

A Critical Stylistic Analysis of Biden's Representation on Israel-Palestine War

Omar Osama Nashaat^{1*}

Abstract

This investigation is being conducted with the intention of utilizing linguistic formality in order to uncover the author's hidden philosophy. In the field of critical stylistics, the objective is to go behind the surface of the words in order to discover the political ideas that lie beneath them. The purpose of this study is to seek an answer to the following question in order to shed light on the ideologies that are employed in political discourses: what are the essential stylistic instruments that were utilized in Joe Biden's political speech on the Israel-Palestine war? Exactly what are the beliefs that are being concealed behind this political speech? The purpose of this study is to analyze Joe Biden's political declaration in an effort to unearth the ideologies that are concealed inside this ideological statement. 2010 year of Jeffries The model that was utilized in the research might be referred to as Critical Stylistics. According to the findings of the study, the use of the analytical tool known as "naming and describing" in political discourse is related with a significant amount of ideological weight. After doing the research, the researchers came to the conclusion that the most prominent important style instruments in the chosen political statement of Joe Biden are identifying and describing. In addition, the analysis shows the underlying ideologies that are contained inside this political statement. These ideologies include provocation, legitimized slaughter, pathos, retribution, anti-Semitism, religious discrimination, inclusivity, deceiving, and media blackout.

Keywords: naming and describing, ideology, political speech, discrimination, incitement.

1. INTRODUCTION

Within the realm of speech that is connected to the power of discourse is the category of political speech. Political thought typically results in a power struggle over who gets what. This is the typical consequence. Language is of the utmost importance when it comes to organizing, regulating, completing, and exercising authority. It is described as "the study of conflict resolution, the art of government, the conduct and management of public affairs, and so on." According to Modebadze (2010), this is what he means when he talks about politics. Wilson (2001, p. 411) claims that this word "highlights the numerous connotations and laden meanings that politics has in everyday life responsibilities." One perspective on politics is that it may be viewed as a fight for dominance, with influential people on one side and those on the other side attempting to lessen or eliminate the influence of the other side. Within this framework, politicians make use of the language that they employ in order to explain their political goals. Orwell (1968, p.225) brought attention to the political power of language by pointing the finger of blame at politicians for the reduction in their usage of this language. Language, in contrast to Orwell's viewpoint, is responsible for conveying our thoughts as well as proposing and maintaining a wide number of alternatives. Politics and language are social attitudes and behaviors that complement one another since they both serve the purpose of communicating ideas and actions. By gaining an understanding of these methods for acquiring and

¹ (PhD) / Iraqi Ministry of Education / Directorate General of Teachers Training and Educational Development / Baghdad/ Iraq, oo8004880@gmail.com

holding power, it is possible that these techniques will be recoded inside other, more complex ideological frameworks.

Political speech adheres to specific styles, genres, or registers. We argue that there is linguistic diversity when distinct sets of linguistic alternatives are employed to designate different communication roles in different circumstances. One example of this is when we use the word "language." Politicians who are fervently committed to their ideals frequently give speeches. The three types of nonverbal communication that affective politicians are experts in include paralinguistic hints, physical and physiological traits, and linguistic (messages that are presented in a practical manner). Speaking in public presents a unique set of challenges for public speakers, particularly when it comes to political discourse, which is a form of spoken discourse. Given that there are no restrictions on what they may say, those who are speaking ought to use caution with their statements. In addition to this, they should be knowledgeable about the subject matter they are discussing and have confidence in their abilities. Furthermore, they should keep a careful eye on their audience to ensure that they do not become disinterested. According to Chilton (2008), the use of language for political purposes distinguishes political speech. The use of subtle and indirect meanings, the avoidance of improper reality, and the appeal to political emotions through language are all examples of anything that falls under this category. As was said before (on page 226), political emotions, for example, contribute to the definition and characterization of the significant role that emotions play in politics through their influence.

The study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the critical stylistic tools utilized in Biden's political statement on Israel-Palestine war?
2. What is/are the hidden ideology(ies) within Biden's political statement?

The study consists of five sections. The first section is about an introduction to the study. The second section is about the field of study which is Critical Stylistics and its tools. The third section is about the ideologies manifested within political discourse. The fourth section is about the data analysis of the political statement by Joe Biden on Israel-Palestine war. The fifth section is about the conclusions reached by the study.

