

Constructing Political Narratives and Seeking International Legitimacy: An Appraisal Analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's UN Speech

Cecillia Jhovanca Pramudita^{a,1}, Khristianto^{b,2}

^a Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Jl. K.H. Ahmad Dahlan, Purwokerto 53182, Indonesia
cecilliajhovanca12@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Article history:

Received: 9/5/2025

Revised: 12/6/2025

Accepted: 16/6/2025

Keywords:

Judgement

Critical Discourse Analysis

Political Rhetoric

Social Sanction

Social Esteem

Israeli – Palestine Conflict

This study explores how Benjamin Netanyahu employs evaluative language in his political speeches at international forums, particularly in relation to the conflicts between Israel and Hamas and Hezbollah. Using critical discourse analysis and Martin and White's (2005) Judgment theory, the study distinguishes between evaluations based on social esteem and social sanction. The data, drawn from transcripts of Netanyahu's speeches at the United Nations, are analyzed to identify linguistic strategies that construct narratives of existential threat and legitimize Israel's defensive actions. The findings reveal that Netanyahu consistently uses negative social evaluations to portray his opponents as brutal and immoral, while positioning Israel as a threatened nation acting in justified self-defense. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of how political language shapes public opinion and international perceptions in the context of conflict.

I. Introduction

In the modern digital age, the impact of rhetorical language used by leaders is not only limited to official forums such as the UN, but also extends to social media such as YouTube, where messages can quickly spread, shape greater public opinion, and directly influence the views of the global community. Speeches by leaders at international forums such as the United Nations (UN) often use strong and emotional rhetorical language to shape public opinion and influence global policy. The use of language that contains moral judgments does not only function as information delivery, but also as a rhetorical strategy to build a political narrative that strengthens a country's position in the international arena [1]. Martin and White (2005) in Judgment theory divide moral judgments into two main categories, namely social esteem, which relates to the assessment of character or actions socially, and social sanction, which focuses on moral condemnation or punishment of certain actions [2].

Social media allows people to share their information, views and opinions with others, which can influence public perceptions of both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In addition, social media can be used to share information that supports justice and increases understanding of the conflict [3]. One of them is using the YouTube platform as an attractive marketing tool and to maintain the company's brand. YouTube is usually a website that utilizes the web to display its highlights and allows users to upload their videos for viewing by many people. The concept is as a media sharing platform that allows users to share media, including images, audio, and video [4]. To date, a lot of content has appeared on YouTube, which continues to grow. On the Al Jazeera English YouTube account with more than 15 million followers and featuring a video of Netanyahu's speech at the UN. with 121 thousand views and 2.4 thousand comments. This video was uploaded on September 27, 2024 and generated 121 thousand views and 2.4 thousand comments.

Benjamin Netanyahu is a multi-term Prime Minister of Israel, known for his strong pro-Israel positions and controversial approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Al-Jazeera English's YouTube account shows Benjamin Netanyahu's speech affirming Israel's commitment to continue its military

operation in Gaza. In his speech, Netanyahu shows a map of the territory claimed by Israel, which triggered protests from the Indonesian delegation and other countries. The delegation walk-out in response to Israel's policy and in support of Palestine before the United Nations (UN). Netanyahu affirmed during the 79th United Nations General Assembly on September 27, 2024 that Israel will continue to carry out attacks against Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon, and will not stop military operations before all its strategic goals are met. This speech reflects the continuing tensions in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, where the UN, as an organization established to maintain peace, security, and social protection for all countries of the world [5], faces challenges in mediation and conflict resolution. Netanyahu's actions and the international reaction demonstrate the complexity of the situation that requires deeper attention and solutions.

The conflict between Israel and Palestine is an issue that continues to be discussed and has yet to find a resolution. Many people assume that this conflict is based purely on religious differences, when in fact there are various other factors such as economics and politics that also influence it [6]. Since the United Nations (UN) was founded, this conflict has been a main topic at the General Assembly, but it still hasn't been fully fixed even though hundreds of related resolutions have been issued. The complexity of this issue is not only related to religious aspects but also includes political and economic factors that continue to influence the situation in the region to this day [7]. The United Nations (UN) has played a role since the beginning in efforts to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by proposing a division of the territory through Resolution 181 in 1947, which divided Palestine into two states and made Jerusalem an international territory. Although accepted by the Jewish community, the Arab side rejected it, triggering the 1948 war. Since then, the UN has continued to issue resolutions calling for an end to the conflict and recognize Palestinian rights, but a comprehensive resolution has not been achievable due to the UN's limited ability to enforce its decisions. Resolution 181 remains a crucial foundation in debates over the justice and legitimacy of this conflict [8].

