

Research Article

The Representation of Palestinian and Israeli Communities in Cameron's Speech: A critical Discourse Analysis

Amaal Kamal Al.Farra

A teacher of English and a lecturer at Al-Quds Open University, Gaza, Palestine

Corresponding Author: Amaal Kamal Al.Farra, E-mail: amaalkamal@hotmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: October 02, 2020

Accepted: September 22, 2020

Volume:3

Issue: 9

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.9.12

KEYWORDS

Discourse- Critical Discourse

Analysis- representation- power-

ideology

ABSTRACT

One of the main functions of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is to connect the linguistic categories to the ideological functions. The way Palestinians and Israelis are represented ideologically and grammatically are taken into account in this current study. The interpretation between ideology and discourse are considered within the scope of critical discourse analysis. The present study follows the method of CDA for its functional importance in the field of discourse analysis. To achieve that, the researcher adopts the CDA framework which is stated by Fairclough in his book "language and power" as it is a systematic and helpful way in the analysis. It has three dimensions; description, interpretation and explanation. Following his framework, the researcher tries to shed the light on grammatical, linguistic and social relational features, as well as micro and macro analysis. The selected data is the speech of Cameron, the Prime Minister of Britain, to the Knesset in 2014. The researcher tries to spot the representations of both Palestinian and Israeli communities in his speech. This study aims to investigate if his speech is neutral or it contains any bias. The results show that most of Cameron's representations are used to support the Israeli community rather than the Palestinian community.

1. Introduction

As the researcher is a Palestinian, she has the interest in gaining a deeper understanding of the mechanics Cameron used in constructing his speech to the Knesset in 2014. Most emphasis in this analysis is given to the linguistic, grammatical and semantic elements of his speech. CDA approach is followed in this study for its importance as it is considered as:

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and restricted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality. (Van Dijk, 2008, p. 85)

Indeed, this paper seeks to analyze Cameron's speech and have recommendations for both teachers and researchers in this field of analysis.

2. Literature Review

For the purpose of this study, it is important to identify some terms as they have been seen and identified in previous studies.

2.1 Discourse

Discourse has different meanings in different contexts. Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) define discourse as:

The general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people's utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life, familiar examples being medical discourse and political discourse. Discourse analysis is the analysis of these patterns.

Generally the term "discourse" is wider than "text" and Fairclough (1989) uses the term discourse to refer to the whole process of social interaction of which the text is only a part of it.

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Before identifying the term of critical discourse analysis which is known as CDA, let's see some related definitions stated by Fairclough (1989). He defines discourse as: "Language use conceived as social practice." The term text is defined as: "The written or spoken language produces in a discursive event." He also defines discourse as: "The production, distribution and consumption of a text" and the term "genre" as: "Use of language associated with a particular social activity."

CDA stems from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. This social practice is tied to special historical contexts. When the analyst seeks to understand how discourse is implicated in relations of power, then it is called CDA (Janks, 1997).

2.3 Language, Power and Ideology

It is of great importance to identify these terms as they are connected with CDA. The researcher likes to state Fairclough's description of the concept *language*. He defines it as: "Language is a form of social practice" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 16).

The discourse has three dimensions; the first one is its ability to form consciousness. The second dimension is the claim that discourse serves a certain purpose by exercising power with all its effects (Jäger, 2001). The third dimension emphasizes that discourse brings into the relations that make up for social life through meaning and the making of meaning (Fairclough, 2013). These three features allow the speaker, e.g. a political leader, to form consciousness, to exercise power and to build discourse where meaning is involved and related to the process of decoding these messages. Discourse cannot be depended upon solely. Language is connected to power and ideology.

More specifically, Fairclough (2013, p. 4) emphasizes the relationship between discourse and power from a political point of view. He states that "Power is partly discourse, and discourse is partly power, they are different but not discrete, they flow into each other, discourse can be internalized in power and vice-versa."

As for ideology, Heywood (2017, p. 10) describes this concept as: "A more or less coherent set of ideas that provides the basis for organized political action, whether this is intended to preserve, modify or overthrow the existing system of power." Moreover, Fairclough (2013) states that the ideologies play a crucial role in establishing, maintaining, enacting and transforming relations of power.

These three concepts; language, power and ideology are linked to each other. This is clear when Fairclough (2013, p. 79) states that: "ideology is, first, a relation between texts (in meaning-making) and power, it is second, a relation between orders of discourse and power, and even language and power." Fairclough (1989) states that there are three levels of discourse. The first one is the *social conditions of production and interpretation*. The second level is *the process of production and interpretation*. The third level is the *text* which is the product of the two levels. Also his model of CDA consists of three stages which are inter-related to the previous levels:

1. Description which is concerned with the formal features of the text.
2. Interpretation which is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction. As the text is the product of the process of production and also as a resource in the process of interpretation.
3. Explanation which is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context including the processes of production, interpretation and their social effects.