2. CRITICAL STYLISTICS

Jeffries (2010) suggested creating the field of critical stylistics in order to bridge the gap between critical linguistics and stylistics. At the level of formal language, it has a propensity to provide a comprehensive collection of analytical tools for the purpose of illuminating the concealed ideas contained within the text and displaying how these concepts influence the reader. According to Jeffries (2010, p.1), the ideological ramifications of the text's stylistic choices are readily apparent. In critical discourse analysis, the phrase refers to a specific socialist (Marxist) viewpoint on language analysis. On the other hand, in critical stylistics, it proposes a technique to locate the ideology in texts regardless of whether readers agree or disagree with the ideology (Jeffries, 2014, p. 417).

The field of critical stylistics is comprised of literary works that study the ways in which language expresses social meanings. Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis are two methodologies that may be linked back to the origins of emerging critical stylistic study and analytic tools. Textual meaning is brought into contact with Austin's locution, illocution, and perlocution forces inside the speech act theory; the Hallidayan interpersonal metafunction is responsible for bringing these forces together. This is due to the fact that the meaning of the text acts as a mediator between the language and the sentence. The basic structure of ideational textual structures is comparable to that of locution, and the power of illocutionary expression is comparable to the naturalized meanings that were intended.

Critical stylistic theory, which offers a textual model that is both text- and context-driven, places the text as its primary focus. The model's foundation was the research of Fairclough, Halliday, Fowler, and Simpson. A total of 10 different analytical tools are utilized in order to explore the author's perspective. As an illustration, Jeffries (2010) states that there are several methods to communicate

one's thoughts while using the English language. The following are some of the ways in which this can be accomplished: identifying and describing; representing actions, events, or states; elaborating, listing, prioritizing, or negating; presenting the ideas or speech of others; comparing and contrasting; assuming or implying; hypothesizing; and finally, representing time, space, or society.

3. THE POWER OF IDEOLOGY IN POLITICAL CONTEXTS

As a result of the numerous approaches that have been taken to investigate the concept of ideology, it has been impossible to arrive at a single definition of the term. Every single one of the various points of view reaches the same conclusion: it is, at its core, a social phenomenon. Generally speaking, this is what van Dijk (1998) describes as the views that are prevalent in a culture. There are a lot of definitions provided by Eagleton (1979), and some of them are in conflict with one another. According to him, ideologies contain a wide variety of social awareness, including political, artistic, religious, and ethical considerations. The production and interpretation of texts are ideological activities that seek to strengthen prevailing worldviews; there is no text or discourse that is ideologically neutral. Because ideologies are sometimes implicit, uncovering them requires a comprehensive investigation of the text on every level, in addition to a comprehensive examination of the social environment that is around the text.

To address particular social issues, political discourse comprises a formal exchange of reasoned perspectives on a number of viable solutions (Hult, 2015, p. 217). This facilitates the process of addressing specific social problems. Politicians are the individuals who are able to make their opinions known during political debates. Politicians are those who occupy public office and seek compensation for their political activities. Politicians are also known as public servants. Individuals who attend political communicative events, such as the general public, citizens, masses, and so on, are also considered to be participants in the political process from an interactional point of view. Examining the context of a speech is necessary in order to ascertain whether or not it is political. However, there are other essential conceptual features as well, such as communicative events and encounters, intentions, occasions, goals, legal or political repercussions, and functions. Acts and participants form the foundation of political discourse, but there are also other crucial aspects. Therefore, political discourse is defined as speech made by politicians in a political situation, such as a parliament, a cabinet meeting, an interview, an election campaign, and other similar settings. There is a mutually defining and integrating relationship between the political text and its surroundings. Taking into consideration a parliamentary session, it is only regarded as political when the elected members of parliament meet in the building of the parliament in accordance with the official agenda in order to discuss the matter. Outside of this context, the session is not anything that can be deemed political. It is possible to view the integration of text and context in political discourses as a tool to accomplish certain political goals, such as influencing the decisions that the government makes on matters such as the regulation of laws, the formulation of official rules, and other similar matters.

It is at meetings, speeches, debates, interviews, and broadcasts in various forms of media that a significant portion of the activities that take place in politics take place. These activities include decision-making, legislation-making, debates, and news interviews (van Dijk, 1997, pp. 14–18).