Judgement, according to the theory by [9], refers to moral judgments that individuals make about the actions or character of others. In the context of political speeches, these judgments are often used to shape public opinion and influence the audience's views on certain issues. Martin and White (2005) classify judgments into two main categories, namely social esteem and social sanction. Social esteem relates to the assessment of one's personal qualities, such as ability, reliability, and normality. Meanwhile, social sanction focuses more on moral judgments that include aspects of honesty, ethics, and compliance with social norms or applicable laws. Therefore, Benjamin Netanyahu's speech before the United Nations (UN) is an interesting subject of analysis. This is due to the complicated political background and tensions that exist in the Middle East, which often trigger emotional reactions from listeners. By understanding the way judgment is applied in the speech, we can better understand how political messages are sent and taken in by the international community (Martin & White, 2005). In this analysis, the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach developed by Van Leeuwen will be applied. CDA emphasizes the relationship between language, power, and ideology, as well as how discourse is influenced by social and political contexts (Van Leeuwen, 2008). Netanyahu's speeches serve not only as a communication tool, but also as a way to build legitimacy and justification for the Israeli government's policies.

Previous research by Dini Sri Istiningdias and her team [10] examined the application of the Judgement system in official statements by the Indonesian Ministry of Health at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic using the Appraisal theory approach from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This study explored how the Ministry of Health assessed the character, actions, and attitudes of various parties through language in public communication. The results showed that the statements extensively utilized two main categories in Judgment: social esteem, which evaluates personal qualities such as ability and reliability, and social sanction, which highlights criticism or praise for behavior that aligns with or violates health and social norms. The choice of language used plays a

strategic role in building public trust in government policies and strengthening the legitimacy of measures taken to address the pandemic, such as emphasizing firmness and vigilance to ensure public compliance with health protocols. The moral judgment in these official statements plays a crucial role in shaping public attitudes and behaviors, as well as managing perceptions regarding risks and pandemic mitigation efforts. Furthermore, the use of Judgment is not merely informative but also serves as a rhetorical tool to regulate social relations and reinforce the government's position in complex health crises. Therefore, this study underscores the importance of the Judgment system in official government communication during crises, while also demonstrating how Appraisal theory can reveal evaluative and moral aspects in public discourse amid the pandemic.

This study uses Appraisal research by Martin and White 2005. This research focuses on attitude in conjunction with judgment. Based on the discussion above, research on appraisal theory is very useful. The purpose of this study is to identify how phrases used by the Head of State in shaping public opinion and supporting Israel's political narrative in the middle of the current conflict. This research gap shows a general lack of research that only focuses on judgment, especially the use of rhetorical strategies used to gain support and build legitimacy at the international level. Novelty research on this judgment system provides a new understanding of moral judgments (social sanction and social esteem) used strategically to build legitimacy and respond to global pressure in the international community.

II. Literature Review

A. *Appraisal Theory*

The assessment framework developed by Martin and White (2005) offers an examination of the meanings that are employed in the text to express favorable or unfavorable conclusions. This engages the author or speaker in a dialogic relationship with the previous speaker and changes the utterance's directness or intensity. Since they are all methods of assessing the speaker's or writer's individual engagement with the text through taking a position either toward phenomena (entities or events that the text interprets) or toward propositions about events, these sources of meaning-making can be referred to as the "language of evaluation."

Although it rejects the denotation of interpretation, this theory offers a comprehensive strategy. After recognizing the flaws of the early 1900s, James Robert Martin initially presented Appraisal Theory in his 2000 book *Beyond Exchange: Appraisal System*, suggesting that it be founded on SFL. Since its publication, Appraisal Theory has drawn the interest of several individuals worldwide. Additionally, in a work co-authored with Discourse to establish a platform for the study of relational and other definitions, Martin (2007) wrote extensively about assessment schemes.

B. *Attitude System*

Attitudes are related to thoughts and include emotional responses, attitudinal perceptions, and interpretations of effects. Affect refers to the expression of emotions and feelings, which can be positive or negative, such as happiness, sadness, or anger. Meanwhile, appreciation relates to the judgment of objects, events or phenomena based on their aesthetic or functional qualities, which includes aesthetic appreciation (beauty or art value) and functional appreciation (usefulness or practicality). Judgement is one of the categories in this attitude system. Judgement focuses on mindsets related to behaviors that are admired, criticized, or praised (Martin & White, 2008.p.42). This allows judgments to be placed into society as a form of respect and approval. Halliday (1994) categorizes that Judgements are classified based on modality, then Martin & White (2005:52) categorize that Judgements are classified based on two types, namely, social esteem and social sanctions. This attitude system is very useful in analyzing texts and discourses, aids in the

understanding of how language conveys attitudes, and can be applied in various fields such as linguistics, psychology, and communication studies.

