by Jackson (2024), The New York Times was biased in its reporting on the war in Gaza, depicting the Palestinian side in a negative light and the Israelis in a positive one. This agrees with the research results of the Damanhoury and Saleh study (2024), which examined the news framing of CNN when it reported the Gaza war. The study analyzed the content of a selection of articles published on the network's website. Damanhoury & Saleh (2024) confirmed CNN's biased coverage, highlighting Israeli casualties. This is precisely what Hen and Chandra (2022) also confirmed in their study of Fox News' coverage in 2021 (May 15 to May 31, 2021). The findings of Hen and Chandra (2022) confirmed Fox News' bias towards the Israeli side, exaggerating losses on the Israeli side while downplaying losses among Palestinians.

Jamil's (2025) analysed the American speeches during the 2025 Gaza War. The study focused on the speeches of US President Donald Trump after he assumed presidency in 2025. Jamil (2025) asserted that these speeches encompassed numerous American dimensions and interests. The speeches reflected the dynamics of the relationship between the US and other countries. The speeches emphasized the United States' status as the dominant global superpower and its complete control over the sovereignty of other nations. Jamil (2025) discussed Trump's speeches regarding the reconstruction of Gaza, arguing that Trump's insistence to reconstruction did not stem from a genuine desire to rebuild Gaza, but rather from a desire to impose US and Israeli hegemony over the Gaza Strip, attempting to provide an image of goodwill towards the Palestinian situation. US intervention in Gaza's reconstruction presented a suitable opportunity for the US to consolidate its control over Gaza without facing any other international threats. This means that America's desire to rebuild Gaza serves its own interests and expresses its political dominance. For the US president, this reconstruction is not a humanitarian gesture or an act of compassion, but rather a means to consolidate US hegemony within the Gaza Strip and to create an economic environment aligned with US interests and supportive of Israeli interests by imposing US-Israeli control over the Strip.

It is clear from the above that the Palestinian issue has received widespread attention from researchers analyzing discourse in various media outlets and social networks. The results of these studies confirm that American discourse, whether issued by the presidency or published through media channels, radio stations, and news websites, portrays Israel as the victim and the Palestinians as the cause of the human losses, attempting to mislead global public opinion regarding the Palestinian issue, specifically concerning the October 7th War. Therefore, the problem

addressed in this research is to monitor and analyze the mechanisms of bias within the American presidential discourse regarding the October 7th War of 2023 in Gaza, and to analyze the speeches and topics addressed in these speeches. Especially since the events of the Gaza war dominated local and international media coverage, and the repercussions of this war had a wide-ranging impact on both the Arab and Western worlds. Therefore, a critical analysis of these speeches is crucial to highlighting the implications conveyed by the US presidency regarding the Gaza war of 2023 through analyzing Palestinian 'terror' and 'rights' in US Presidential speeches since 7 October 2023.

### 3. Method

As previously explained, this research will rely on the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology, specifically Van Dijk's Ideological Discourse Analysis model. This model is considered the most suitable for identifying the linguistic semantics in American political discourse related to the October 7th war in Gaza. This type of analysis allows for highlighting linguistic representations at multiple levels, including microscopic and macroscopic levels, thus clarifying the discursive strategies and linguistic structures that express the underlying ideology. This allows for clarifying the image conveyed by the discourses that portray Palestinians as 'terrorists' and as having 'rights'.

Microscopic-level analysis focuses on highlighting vocabulary, pronouns, verbs, and adjectives. Macroscopic-level analysis focuses on the main themes of the discourse, analyzing the narrative framework, and highlighting the messages intended to be conveyed regarding the image of the Palestinian through the discourse. Finally, the ideological strategies embedded in the discourse will be clarified, specifically by clarifying the image that the discourse presents of the Palestinian and the Israeli side.