Fairclough's approach to CDA is so useful because it provides multiple points of analytic entry. It does not matter which kind of analysis one begins with, as they are all included whether used at the beginning or at the end of the analysis.

3. Research Questions

This study aims to shed the light on Cameron's speech and his representation of both Palestinian and Israeli communities in his discourse. To achieve this, the study addresses the following two questions:

1. How are Palestinian and Israeli communities represented in Cameron's speech?
2. Does his speech contain any kind of bias and if yes, towards which community?

4. Research Design and Methodology

This study adopts the approach of critical discourse analysis (CDA). It is used specifically as a tool for the analysis of Cameron's discourse.

4.1 Methodology in Data Collection

Data collection is not considered as an essential step that must be done before analysis begins. It is a matter of carrying out the first analysis after choosing the text to be analyzed. The analysis starts by finding indicators for particular concepts, expanding concepts into categories and on the basis of these results, collecting further data from the text is done. But data collection is not excluded as new questions always arise. (Wodak & Meyer, 2001)

4.2 Sampling or Selection of Data

The researcher chose the full text of David Cameron's speech to the Knesset in March 2014 as written by (Staff, 2014). The appendix of this paper contains the full text of the speech. The ideology of this leader is clearly expressed in his speech, where his beliefs are conveyed and where his strategies towards the Jews are also announced clearly in his speech. For those reasons the researcher chooses this specific speech, which as it will be explained, shows his great support and bias towards Israel.

4.3 Data Analysis

During this analysis, Fairclough's framework (2001) from his book *language and power* is adopted by doing macro and micro analysis through answering his key questions for text analysis. The analysis is done on three dimensions:

1. Text analysis (description)
2. Processing Analysis (Interpretation)
3. Social Analysis (Explanation)

So his stated questions comprise the three dimensions as the following:

1. What relational and grammatical values do textual features have?
2. What experiential values do textual features have in terms of the subject position of the producer and the use of modality?
3. What values do textual features have with respect to the subject positions of members of the audience?
4. What traces are there in the features of the text of struggle between the producer and his audience?
5. What problems arise for David Cameron in the process of production through mismatches between his resources and the analysis of his situations? And what combinations of discourse types does he generate in trying to resolve them?
6. What institutional and/or social processes does this discourse belong to and how is it ideologically determined and ideologically determinative?

The first four questions are the descriptive dimension; the fifth is related to the interpretation dimension; and the sixth is related to the explanation phase (as cited in Escarcena, 2013).

5. Findings and Discussion

5.1 Macro Analysis- Perceptions of David Cameron

The influence of David Cameron as a Prime Minister goes from Margret Thatcher to Tony Blair. This mixture can be seen in the duality of his conservative way of thinking. He has an eagerness to distance himself from his party- base. As he has applied a strategy to distance himself from the conservative sector and present himself as a conservative who could also appeal to the liberals (as cited in Escarcena, 2013).

To start the analysis, the researcher sees that the British Prime Minister, David Cameron's speech is the most pro-Israel in Europe. He supports Israel more than any of his recent conservative predecessors. His main topic is basically opposing the Boycott, Divestment and Sanction (BDS) movement and defeating all the attempts to delegitimize Israel as he said: "Britain opposes boycotts, whether it is trade unions for the exclusion of Israelis or universities trying to stifle education"

Generally, Cameron came to the Knesset with certain ideas prepared in advance having a determination not to object the leaders of Israel nor to say anything against their attitudes regarding the settlements and peace negotiations. He mentioned the settlements just once, in a gently, non-condemnation manner. He supported using power against the Palestinians particularly Hamas and its supporters as Iran. He used open and closed remarks in Hebrew imitating President Obama, to show his loyalty to Israel. He started "Shalom l'kulam" –Hi everybody- and ended saying "Anachnu byacharf" –which means "We are with you."

Moreover, his speech has a direct message which shows that he represents his government in supporting Israel as he had stood firm against anti-Semitism: "Saying not to Dieudonne M'bala M'bala."²

² Dieudonne M'bala M'bala is a French comedian actor and a political activist who denounced Zionism

The right of Israel to have a country and a homeland is represented in his discourse while this right is neglected for the Palestinians. He just called for a two- state solution in a quick manner as this is not the main topic to be discussed from his point of view.

5.2 Micro Analysis

The researcher tries to analyze according to Fairclough's key questions and tries to cover the three dimensions of text analysis; description, interpretation and explanation:

5.2.1 The First Dimension: Description

5.2.1.1 What relational and grammatical values do textual features have in Cameron's speech?

This is clear from the use of pronouns as the following:

The pronoun "**we**": Cameron uses this pronoun in both inclusive and exclusive way. The relational significance of the former is clear in uniting Cameron with all the British, showing that he represents them all in having the same needs and goals as:

We will preserve the memory of that generation for every generation to come. And just as important as the history, is the partnership **we** are building between **our** countries today. That begins with **our** commitment to Israel's security.