Judgement of esteem is done based on “Normality” (how often someone faces reality or fate) featuring modalities such as normal, average, fashionable, typical, and strange; “Capacity” (how strong they are in facing problems) with modalities of mature enough, healthy enough, intelligent enough, and smart enough; “Tenacity” (how strong they are in solving problems) with modalities of firm and persistent. In oral cultures, social esteem is usually respected through chatter, gossip, jokes, and various types of stories where humor often plays an important role. Judgement of sanctions is done by means of “Veracity”, which shows how honest a person is in expressing the truth, represented by things like true, honest, genuine, credible. “Propriety”, which indicates how ethical a person is in showing politeness, is represented with things like insensitive, arrogant, self-centered, and rude. Most social sanctions are made in writing, such as decrees, regulations, and laws on how to behave to deal with those who do not adhere to the code.

C. Previous Studies

In previous research examining appraisal analysis using Martin & White 2005 theory, especially on attitude analysis from various research studies. First from [11], this study examines the attitudes of 20 comments on Reza Oktovian's Instagram with the posting of the video clip song “Lathi”. The purpose of the research study explains the appraisal analysis used by listeners in the comment column on posts on the @ybrap Instagram account. Evaluation analysis 100% positive value data and 0% negative value. [12] the research focus is Najwa Shihab's speech related to women and entrepreneurship. The results of the study were 55 clauses, consisting of 27 affection clauses (49%), 18 assessment clauses (33%), and 10 appreciation clauses (18%). [13], in 60-minute political interviews during the 2020 US presidential election, the research showed Trump and Stahl used more attitudes in their interviews, while Biden and O'Donnell used less appreciation. The results showed that the four participants developed a strategy of attitude type and polarity to achieve specific argumentative goals. The study by [14] the purpose of this research found evaluative attitudes on 8th grade students' language use in descriptive texts. 10 students participated in a descriptive text writing competition taken from Instagram. The results of this study show affect 44%, judgment 33%, and appreciation 22%.

III. Method

This research uses qualitative descriptive research. A qualitative approach is a method or procedure in research that produces descriptive data about behavior, written words, and oral from people. This approach emphasizes aspects of a deeper understanding of a problem and tends to use analysis to better understand its meaning [15]. The data source for this research was taken through the Aljazeera English YouTube account, Netanyahu's speech representing Israel has 2.2 thousand likes and 121 thousand views. In this video, Israel conveyed in his speech emphasizing Israel's commitment to continue its military operations in Gaza.

This study uses Martin & White's (2005) Appraisal Theory, employing Van Leeuwen's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The focus of this study is solely on the appraisal contained in Netanyahu's speech. To collect data, the researcher conducted several stages of data analysis. First, the researcher watched Netanyahu's speech video on the Aljazeera English YouTube account, then wrote a transcript of the video. Next, the researcher selected controversial statements made by the Israeli leader about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict to be included in the categories of social sanctions (property and veracity) or social sanctions (normality, capacity, and perseverance). The researchers then interpretation the statements using the CDA approach after defining the statements according to the previously defined categories. In particular, the researchers consider Van Leeuwen's ideology of the

overall meaning contained in the assessment. The researchers identify language patterns, sentence structures, and the socio-political context underlying the choice of words and phrases during the analysis process. The purpose of this process was to reveal how rhetorical strategies were used to form legitimacy and influence public opinion. In the final step, the researchers drew conclusions from their findings

IV. Finding and Discussion

Based the examination, there are clauses containing lexis which can be included in the judgment: social esteem and social sanction. Here they are going to be deciphered as forms of the assessments represented two opposing countries, namely Palestine and Israel, related to the war or aggression in between them in a UN forum.