The current research is a qualitative study based on discourse analysis and the clarification of its ideological meanings through the analysis of a sample of speeches by US presidents to analyze Palestinian 'terror' and 'rights' in US Presidential speeches since 7 October 2023. The study population consists of all American speeches related to the events of October 7, 2023, from the beginning of the war until the end of the war on Gaza in 2025. Four speeches were selected to represent the study population, specifically those proposed by US President Joe Biden at various political junctures during the war. The speeches chosen reflect shifts in the American position on the war and specifically include the terms 'terror' and "right" due to their relevance to the main research topic.

### 4. Analysis and Results

#### 4.1 Speech 1: Biden Speech, 10 October 2023:



*'The brutal attack by Hamas on innocent Israeli civilians was an act of pure evil. We stand firmly with Israel as it defends itself. Hamas terrorists showed no regard for human life, using fear and terror to destroy families'*

- **Microscopic-level analysis**

The quoted speech clearly employs emotionally charged language that portrays Israel as a victim, such as 'innocent Israeli civilians' and 'brutal attack'. It also uses lexical choices that justifies the legitimacy of Israeli actions in the Gaza Strip, such as 'defends itself'. Furthermore, it employs a 'terrorist framing' approach. The speech describes individual Hamas actions using 'attack' and 'destroy' to emphasize that Hamas alone is responsible for these actions, thus justifying Israel's defensive stance. Strong adjectives are also used to describe the criminal acts committed by Hamas, such as 'pure evil' and 'brutal'.

- **Macroscopic-level analysis**

In general, the speech incorporates a range of themes, including: US support for Israel's right to defend itself, unequivocal condemnation of Hamas, affirmation of Israel's right to defend itself against terrorist acts, and holding Hamas responsible for any criminal acts. These themes are expressed through the general narrative using phrases like 'We stand', 'defends itself', and 'Hamas terrorists'.

- **The used ideological strategies**

The speech employs several ideological strategies, including a positive self-portrait, expressed through 'We stand firmly with Israel', and a negative portrayal of the other, expressed through 'pure evil, terrorists'. The speech justifies Israeli defense, describing Hamas as terrorists without mentioning civilians, and focuses on Israeli victims.

The first speech demonstrates the US's full support for Israel, its justification of Israeli defense, its characterization of Hamas as 'terrorists', and its portrayal of Israel as a victim in the war.

#### **4.2 Speech 2: Biden Speech, 20 October 2023:**

*'Israel has the right and responsibility to respond to terrorism. We mourn every innocent life lost, but we must be clear: Hamas hides behind civilians, turning them into shields. The United States will ensure Israel has what it needs'*

- **Microscopic-level analysis**

The speech employs lexical choices that reinforces Israel's legitimacy in self-defense, such as 'right and responsibility'. It also uses phrases that hold the Palestinian side responsible for civilian casualties and

suggest that Hamas uses civilians as human shields, as in ‘Hamas hides behind civilians’. While the speech doesn't specify the identity of these civilians, it attempts to express sympathy for their plight, but this sympathy is vague and undefined. According to the US president, Hamas is responsible for their deaths. Moreover, the speech referred to the United States using the pronoun ‘we’, while Hamas is referred to in the singular, meaning that the speech employs duality in its expression. The verbs used in the speech, including ‘respond’ and ‘ensure’, emphasize US support for Israel.

- **Macroscopic-level analysis**

At the macro level, the speech included a number of points, including holding Hamas responsible for the human losses through its use of civilians as human shields, affirming Israel's legitimacy to defend itself, and expressing sympathy for the Palestinian victims. The speech employed a tone of sympathy for the victims, stating, ‘*We mourn every innocent life lost, but we must be clear: Hamas hides behind civilians*’.

- **The used ideological strategies**

The speech employed a range of ideological strategies, including positive self-presentation, where the United States showed empathy for civilian victims, highlighting America's humanitarian side. It also portrayed itself as morally balanced through its sympathy for Palestinian civilian victims, reflecting a balanced ethical equation. The United States also blamed Hamas for the civilian victims.