A very clear example of the exclusive "**we**" when he talks about peace and security of Israel and its neighbours in which he hopes to happen but of course this faces difficulties which are out of his hands as he cannot have the strength to let Israel agree on the compromises of peace: "**We** all yearn for a lasting and secure peace between Israel and its neighbours. And **we** believe that in Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas you have leaders who want peace too."

The pronoun **you**: Fairclough (2001) explains the relational value of **you** as a significant pronoun because it means choosing this option instead of the more impersonal one. It also means to have a direct engagement with the audience as a whole as he said: "So let me say to **you** very clearly," "They tell **you** how to run **your** peace process: I will not do that" and "**You** don't need lectures from me."

Other grammatical features can be seen in particularly in the cohesive features in the use of the logical connectors which shows his full support to Israel but not to the Palestinians, such as:

I remember being quite bemused **as** I sat listening to Israeli politicians.

So let me say to you very clearly: with me, you have a British Prime Minister whose belief in Israel is unbreakable and whose commitment to Israel's security will always be rock solid.

Regarding passive and active voice, the sentences are mostly active as he is talking about their friendship, and he is the doer of keeping this support and this strong relationship. In the following example he uses active voice to show the Jewish contribution to Britain, "All of survivors have made such an incredible contribution to Britain." He means the survivors of the Holocaust.

5.2.1.2 What experiential values do textual features have in terms of the subject position of the producer and the use of modality?

Subject Position is defined as:

A subject position incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for persons within the structure of rights for those that use the repertoire. Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position. (Davies, 2000, p. 89)

Subject Position of Cameron is the Conservative Prime Minister of Britain.

5.2.1.2.1 **Modality**: Cameron uses modal auxiliaries that convey his personal authority as a speaker such as:

1. It gave me a renewed understanding of what it **must** be like to be afraid in your own home.
2. We **must** be clear what we mean by this term- the poisonous ideology of Islamist extremism- and distinguish it from Islam.
3. We **must** tackle this poisonous thinking. And we **must** and we will pursue it.

These examples show relational and also expressive values. They have two dimensions. The first is Cameron's authority in relation to the others in which he has the authority to stop the Islamist extremism in the third example by following certain strategies in his country as when he said "We said no to Yousif Qaradawi." "We've excluded more foreign preachers of hate."

The second is his authority with respect to the truth or representation of reality as an evaluation of truth and this can be seen in the first example of his sayings. When he says “But we **should** never forget those values that are the heart of our own progress.” This modal shows Cameron’s implicit power as a Conservative.

Besides, Cameron used the modals “**can**” and “**will**” as he said, “It is vital that we do all we **can** with our international partners to preserve the site at *Auschwitz*, which I will be visiting later this year.” This indicates both the ability and futurity. The ability of preserving this memorable place as Auschwitz is a network of German Nazi concentration camps and extermination camps built during World War II. At this place 1.1 million prisoners died, 90% of them were Jews. They were killed in the Holocaust at that camp (wikipedia, 2016). Cameron promises not only to preserve this place, but also to visit it as a kind of his continuous support to Israel

The relevance of responsibility: Cameron assures his and his country’s responsibility towards the security of Israel by standing with the Jews in every step they do. His speech revolves around this idea. He starts saying: “I am here as a good friend and strong supporter of Israel. Under my prime minister ship, I think we have seen the British-Israeli.” He shows his responsibility when he refuses the boycott as the following statistics shows the benefits he gets from this friendship economically. He noted that: “Israel’s technology is protecting British and NATO troops in Afghanistan. It is providing Britain’s National Health Service with one in 6 of its prescription medicines through Teva. Together British and Israeli technical expertise can achieve so much more.” His responsibility is essentially related to Britain that he wants to build: “From our trade and is now worth \$5 billion a year to the world leading partnership between our scientists, academics and hi-tech specialists.”

5.2.1.3 What values do textual features have with respect to the subject positions of members of the audience?

Subject Position: Leaders and members of the Knesset.

Regarding this aspect, Fairclough (1989) suggests focusing on complex sentences with co-ordination and subordination as the main clause is more informationally prominent and important than the subordinate. In order to show his Jewish relationship despite the limited relation with his ancestry, he uses coordination with the coordinator “but” as he says: “Now my Jewish ancestry is relatively limited **but** I do feel just some sense of connection.”

To show his support to Israel and his grief for what had happened to the Jews in the Holocaust, he used the coordinator “and”: “I want every child in Britain to learn about the Holocaust **and** to understand just how vital it is to fight discrimination and prejudice in our world.” Lots of complex sentences with coordination are used.

Bias can be seen clearly in the previous examples. What about Palestinian children and the civilians who were killed brutally and cruelly in the wars of 2008 and 2012 before this speech?? He even did not mention them.

5.2.1.4 What traces are there in the features of the text of struggle between the producer and his audience?

Negative sense of sentences can be seen when he talks about his point of view towards the anti-Semitism and extremism: “We said no to Zakir Naik. We said no to Yousuf Qradawi. And we said no to Dieudonne M’bala M’bala whose abhorrent displays of anti-Semitism have no place in a tolerant inclusive Britain.”