Table 1. Netanyahu speech sub-category

Noted: - (negative) + (positive) X (not included)

Finding

Clauses	Judgement	
	<i>Social Esteem</i>	<i>Social Sanction</i>
Yet we face <i>savage enemies</i> who <i>seek our annihilation</i> and we must defend ourselves against <i>these savage murderers</i> .	X	-
Hamas kidnapped 251 people from <i>dozens of different countries, dragging them into the dungeons of Gaza</i> .	-	-

Social Sanction

Data finding 1 “Yet we face *savage enemies* who *seek our annihilation* and we must defend ourselves against *these savage murderers*.” This shows a social sanction sentence that indicates a social reaction by upholding norms and approving behavior. In Netanyahu's narrative above, he describes Israel's enemies who continuously carry out negative actions as a threat to his country. However, by introducing three phrases in the above narrative, Netanyahu attempts to build legitimacy or twist the facts so that Israel gains support from the international community. In the Appraisal system of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), the context of this judgment sentence leans more toward **propriety**. This is marked by Netanyahu's assessment of the behavior of Israel's enemies as immoral and ethically unacceptable.

Data finding 2: “Hamas kidnapped 251 people from dozens of different countries, *dragging them into the dungeons of Gaza*.” There is one phrase that indicates social sanction, “dragging them into the dungeons of Gaza,” in the narrative. Netanyahu implicitly conveys social sanction by condemning Hamas' harmful actions. By making this statement, he can shape public opinion and international policy. The context of the sentence in Data 2 indicates the subcategory of propriety, explaining that Hamas' actions are considered to have violated humanitarian norms, thereby helping to shape public opinion and encourage social sanctions from the international community.

Social Esteem

Finding 2: “ Hamas kidnapped 251 people from *dozens of different countries*, dragging them into the dungeons of Gaza.” This finding can be categorized as social esteem and social sanction. The phrase “dozens of different countries” indicates the international community's assessment that many countries are involved in the situation, which is detrimental to Israel. Netanyahu's narrative emphasizes the global community's **capacity** to respond and take action against the incident. Thus, this narrative reinforces the legitimacy that Hamas' actions have caused great harm and triggered a reaction from the international community.

Discussion

Data 1 “*Yet we face savage enemies who seek our annihilation and we must defend ourselves against these savage murderers.*”

	Appraising items	Appraiser	Appraised	Type of Appraisal
Savage enemies	Nominal group	Netanyahu	Hamas	Judgement
Seek our annihilation	Elaborative clause			
These savage murderers	Nominal group			

In the speech delivered by Benjamin Netanyahu, the phrase “*Yet we face savage enemies who seek our annihilation and we must defend ourselves against these savage murderers*” reflects a strong moral judgment against Israel's enemies, particularly terrorist groups such as Hamas and Hezbollah. The words “*savage enemies*” and “*savage murderers*” are aimed at Hamas and Hezbollah by showing Netanyahu's statement referring to the attack carried out by Hamas supported by Iran on October 7 where their actions killed and kidnapped Israeli citizens. In addition, Netanyahu also mentioned that Hezbollah launched thousands of rockets into Israel. Netanyahu emphasized that both Hamas and Hezbollah are backed by Iran, which reinforces the narrative that Israel is fighting against a larger force. He stated, “*We are defending ourselves against Tehran on seven fronts*,” suggesting that this conflict not only involves the two groups, but also involves wider regional actors. This sentence can be analyze using the Judgement theory developed by Martin and White, which divides judgments into two main categories: Social Esteem and Social Sanction. In the sentence, Netanyahu gives a clear assessment of the enemy's behavior by referring to them as “*savages*” and “*murderers*”, which shows a very negative moral assessment of their actions. The term “*savage*” indicates that he considers his enemies to not only commit acts of violence, but also to have a very bad and inhumane nature, reflecting the view that their actions are unacceptable in a moral and ethical context.

In the context of Martin and White's theory, this sentence can be categorized as negative Social Sanction. This category deals with the assessment of behavior that is seen as good or bad in a social context. In this sentence, Netanyahu condemns the actions of his enemies and asserts that they must be stopped, which shows a negative assessment of their behavior, which is considered a threat not only to Israel, but also to civilization as a whole. The assessment made by Netanyahu in this sentence is very important in a political and social context. In conflict situations, how a party portrays its enemy can influence public opinion and gain international support. By negatively assessing his enemy, Netanyahu is trying to build legitimacy for Israel's defensive actions and gain support from other countries. The phrase “*savage enemies*” belongs to the nominal group category, where “*savage*” functions as a modifier that gives a negative assessment of “*enemies*.” By using the word “*savage*,”

the author shows that the enemies are considered brutal, cruel, and inhumane, creating a strong image of them as a dangerous threat. Furthermore, the phrase *“seek our annihilation”* functions as an elaborative clause that explains the intention or goal of the *“savage enemies.”* The word *“seek”* denotes action, while *“our annihilation”* refers to the goal to be achieved, which is to destroy the party considered as an opponent. Although this phrase contains an element of judgment, it functions more as a clause that provides additional information about the motivation behind the enemy's actions. Finally, the phrase *“these savage murderers”* also belongs to the nominal group category, where *“savage”* again functions as a modifier that emphasizes the evil and cruel nature of the group in question. In this way, the author reinforces their image as inhumane perpetrators of violence. Taken together, these three phrases serve to convey a strong judgment of a particular enemy or group, building a clear narrative of the threat at hand.