Thus, the second speech clearly demonstrated the use of public sympathy to justify the political stance of supporting Israel, holding Hamas responsible for civilian victims, and reaffirming its full support for Israel to achieve its objectives. The speech highlighted the use of the word ‘right’ in reference to Israel and the implicit characterization of Hamas as ‘terrorism’ for using civilians as human shields.

### **4.3 Speech 3: Biden Speech, 18 November 2023:**

‘*We are working to secure humanitarian pauses to allow aid into Gaza. Palestinian families deserve safety, food, and medicine. Hamas continues to put civilians at risk, but we remain committed to supporting humanitarian efforts*’

- **Microscopic-level analysis**

The lexical choices reveal the first shift in American discourse, including a partial acknowledgment of Palestinian rights through the phrase ‘deserve safety’. The language continues to hold Hamas responsible for the conflict in Gaza and for endangering civilians through the phrase ‘put civilians at risk’. Additionally, the discourse presents a humanitarian



and empathetic aspect to the war in Gaza, highlighting US support for ending the conflict through 'humanitarian efforts'.

The discourse also uses the pronoun 'we' to emphasize the leading role the United States plays in delivering aid to Gaza, specifically to Palestinian families. For the first time, the discourse acknowledges the civilian nature of Palestinians through the phrase 'Palestinian families'.

- **Macroscopic-level analysis**

- There are some themes integrated into the discourse at a macro level. It emphasizes the human tragedy and compassion that the US has towards the Palestine families that have suffered. Nevertheless, it repeats the fact that Hamas is guilty of the threat to civilians. The US also changes its perception of the Palestinians as civilians. There are also narrative phrases that are part of the discourse, which is, We are working, Palestinian families deserve, and Hamas continues.

- **The used ideological strategies**

The speech focuses on demonstrating American empathy and humanitarianism by emphasizing the right of Palestinian families to access food and medicine (i.e. Humanitarian Framing). The United States also portrays itself positively (i.e. Positive Self-Presentation) as striving to deliver aid to Palestinian families.

This speech reveals a shift in the American perception of Palestinians, presenting them for the first time as possessing civil rights. However, the speech makes no acknowledgment that Israel is responsible for depriving Palestinians of these rights; instead, it asserts that Hamas is the primary cause.

#### **4.4 Speech 4: Biden Speech, 8 January 2024:**

*'The situation in Gaza is heartbreaking. Innocent Palestinians, especially children, are suffering. We have urged Israel to minimize harm and allow more aid in. Hamas's actions continue to prevent a sustainable peace'*

- **Microscopic-level analysis**

The United States, in its choice of words, recognizes the colossal pain of the people of Gaza, especially the children, by referring to words such as heartbreaking and innocence Palestinians. It states clearly that it laments the Israeli side, although without emphasizing any negative side of this lamentation, through the use of the term urge Israel. By citing the phrase prevent a sustainable peace, the speech stresses that Hamas is to blame in the extension of the war and inability to find a peaceful resolution.

The speech uses the pronoun ‘we’ to indicate the United States' guiding role towards Israel, not to correct the Israeli position. It also uses a description that affirms Palestinian rights, using the phrase ‘innocent Palestinians’.

- **Macroscopic-level analysis**

At a macro level, the speech incorporates a range of themes. It expands the recognition of Palestinian victims and demonstrates limited political pressure on Israel to deliver aid to Palestinian children. It reiterates that Hamas is responsible for the continuation of the conflict in Gaza.

- **The used ideological strategies**

The text employs a range of ideological strategies, including balanced sympathy for the Palestinians, specifically children, and mild criticism of Israel without explicitly condemning it or naming it as the cause of the ongoing conflict in Gaza (i.e. Soft Criticism). Hamas bears full responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Gaza (i.e. Delegitimization of Hamas).