Moreover, he shows his opposition and an attitude of hatred towards Iran which he states that it supports Hamas with weapons. This indicates that he cares a lot towards realizing the security for Israel. On the other hand, he did not mention the security of Palestine as he finds them criminals and the Jews are the victims: “Not a temporary deal, broken by Hamas firing rockets at you or Iranian proxies smuggling weapons through the Jordan Valley.”

In order to express the threat and challenges in facing Iran, he uses negative sentences as: “A nuclear armed Iran is a threat to the whole world- not just to Israel and with Israel and all our allies, Britain will ensure that is never allowed to happen.”

An implicit criticism of Israel policy with Palestine and its neighbours: Cameron did not state, explicitly, his criticism of Israel and its relationship with its neighbours. He has an implicit desire of having a two-state solution by saying:

But people come to this Parliament from all over the world and talk about maps and population numbers and processes and deadlines. They tell you how to run your peace process. I will not do that. You know I want peace and a 2 state solution. You don’t need lectures from me about how to get there.

5.21.4.1 The choice of mood

According to Fairclough (1989, p.125), there are three major moods; declarative, grammatical question and imperative. In declarative mood, the speaker/ writer is the giver of information and has the power and the addressees position is the

receiver as: "All of the survivors have made such an incredible contribution to Britain." "Britain has played a proud and vital role in helping to secure Israel." "I have led the fight against anti-Semitism."

Regarding the second mood, it has three types; the –wh- questions, the verb question e.g. Can you secure your country? And the third type is Yes/ No questions. Cameron used only one type as: "How to make the best use of land and technology to feed a rising population?" and "How to harness water resources that are so precious to all?"

The third type is the imperative which is seen in the following examples:

Imagine, as Jhon Kery put it: "mutual recognition of the nation state of the Palestinian people and the nation state of the Jewish people."

Think of the capitals in the Arab world when Israelis could travel.

Imagine if you could look your children and grandchildren in the eye and know that your hope could become reality.

In the previous examples, Cameron tries to convince Israel of the good results of peace and a two- state solution through drawing a beautiful image using the imperative mood without lecturing them as he said before. He cares about Israel's welfare but not the Palestinian's.

5.2.1.4.1 The Choice of Vocabulary

Cameron's manipulation and choice of certain words appeal to his intended meaning. This can be seen when he called Israel, "The nation state of the Jewish people." Instead of saying "Jewish State" and that is outlined in the 1917 Balfour Declaration. Moreover the use of the word "homeland" for the Jews not the Palestinians shows his great bias towards Israel and that it is a right for Israel to have a homeland while the Palestinians are deprived from this right.

Moreover, the use of the phrase "she chita" when he said: "On my watch, She chita is safe in the UK." This is a Jewish ritual slaughter which indicates that his country protects the Jewish practices. Even more, the expressive values of vocabulary can be seen when he uses metaphors to assure his total support to Israel against all its enemies such as: "beacon of democracy, whose commitment to Israel's security will always be rock solid, poisonous ideology that fuels terrorism, intelligent political response, building blocks of democracy, extremism feeds on conflict."

Besides, Cameron's use of nominalization is seen in his choice of multi-word compounds as: "I am not *starry-eyed* about the new regime."- "Islamist *mind-set*"- "Intelligence and *counter- terrorism*"- "The underlying conflicts and grievances that are exploited by terrorists are in many cases *long-standing* and deep." Mostly this shows his opposed attitude towards terrorism and extremism as he described.

He also uses synonyms such as "*discrimination, prejudice, persecution*" to show the Jews as victims who suffered a lot. Other synonyms are "*save, survive, secure*" to show his commitments towards realizing security for the Jews. Lots of repetition is used e.g

Word	Times of repetition	Word	Times of repetition
Jewish	16	Israel	43
Palestine/Palestinian	9	extremism	10

As can be seen from this repetition, the emphasis is on mentioning the Israeli community rather than the Palestinian community. Moreover, the repetition of Islamic extremism, as he called, aims to show that he insists to fight the Islamic extremism everywhere.

5.2.2 The Second Dimension: Interpretation

5.2.2.1 What are the arising problems for David Cameron in the process of production through mismatches between his resources and his analysis of his situations? And what combinations of discourse types does he generate in trying to resolve them?

In the relational level, there is a clear match between Cameron who has a Jewish ancestry and warm speech to the Knesset of Israel. Regarding the subject position of Cameron, the Prime Minister as a producer, mismatch is not seen, as he uses the modal auxiliaries which convey obligation.

However, he sympathizes the children of Israel and wants them to live peacefully. So the use of modality appeals to the power and authority he has as a conservative leader. The focus on children and peace appeals to the Conservative's ideology and values.

Finally, as for the subject position, Cameron uses the first personal pronoun "I" which shows his power and authority as a Prime Minister. In other places of his speech, he uses the inclusive and exclusive pronoun "we" to show his needs to be united with Israel in order to achieve the economic goals of his country. This also appeals to the conservative way of thinking.