In this sentence, there are several behaviors that can be identified from Netanyahu. First, by stating that *“we must defend ourselves,”* Netanyahu is exhibiting proactive defensive behavior, emphasizing that Israel has the right to protect itself from a threat that it takes very seriously. This is a common response in conflict situations, where the state feels itself threatened by the actions of an adversary. Secondly, Netanyahu uses strong language to describe his adversary, attempting to build a narrative that Israel is the righteous side and fighting against evil. In this way, he not only defends Israel's actions, but also seeks to gain support from an international audience. This narrative is important in the context of global politics, where the legitimacy of actions often depends on how a party can frame the situation. By describing the enemy as *“savage murderers,”* Netanyahu sought to evoke emotions among the audience, both inside the UN chamber and outside. He wanted the international audience to understand that Israel was in a highly threatened position and needed support to fight terrorism. In this context, a strong moral judgment can help build solidarity and support for Israel. In addition, Netanyahu also sought to create a sense of humanity among the audience. By emphasizing that his enemies are committing extremely cruel acts, he wants the audience to feel empathy for the victims of violence and understand that Israel is fighting to protect its citizens. This is a common rhetorical strategy used in political speeches to evoke emotions and get support.

Data 2 *“ Hamas kidnapped 251 people from dozens of different countries, dragging them into the dungeons of Gaza.”*

	Appraising items	Appraiser	Appraised	Type of Appraisal
Dozens of different countries	Nominal group	Netanyahu	Israeli society	Judgement
Dragging them into the dungeons	Elaborative clause			

Benjamin Netanyahu's statement at his meeting at the UN, which mentioned *“Dozens of different countries”* and *“Dragging them into the dungeons,”* can be analyzed using the Judgement theoretical framework developed by Martin and White (2005). According to Martin and White, Judgement refers to the moral judgment made by the speaker towards the actions or characters of other individuals or groups. In this context, Netanyahu utilizes strong and emotional language to convey his views on the political situation faced by Israel, as well as to criticize the actions of certain countries that he considers potentially harmful. In the explanation of Judgement theory based on Martin and White (2005) grouped Judgement into two main categories: “social esteem” and “social sanction.” “Social esteem” relates to positive or negative assessments of a person's character or actions, while ‘social sanction’ relates to more explicit moral judgments, which can include criticism or punishment.

In Netanyahu's statement, the phrase ***"Dozens of different countries"*** reflects a broad assessment of the international community, where Netanyahu seeks to show that many countries are involved in situations that are detrimental to Israel. This can be understood as a form of *"social esteem,"* where Netanyahu seeks to build legitimacy and support for Israel's position on the global stage. The first phrase belongs to the nominal group category, which refers to a group of words that functions as a subject or object in a sentence consisting of a noun and elements that explain or expand the meaning of the word. Therefore, the phrase ***"Dozens of different countries"*** functions as the subject or object in the sentence, providing a thorough understanding of the many countries discussed. The choice of words and their structure serve an important rhetorical purpose. By mentioning ***"dozens,"*** Netanyahu emphasizes that the issue involves many parties at the international level, not just a handful of countries. This creates the impression that Israel is receiving widespread attention from the global community. The use of the word ***"different"*** further emphasizes the diversity of the countries involved, showing that the issue involves various backgrounds and interests. Thus, this phrase not only conveys information, but also reinforces the legitimacy and weight of the arguments presented by Netanyahu. Overall, the phrase ***"Dozens of different countries"*** is a clear example of a nominal group that is effective in conveying political messages in international forums.