It is clear that the fourth speech is the one that provides the most framework for rights, but it does not directly criticize Israeli practices or hold Israel responsible for the continuation of the war in Gaza and the killing of civilians.

## **5. Discussion**

The four analyzed speeches reveal shifts in the American position, evident in the vocabulary and structures used in the discourse. At the beginning of the war, American discourse portrayed Palestinians as ‘terrorists’ and Israel as the ‘victim’. The US also presented itself as Israel's primary ally, supporting it with all its resources to combat Palestinian evil, primarily represented by Hamas. In subsequent discourses, Israel began to be portrayed as ‘defending’ its rights, and Hamas as solely responsible for the war in Gaza and the killing of civilians. Hamas was accused of using civilians as human shields.

American speeches have not portrayed Israel as responsible for the conflict in Gaza; rather, it has depicted Israel as a victim defending itself against terrorist attacks by Hamas. This observation argues with the research by Hen and Chandra (2022) and Bhowmik and Fisher (2023), which proved that American oratory is biased in favor of the Israeli side and focuses on the right of Israel to self-defense. Thus, American speeches are aimed at greenwashing an image of Israel and ignoring other dimensions, representing the attacks conducted by the Palestinian side as terrorism (Khalifa, 2023). American speeches also always assert that the Palestinian party, that is, Hamas, is the cause of the further development of the conflict in Gaza and the deaths on both the Israeli and Palestinian



parties (Hen and Chandra, 2022). The US has shown its military, material, and political support of Israel with the weapons and equipment they used to defend themselves and enhance their military and economic power against Hamas (Jackson, 2024).

With the further development of the war and its escalation in 2024, a change in the tone of American political rhetoric started to take place, especially as international and regional needs were becoming more urgent. Hence, within its rhetoric, the United States tried to show grief to the victims of Palestine, since it had so far failed to acknowledge their existence. At this point, American speeches did not depict Palestinians as terrorists, but took a humanitarian approach, and found sympathy with the rest of the world. Yet, at the same time, they highlighted the defensive position of Israel and put the entire blame of the conflict on Hamas. This aligns with Thomas's (2024) study, which demonstrated that the United States continued to justify the Israeli offensive in Gaza and its self-defense. Thomas's (2024) study also affirmed Hamas's absolute responsibility for the continuation of the conflict in Gaza, even holding it accountable for Palestinian casualties, based on the American and Israeli claims that Hamas uses Palestinians as human shields to carry out its military operations. Furthermore, Hamas allegedly exploits infrastructure to expand its military operations (Thomas, 2024).

Subsequently, American speeches underwent further shifts in tone and meaning, attempting to project political dominance. American speeches began criticizing the Israeli side without assigning blame or responsibility to Israel for the war on Gaza. In its recent pronouncements, the United States has attempted to propose a humanitarian image and express sympathy for Palestinian victims in order to garner international support and demonstrate its good faith in its desire to end the war. This is seen in the way it talked at the start of 2024 when it stopped concentrating on terrorism and focused on human rights in which it pointed out the hypocrisy and the lack of sense in the American story about the war in Gaza. This is in line with the results of Al-Khouli (2023), Jackson (2024), and Jamil (2025), who have established that due to the growing pressure of the international community, there has been a shift and change in the tone of American discourse that has strengthened American hegemony and promoted its humanitarian order.

## **6. Conclusion**

American discourse involves a shift in tone. At the beginning of the war, terrorism was used to define conceptual frameworks, while later on, specifically by the beginning of 2024, human rights were used to frame the humanitarian and ethical stance of the United States. This shift, or fluctuation, in linguistic resources and ideological strategies does not necessarily signify a change in the American position; rather, it reflects a

diplomatic stance and a political strategy for dealing with surrounding pressures and imposing international political hegemony on the entire world.