5.2.3 The Third Dimension: Explanation

5.2.3.1 What institutional and/ or social processes does this discourse belong to and how is it ideologically determined and ideologically determinative?

It is more ideologically determined than determinative and that is related to his way of thinking as he is a Conservative Prime Minister. "I'm a Conservative. I don't believe in dropping these things from a great height. Every country must make its own war. But we should never forget these values that are at the heart of our own progress."

Socially he cares about the public in general as the Conservative's principles are related to the values of family, patriotism and the criticism of state interference. He tries to be a sympathetic leader rather than an authoritative one as he said, "And that means supporting the evolution of effective and accountable government and backing people in their search for a job and a voice."

He tries to be determinative when he asks for co-operation between Britain and Israel in ending the extremism of Islam, as he describes the interference of Iran when he says:

I am convinced we will be fighting Islamic extremism for the rest of my political lifetime. We must tackle this poisonous thinking at home and abroad and resist the ideologues' attempts to divide the world into a clash of civilizations.

6. Results

5.3 How are Palestinian and Israeli communities represented in Cameron's speech?

The previous analysis shows that Cameron's speech is mostly related to the Israeli community. Showing solidarity with the Palestinians in their fight against Israeli terror is not on Cameron's agenda. What he cares about is building a specific image of himself showing his full support to Israel through systematic choice of vocabulary and relational grammatical features. His speech focused on certain topics such as the Holocaust, its survivors and their great support to Britain, being proud of Balfour declaration, opposing the boycott, how to face the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran, how to face all the enemies of Israel, ending terrorism and extremism and keeping the economic relationship between Israel and his country. These are the main topics which Cameron discussed in his speech focusing on representing the Israeli community more often. On the other hand, the Palestinians are only mentioned as having a two-state solution.

5.4 Does his speech contain any kind of bias and if yes, towards which community?

Of course it contains lots of bias, as it is seen in every paragraph in his speech, in which he gives his full support to Israel. He insists on ending the nuclear of Iran. On the other hand Israel has huge arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and he did not even mention this. He ended his speech saying, "So as I stand here with you and look at the future, my message to you today is simply this: We'll be with you every step of the way." This concludes his biased attitude which is seen from the beginning of the speech till the end.

7. Conclusion

To conclude, CDA approach and Fairclough's framework for analysis is really helpful in bringing language to life following a systematic way in the analysis as the researcher has done. The political situation in which the Prime Minister delivers his speech in front of the Knesset determines the structure of his speech. Being in front of the Israeli leaders, he is careful in choosing his words in a way does not make them feel angry. So he only mentions the settlements just once. Most of his representation is a reflexive self-construction of his beliefs towards the Israeli community such as the grief he feels for the memory of the Holocaust and the security of Israel as it is a victim not a criminal. As for the Prime Minister's representation of the Palestinians in his speech, this aspect was absent as he just focused on the Israeli community and its security.

7. Recommendations

7.1 To the Teachers

The use of CDA in the classroom is very important. Teachers can introduce this approach to their students in a simple way according to their academic standard in order to help them in choosing the appropriate linguistic forms which are closely related to the context. Moreover, Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) notify that "It would be ill-advised to teach language via the communicative approach without relying heavily on discourse analysis."

7.2 To the Researchers

The present study suggests more analysis for the representations of these two communities, the Israeli and Palestinian, using CDA but with a different framework. As the researcher read a lot in this aspect, there are different frameworks that can be used such as Van Leeuwen's framework. It can be useful in analyzing Cameron's speech and other political leaders' speeches regarding the representation of the two communities.

References

- [1] Davies, B. (2000). *A Body of Writing, 1990-1999*: AltaMira Press.
- [2] Escarcena, I. J. A. L. (2013). From Liberal Conservative to Conservative Conservative: David Cameron's political branding.
- [3] Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*: Longman.
- [4] Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*: Longman.
- [5] Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*: Taylor & Francis.
- [6] Heywood, A. (2017). *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [7] Jäger, S. (2001). *3 Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (1st edition)*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.
- [8] Janks, H. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18(3), 329-342. doi:10.1080/0159630970180302
- [9] Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*: SAGE Publications.
- [10] Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse analysis and language teaching. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 707-724.
- [11] Staff, T. o. I. (2014). Full text of British PM David Cameron's Knesset speech. *The Times of Israel*.
- [12] Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [13] wikipedia. (2016). *Auschwitz_concentration_camp*.
- [14] Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*: SAGE.