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

During this qualitative investigation of Biden's representation, the researcher makes use of one of the ten textual-conceptual tools that are included in the model and are designed to deal with Biden's representation. The tool includes naming and describing, and it is utilized within the critical stylistic framework of Leslie Jeffries (2010). The purpose of this endeavor is to discover the philosophy that is concealed inside the text. Assumptions are developed and presented to the audience with the purpose of illuminating the audience's fundamental ideas. The political speech given by Biden served as the primary source for the data collection. In his political speech, which mostly focused on the conflict between Israel and Palestine, President Biden provided the material that was gathered from

those addresses. The researcher chose 10 extracts from a political speech that Biden has given for the purpose of this exploration.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

1. *"You know, there are moments in this life — and I mean this literally — when the pure, unadulterated evil is unleashed on this world."* **(Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)**

This remark presented by Biden in 2023 on Hamas's attack on Israel. Biden uses the critical stylistic 'naming and describing'/ pre-noun modification in order to depict and portray Hamas attack on Israel. Two adjectives are utilized to portray this attack which are 'pure' and 'unadulterated'. Biden wants to depict that Hamas attack is unique and the first of its kind which committed against Israel, America's favorite ally. Biden wants to deliver a message that this assault, unleashed by Hamas, is complete and it is against the world. Accordingly, he wants the world to react against Hamas as Hamas launched this assault against the whole world not only Israel.

In addition, he named Hamas as 'evil'. Naming is a kind of tool which is used to draw the public attention to a certain entity with an attached nickname. He, Biden, wants the world to know that Hamas is an evil entity which threatens not only the existence of Israel, but the whole world. Accordingly, he wants to get a backup from countries to support Israel in its war against Hamas. The ideology behind this remark is misleading the public.

2. *"This was an act of sheer evil."* **(Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)**

Biden continues to give his remarks on Hamas attack against Israel. Biden utilizes 'naming and describing'/ post-noun modification' in order to depict the kind of attack Hamas has conducted against Israel. In this remark, Biden uses the adjective 'sheer' in order to show the world that this assault is an absolute and on purpose. He, Biden, wants to draw the public to the attack conducted by Hamas on Israel and blackout what crimes Israel is committing against Palestinians. The ideology behind this remark is media blackout.

3. *"Entire families slain."* **(Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)**

Biden in this remark uses 'naming and describing'/ pre-noun modification' in order to describe the assault unleashed by Hamas on Israel. He, Biden, uses the adjective 'entire' in order to show the world that this attack is a wide-scale assault. He, Biden, wants to show the world that all Jewish families have been massacred by Hamas. He wants to depict the attack as a very brutal ever on Israel. The ideology behind using this remark is all-inclusiveness.

4. *"But sadly, for the Jewish people, it's not new."* **(Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)**

In this remark, Biden utilizes 'naming and describing'/ pre-noun modification' in order to portray the assault conducted by Hamas on Israel. Biden uses the adjective 'Jewish' in order to limit the kind of religion Hamas is targeting. He, Biden, wants to tell the world that only Jewish people are the target of Hamas and not all Israelis. He, Biden, wants to play on the sectarian strings in order to get the public support. The ideology behind this remark is religious discrimination.

5. *"This attack has brought to the surface painful memories and the scars left by a millennia of antisemitism and genocide of the Jewish people."* **(Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)**

In this remark, Biden uses 'naming and describing'/ pre-noun modification' in order to describe the kind of assault unleashed by Hamas on Israel. In this remark, Biden uses the adjective 'painful' in order to portray the impact of Hamas attack on Israelis which reminds them of the genocide committed against them by the anti-Semitism.

In addition, Biden uses the adjective of nationality 'Jewish' once again to remind the world that Jewish people in Israel are the only target by Hamas and by anti-Semitism who want to eliminate Jewish from the whole world. In this remark, Biden wants to get the backup from the world by triggering in their mind the concept of anti-Semitism. The ideology behind this remark is anti-Semitism.

6. *"So, in this moment, we must be crystal clear: We stand with Israel. We stand with Israel. And we will make sure Israel has what it needs to take care of its citizens, defend itself, and respond to this attack."* **(Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)**

In this remark, Biden uses 'naming and describing/ pre-noun modification' in order to portray the attack conducted by Hamas against Israel. After giving the world a full depiction of the awful and painful assault by Hamas, now, he uses the adjective 'crystal' to show the world that they have to stand together against Hamas with an iron fist in order to defend the Jewish families and to respond to the attack. The ideology behind this remark is reprisal.

7. *"The loss of innocent life is heartbreaking". (Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)*

In this remark, Biden uses 'naming and describing/ post-noun modification' in order to describe the attack conducted by Hamas on Israel. Biden uses the adjective 'innocent' in order to shift the world towards the people who have been killed by Hamas. Biden wants the world to know that Hamas is targeting innocent families which is something heartbreaking. Biden wants the world to feel pity and sorry for Jewish people who have been massacred by Hamas. The ideology behind this remark is pathos.