Despite the appearance of human rights discourse in many instances in the US presidential speeches, reality reveals a weak commitment to rights due to the absence of political actions to affirm them. Consequently, political media discourse presents the image of the Palestinian according to American and Israeli interests through an ideological system that expresses actual American policies.

## 6.1 Recommendation

Based on the findings, the research recommends further analysis of American discourse in 2024 and 2025, in an attempt to highlight the gap between the content of the discourse and the reality of events in Gaza, and to assess whether the discourse on Palestinian rights remained within a formal framework or adopted a realistic and genuine one.

It is also important to study the policies included in the American ceasefire speeches in Gaza and the violations committed by the Israeli side during this time.

### References

- Alduhaim, A. (2019). A Comparative Study of Political Discourse Features in English and Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistic*, 9(6), 148–159.
- Al-Khouli, S. (2023). Mechanisms of bias in the discourse of American newspapers towards the Israeli war on Gaza 2023: A comparative critical study in light of the Palestinian and Israeli narratives. *Egyptian Journal of Media Research*, 88, 275–345.
- Bhowmik, S., and Fisher, J. (2023). Framing the Israel–Palestine conflict 2021: Investigation of CNN’s coverage from a peace journalism perspective. *Media, Culture & Society*, 45(5), 1019–1035.
- Damanhoury, K. E., & Saleh, F. (2024). Mediated Clash of Civilizations: Examining the Proximity–Visual Framing Nexus in Al Jazeera Arabic and Fox News’ Coverage of the 2021 Gaza War. *Digital Journalism*, 1–23.
- Gyawali, Y. (2020). Ideological Interaction Theory in Critical Discourse Analysis. In book: *Heritage* (pp.1–14). Intech Open.
- Hen, A., and Chandra, O. (2022). The Representation of Palestinian–Israeli Conflict in Online News Articles: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, dan Budaya*, 12(1), 134–147
- Jackson, H. (2024). The New York Times distorts the Palestinian struggle: A case



- study of anti-Palestinian bias in US news coverage of the First and Second Palestinian Intifadas. *Media, War & Conflict*, 17(1), 116–135.
- Jackson, H. (2024). The New York Times distorts the Palestinian struggle: A case study of anti-Palestinian bias in US news coverage of the First and Second Palestinian Intifadas. *Media, War & Conflict*, 17(1), 116–135.
- Jamil, N. (2025). The Impact of Trump's Speeches on Dynamic Transformations in the International System: A Critical Study from the Perspective of International Relations Theories (Analyzing Trump's Speech According to International Relations Theories). *Hammurabi Center for Research and Strategic Studies*.
- Khalifa, A. (2023). *A Month's Siege of Arab and European Positions on the War on Gaza (October 7–November 7)*. Center for Civilization Studies and Research. Published in November 15, 2023. Available at: <https://rebrand.ly/o7hgdcu>
- Orhan, E. (2024). The Us Approach to the October 7 Attacks and the Israel–Hammas Conflict in the Context of Antony Blinken's Discourses. *Akdeniz İİBF Dergisi*, 24(2), 49–58.
- Sichi, Y., and Chaib, T. (2024). Strategy for building resistance political discourse Abu Ubaida's speeches as an example. *Djoussour El-maaréfa*, 10(2), 606–615.
- Taubaldiyev, M., Kulmanov, S., Amirbekova, A., Azimkhan, Y., Zhonkeshov, B., Utemissova, G., and Ospanov, Y. (2024). Terminology In Political Discourse as A Means of Language Representation of The Image of The Country. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 186–198
- Thomas, K. (2023). Biden Says Civilians in Gaza Are 'Being Used as Human Shields'. *Wall Street Journal*. Published in 16 October 2023. Available at: <https://archive.is/nVJJG>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin et al. (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352–371). Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Youssef, L. (2024). President Trump's media discourse in the US election Study in electronic news sites – CNN ARABIC Mode. *Al-Bahith Al-I'lami Journal*, (42), 93–108.