Appendix

Full text of British PM David Cameron's Knesset speech

"Mr President, Prime Minister, Mr Speaker, Members of the Knesset, ladies and gentlemen. It is a great honour to address this historic Parliament – for 65 years the heart of the State of Israel and a beacon of democracy to the region – and to the world. When I was last here in Jerusalem, I came as Leader of the Opposition and I remember being quite bemused as I sat listening to Israeli politicians telling me all about the challenges of coalition politics. They told me about building a coalition, keeping it together, balancing the demands of different parties, sorting out the disputes and I just didn't understand this strange system of government. But after nearly 4 years as Prime Minister of my own coalition all I can say is: achshav ani mevin. But what I have always understood is the extraordinary journey of the Jewish people. Thousands of years of history in this holy land. Thousands of years of persecution. And even today, some people despicably questioning your right to exist. Now my Jewish ancestry is relatively limited but I do feel just some sense of connection. From the lexicon of my great, great grandfather Emile Levita, a Jewish man who came from Germany to Britain 150 years ago to the story of my forefather Elijah Levita who wrote what is thought to have been the first ever Yiddish novel

But more importantly I have learnt to understand something of Jewish values and character and I have grown to appreciate the extraordinary contribution of the Jewish people to my country and to the world. That sense of understanding has shaped my determination to remember the past, my commitment to Israel in the present and my hopes for Israel's future.

And I would like to say something about each of these today. First, remembering the past. One of the most moving experiences I have had as Prime Minister came in January this year, when I held a reception in Downing Street for 50 Survivors of the Sho'ah. I met some of the most inspiring people and heard some of the most incredible stories. People like Harry Spiro who couldn't understand why his mother pushed him out of her house and off to the factory, when she was actually saving his life. Gena Turgel, who witnessed her brother being shot by the Nazis and lost another brother and two sisters before she was eventually liberated from Bergen-Belsen and went on to marry the British soldier who freed her. And Ben He Ifgott who endured 3 years in a ghetto, 2 labour camps and 3 concentration camps to make it to England where he

was reunited with one of his sisters, the only other member of his family to survive. Ben went on to represent Britain as a weightlifter in 2 Olympics set up a society for Holocaust survivors and was honoured in Poland for his reconciliation work between Poles and Jews. And I am delighted that Ben has come with me here today. All of the survivors have made such an incredible contribution to Britain. And one of the things so many of them have done – and which never ceases to amaze me – is to go into our schools and share their testimony first hand. It is hard to imagine the sheer strength of humanity it must take to do that. And I am determined that long after they are gone and long after we are all gone their memory will be as strong and vibrant as it is today. As a father, I will never forget last year visiting the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin with my young children and for the first time trying to explain to them quite what had happened. I want every child in Britain to learn about the Holocaust and to understand just how vital it is to fight discrimination and prejudice in our world. It is vital that we do all we can with our international partners to preserve the site at Auschwitz, which I will be visiting later this year. But we need to do more. That is why I have set up the Holocaust Commission in Britain. A number of the Commissioners are here with Ben and me today and as we visit Yad Vashem together later today, our pledge to Ben will be that Britain will never forget what he and his fellow survivors have taught us. We will preserve the memory of that generation for every generation to come. But remembering the past goes far beyond that horrific suffering of a generation. It is about remembering the long and rightful search of a people for a nation. And the right for the Jewish people to live a peaceful and prosperous life in Israel. From the early pioneers, the men and women of the Palestine Exploration Fund, who saw the Jewish history in this land and the possibilities for the future to the Balfour Declaration – the moment when the State of Israel went from a dream to a plan Britain has played a proud and vital role in helping to secure Israel as a homeland for the Jewish people. And just as important as the history, is the partnership we are building between our countries today. That begins with our commitment to Israel's security. On my last visit here I took a helicopter ride heading north over Israel. Looking right to the Jordan River and left to the Mediterranean Sea, I really appreciated for the first time just how narrow and vulnerable this land is. A vulnerability that has already seen 38 missiles from Gaza this year alone. A vulnerability that just this week has seen the interception of the Klos C ship – yet another despicable attempt by the Iranians to smuggle more long-range rockets into Gaza. A vulnerability that has too often seen nearby Palestinian schools being named in honour of suicide bombers. It gave me a renewed understanding of what it must be like to be afraid in your own home. So let me say to you very clearly: with me, you have a British Prime Minister whose belief in Israel is unbreakable and whose commitment to Israel's security will always be rock solid. I will always stand up for the right of Israel to defend its citizens. A right enshrined in international law, in natural justice and fundamental morality, and in decades of common endeavour between Israel and her allies. When I was in Opposition I spoke out when – because of the law on universal jurisdiction – senior Israelis could not safely come to my country, without fear of ideologically motivated court cases and legal stunts. When I became Prime Minister I legislated to change it. My country is open to you. And you are welcome to visit anytime. When I saw the threat that Hezbollah represented to Israel and beyond I forged a Europe-wide consensus to proscribe its military wing, a key step in the fight against this enemy on your borders. I have led the fight against anti-Semitism and extremism in Britain. We've removed over 26 thousand pieces of illegal terrorist content from the internet. We've worked with the police and with universities to stop extremists spreading their divisive messages on our university campuses and we've excluded more foreign preachers of hate on the basis of our strategy for preventing extremism than ever before. We said no to Zakir Naik. We said no to Yusuf Qaradawi. And we said no to Dieudonne M'bala M'bala whose abhorrent displays of anti-Semitism have no place in a tolerant and inclusive Britain. I've stood up to protect Jewish practices too. The Jewish community has been an absolute exemplar in integrating into British life in every way but integration doesn't mean that you have to give up things that you hold very dear in your religion. When people challenged kosher Shechita. I have defended it. I fought as a back-bench Member of Parliament against the last attempt to do something to change this. And there's no way I'm allowing that to change now I'm Prime Minister. On my watch She chita is safe in the UK. I am proud to be pursuing the strongest and deepest possible relationship between our 2 countries. From our trade – which has doubled in a decade and is now worth £5 billion a year to the world leading partnerships between our scientists, academics and hi-tech specialists. Britain and Israel share a commitment to driving the growth of high-tech start-ups. In Britain we've introduced huge tax breaks on early stage investment and special visas for entrepreneurs and in just 3 and a half years we have grown our Tech City in East London from 200 digital companies more than 1,300 today. Israel is the start-up nation – with the second highest density of start-ups outside of Silicon Valley anywhere in the world. As the inspirational President Peres has put it: Israel has gone from oranges to Apple. Israel's technology is protecting British and NATO troops in Afghanistan. It is providing Britain's National Health Service with one in 6 of its prescription medicines through Teva. Together British and Israeli technical expertise can achieve so much more. And to those who do not share my ambition, who want to boycott Israel, I have a clear message. Britain opposes boycotts. Whether it's trade unions campaigning for the exclusion of Israelis or universities trying to stifle academic exchange Israel's place as a homeland for the Jewish people will never rest on hollow resolutions passed by amateur politicians. It is founded in the spirit and strength of your people. It is founded in international law. It is founded in the resolve of all of your allies to protect an