8. *"Like every nation in the world, Israel has the right to respond — indeed has a duty to respond — to these vicious attacks." (Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)*

In this remark, Biden uses 'naming and describing/ pre-noun modification' in order to describe the attack launched by Hamas against Israel. In this remark, Biden wants to tell the whole world that Hamas launched a devilish attack against Israel and it, as other countries, has the right to defend itself and respond to this attack. Biden wants to send a message that Israel is an independent country and has the right like other countries to respond. In addition, he, Biden, wants to deliver a message that the attack unleashed by Hamas is a vicious and on purpose. Accordingly, he legitimizes the response of Israel. The ideology behind this remark is legitimized killing.

9. *"A lot of us know how it feels. It leaves a black hole in your chest when you lose family, feeling like you're being sucked in." (Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)*

In this remark, Biden uses 'naming and describing/ pre and post noun modification' in order to describe the feelings of families who lost their members in Hamas attack. Biden uses the adjective 'black' in order to describe the feelings and emotions of the Jewish families who lost their loved ones in Hamas attack. Biden chooses the chest which is the most vital part of the body. He wants to send a message that Jewish families are in grief for their family members who have been killed by Hamas attack. In addition, their lives become black and dark as they are full of sadness. The ideology behind this remark is incitement.

10. *"This is not about party or politics. This is about the security of our world, the security of the United States of America." (Biden's speech, Oct. 10th, 2023)*

In this remark, Biden uses 'naming and describing/ post-noun modification' in order to get the support of the whole world in general. In this remark, Biden uses the prepositional phrases 'of our world' and 'of the united states of America' to send a message that this war is against the whole world in general and the United States of America in particular. He, Biden, wants to get the backup of the whole world saying that this is not only the war of Israel but the whole world as well. The ideology behind this remark is incitement.

6. Conclusion

The study reaches the following conclusions which cope with the problems of the study:

1. The critical stylistic tool utilized by Joe Biden in his political statement is 'Naming and Describing' with sub-tools such as 'pre-noun modification, post-noun modification, pre and post noun modification and naming'. This tool focuses on the description of events and actions. Joe Biden, using this tool, wants to portray the attack unleashed by Hamas as vicious, devilish, absolute and on purpose. He wants to send a message that the war is not only against Israel but the whole world. In addition, he wants to tell the world that the only religious families targeted by Hamas are Jewish families.

2. The study finds out that the hidden ideologies within Joe Biden's political statement are the following: incitement, legitimized killing, pathos, reprisal, anti-Semitism, religious discrimination,

inclusiveness, misleading and media blackout. These ideologies represented the message Joe Biden wants to send to the world in order to get their backup in Israel war against Palestine.

References

1. Chilton, P. (2008). *Political terminology*. In Karlfried Knapp and Gerd Antos (eds.). *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere*, Vol. 4, (pp. 226-42). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
2. Eagleton, T. (2017). *Ideology, fiction, narrative*. Social Text, no. 2. 1979. Web. 8 April 2017. <<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0164-2472%28197922%290%3A2%3C62%3AIFN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-%23>>.
3. Hult, F.M. (2015). *Making policy connections across scales using nexus analysis*. In Hult, F.M.; Johnson, D.C (eds.). *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide* (First ed.). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley. ISBN 978-1-118-33984-8. OCLC 905699853.
4. Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical Stylistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
5. Jeffries, L. (2014). *Interpretation*. In: P. Stockwell and S. Whiteley, (eds.) *The handbook of stylistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Modebadze, V. (2010). *The term politics reconsidered in the light of recent theoretical developments*. *IBSU Scientific Journal*, 1(4), 39-44.
7. Orwell, G. (1968). *Politics and the English Language*. In Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.), *the collected essays, journalism and letters of George Orwell*, Vol. 1. New York: Harcourt.
8. Van Dijk (1997). *What is Political Discourse Analysis* in Blommaert, J. and Chris Bulcaen (eds.) *Political Linguistics*, Belgian Journal of Linguistics. Volume: 9. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
9. Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
10. Wilson, J. (2001). *Political Discourse*. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, (pp. 398-415). Oxford: Blackwell.

Online References

11. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2023/10/10/remarks-by-resident-biden-on-the-terrorist-attacks-in-israel-2/>