international system that was forged in our darkest days, to put right historic wrongs. It is founded in the achievements of your economy and your democracy – a country pledged to be fair and equal to all its citizens whether Jewish, Muslim, Christian Arab or Druze. It is your destiny. Delegitimising the State of Israel is wrong. It's abhorrent. And together we will defeat it. Let me turn to my hope for Israel's future. We all yearn for a lasting and secure peace between Israel and its neighbours. Britain fully supports the great work that American Secretary of State John Kerry has been leading. And we believe that in Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas you have leaders who want peace too. We back the compromises needed – including the halt to settlement activity and an end to Palestinian incitement too. And we recognise the difficult and courageous decisions both sides are taking not least with Prime Minister Netanyahu's decision to release terrorist prisoners, with all the anguish that can bring for affected families. But people come to this Parliament from all over the world and talk about maps and population numbers and processes and deadlines. They tell you how to run your peace process. I will not do that. You know I want peace and a 2 state solution. You don't need lectures from me about how to get there. What I want to say is something different. What I want to say is this: Imagine what this land would be like if a 2 state solution was actually achieved. Think of all the aspects of life that would change. Israel's relationships with the world. Its security its long-term prosperity and the quality of life for all its people. On Israel's relationships, imagine, as John Kerry put it: "mutual recognition of the nation state of the Palestinian people and the nation state of the Jewish people" Let's be clear what that means. An end to the outrageous lectures on human rights that Israel receives at the United Nations from the likes of Iran and North Korea. An end to the ridiculous situation where last year the United Nations General Assembly passed 3 times as many resolutions on Israel as on Syria, Iran and North Korea put together. No more excuses for the 32 countries in the United Nations who refuse to recognise Israel. And for the Arab League, how many of those States today yearn for a different relationship with Israel – which the peace agreement would enable them to deliver? Think of the capitals in the Arab world where Israelis could travel, do business, and build a future. Imagine Israel – like any other democratic nation – finally treated fairly and normally by all. On security, imagine a peace deal that would leave Israel more secure, not less secure. Not a temporary deal, broken by Hamas firing rockets at you or Iranian proxies smuggling weapons through the Jordan Valley. But a proper lasting peace that allows a strong moderate Palestinian government to end the fears of a failed state on Israel's border. A deal that means an end of all claims – and the end of all conflict. Israelis and Palestinians no longer each other's enemy, but actually working together to maintain security against those who would seek to harm us all. On prosperity, the possibilities of peace are extraordinary. This is a region where demographics are demanding 40 million jobs in the next decade, to keep pace with the rising expectations of young people. A region where the thirst for higher education today will need to be met with the jobs of tomorrow. So imagine the engine of Israel's economy fully unleashed to work in the region – and to meet the needs that are common to all. How to make the best use of land and technology to feed a rising population? How to harness water resources that are so precious to all? Imagine Israel's technology working hand in glove with those making strides with renewables – securing the future needs of their peoples for a time when their economies are no longer so reliant on carbon. Imagine the agreements ready to be signed off with every major trading bloc in the world. Committees deliberating not on what products to stop from Israel – but on what products they can bring in. Imagine too how this new future would feel. Because this isn't just about security and prosperity – as important as those are. This is about justice for 2 peoples. Dignity for the Jewish people and yes, dignity for the Palestinian people too. Generations of Jewish and Palestinian children for once growing up in hope not fear. Israel is a nation where around every corner there is a memorial and a reminder of those who fought to create a modern Israel from the human tragedies of the past. But those sacrifices were not just to build a State that was physically secure. They were to build a state that would fulfil its rightful moral position in a region where security, dignity and mutual respect would be the new watchwords. For Israelis, a life free from the everyday fear of terror. For the Palestinians, finally, the chance to live autonomously in a state of their own. Imagine if you could look your children and grandchildren in the eye and know that your hope could become their reality. These are the dividends of peace that I long for in Israel. And I will do everything I can do help bring them about. At the same time, we must be constantly vigilant about the wider challenges in the region. These are challenges we all face. The threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and perhaps the greatest challenge of all, the poisonous ideology of Islamist extremism. And to people who try to say that Israel is the cause of these problems. I say that fundamentally misunderstands what these problems are about. Take Iran. Israel is not the cause of the shadow that Iran casts over the world. There is no rule that says if Israel and the Palestinians make peace, Iran is somehow going to dismantle its despotic regime or abandon its nuclear intentions. That can only be done through sustained international pressure. I share your deep scepticism and great concern about Iran. I am not starry-eyed about the new regime. A nuclear armed Iran is a threat to the whole world – not just to Israel and with Israel and all our allies, Britain will ensure that is never allowed to happen. Similarly, while of course, extremism feeds on conflict in the Middle East and elsewhere, Israel is not the cause of the poisonous ideology that fuels terrorism across the region and across the world. We must be clear what we mean by this term – the poisonous ideology of Islamist extremism – and distinguish it from Islam. Islam is a religion observed peacefully and devoutly by over a billion people. Islamist extremism is a warped and barbaric ideology that tries to set our societies against each other by radicalising young Muslims all across the world. At its

furthest end are those who back terrorism to promote their ultimate goal: an entire Islamist realm. Governed by an interpretation of Sharia. Move along the spectrum and you find people who may reject violence, but who accept various parts of the extremist world view, including real hostility towards Israel and the West, towards our democracy and liberal values. They provide succour for the men and women of violence – and we must confront and challenge them too. That is what Britain’s approach to anti-extremism is all about. No country knows more about the threat of terror justified by this grim Islamist mind-set than you do here in Israel. But we too have paid our own prices on the streets of London, elsewhere in the country and around the world. So we share your resolve to overcome this evil. And I believe that like our closest allies, Britain and Israel have the history, the values, capability and – yes – the historic responsibility to take this on. We need a response that is tough, intelligent and patient. Tough – in that it demands a strong security response. Whether that’s military action to go after the terrorists, or international co-operation on intelligence and counter-terrorism. To make sure that the Taliban don’t take over Afghanistan. To support AMISOM against Al-Shabab in Somalia. To support the government in Libya to build new and effective security forces. To support the people of Mali, together with their neighbours and our French allies to prevent a new terrorist haven developing on our doorstep and yes, it requires a tough, strong security response to defeat the Al Qaeda linked extremists in Pakistan, in Syria, in Sinai – and wherever else they are found. But second, alongside a tough security response must be an intelligent political response. We know that Al Qaeda franchises thrive where there is political instability and weak or dysfunctional political institutions. So we must match a strong security response with a political approach that addresses these issues. That means supporting the building blocks of democracy – the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary, the rights of minorities, free media and association and a proper place in society for the army. I’m a Conservative. I don’t believe in dropping these things from a great height. Every country must make its own way. But we should never forget those values that are at the heart of our own progress. And that means supporting the evolution of effective and accountable government and backing people in their search for a job and a voice. Third, we must be patient and resolute. We are in the middle of a generational struggle against a poisonous ideology which is an extreme distortion of the Islamic faith – and which holds that terror and mass murder are not only acceptable but necessary. I am convinced we will be fighting Islamic extremism for the rest of my political lifetime. We must tackle this poisonous thinking at home and abroad and resist the ideologues’ attempts to divide the world into a clash of civilisations. The underlying conflicts and grievances that are exploited by terrorists are in many cases long-standing and deep. And the building blocks of democracy, which are a big part of the solution, take time to put in place. But this tough, intelligent and patient approach is the best way to defeat terrorism and ensure our own security. And we must – and will – pursue it with an iron resolve. Later this week you will celebrate Purim. You will recall the time when the Jewish people were under threat of extermination in ancient Persia. And you will experience a day of joy in memory of the way the Jewish people were saved and freedom was delivered. All of us here long for the day that the Jewish people can be free and safe in their homeland. I know the challenges in getting there are great. But far greater is the friendship I bring from Britain – and the strength of our collective resolve. So as I stand here with you and look to the future, my message to you today is simply this: we’ll be with you every step of the way.”