Furthermore, the phrase ***"Dragging them into the dungeons"*** has a very negative connotation and reflects a clear moral judgment. The term ***"dungeons"*** implies a place of darkness and suffering, indicating that the actions of certain countries are considered cruel and inhumane. In this context, Netanyahu uses "social sanction" to condemn such actions, placing them in a very negative frame. By using dramatic language, he sought to evoke an emotional reaction from the audience, both inside the UN and outside, to show how serious the situation faced by Israel was. When we compare the details of Netanyahu's statement with Judgement theory, we can see how he uses language to shape a larger narrative about Israel's identity and its place in the world. By mentioning ***"dozens of different countries,"*** Netanyahu creates the image that Israel is not alone in its struggle and that there are many who also feel the impact of policies or actions taken by certain countries. This creates a sense of solidarity and legitimacy for Israel, which is in line with the concept of "social esteem" in Judgement theory. On the other hand, the use of the phrase ***"Dragging them into the dungeons"*** indicates a strong moral judgment against the actions of these countries. In this context, Netanyahu is trying to condemn and condemn actions that he considers harmful, which is in line with the concept of "social sanction". In this way, he not only conveys information, but also shapes public opinion and international policy. This is a common rhetorical strategy used in international politics, where leaders seek to build support by portraying themselves as the persecuted party.

The phrase ***"Dragging them into the dungeons"*** belongs to the elaborative clause category, elaborative clauses are clauses that provide explanations or additional details about ideas that have been conveyed previously. This clause serves to clarify meaning and provide further context. The phrase ***"Dragging them into the dungeons"*** consists of the verb ***"dragging,"*** which indicates action, followed by the object ***"them,"*** and the prepositional phrase ***"into the dungeons,"*** which provides context regarding the purpose of the action. The term ***"dungeons"*** describes a place that is dark and full of suffering, creating a strong image of inhumane conditions. The use of this elaborative clause is very important because it provides an in-depth explanation of the actions that Netanyahu considers certain countries to have committed. With this phrase, Netanyahu not only conveys information, but also builds a strong emotional narrative. The word ***"dragging"*** implies forced action, while ***"dungeons"*** creates a visualization of suffering. This is an effective rhetorical technique to evoke an emotional reaction from the audience. An evaluation of Netanyahu's judgment must also consider the factual context of the situation faced by Israel. In recent news, it can be seen that Israel faces significant challenges from various countries and groups, including criticism of settlement policies in the occupied territories and responses to rocket attacks from militant groups. In this context,

Netanyahu's statement can be seen as an attempt to build a narrative that Israel is the victim of unjust collective action, seeking to gain sympathy and support from the international community. However, it is important to remember that the moral judgments made by Netanyahu do not necessarily reflect objective reality. Many countries may have a different view of the situation in Israel and Palestine, and criticism of Israeli policies is often based on a broader perspective of human rights and international law. In this sense, Netanyahu's statements can be perceived as an attempt to frame a narrative that supports his position, despite the many arguments against his views.

Benjamin Netanyahu purposefully used strong, emotive language in his speeches at international fora, especially the UN, to portray Israel's enemies Hamas and Hezbollah in particular as existential threats to the country and to civilization in general. Netanyahu sometimes refers to these organizations as "savage enemies" and "savage murderers," highlighting their brutality and inhumanity. Martin and White's (2005) Judgement framework, which divides evaluative language into "social esteem" (judgments of competence and character) and "social sanction" (moral judgments of right and wrong), is the foundation of this rhetorical device. His portrayal of Hamas, Hezbollah, and their Iranian supporters as tragedy criminals, citing incidents like the October 7 attacks, rocket dams, and hostage-taking, demonstrates Netanyahu's constant a job of negative social sanctions. In addition to criticizing these organizations' acts, Netanyahu uses insulting phrases to try to gain international support for Israel's military response. Israel's acts are presented as necessary self-defense against an unforgiving and immoral enemy when the words "we must defend ourselves against these savage murderers" is used. By associating Iran with Hamas and Hezbollah, claiming that Israel is "defending ourselves against Tehran on seven fronts," and outlining a regional axis of enmity, Netanyahu further expands the threat. In order to further defend continuous military actions and opposition to ceasefire agreements, this more expansive framing attempts to portray Israel's battle as a component of a larger conflict with forces that pose a threat to international stability. By using social respect and social censure to sway opinions, the allusions to "dozens of different countries" and "dragging them into the dungeons" portray Israel as both a target of international hate and a crucial participant in the fight against extremism. Additionally, Netanyahu use nominal groups and elaborative clauses in his speech to linguistically support the negative description of others and make clear their goals (e.g., looking for annihilation, causing atrocities). In addition to providing facts, these structures increase the moral and emotional impact of his arguments in an effort to attract sympathy and understanding from audiences locally as well as globally. In order to amplify the sense of existential threat and the need for Israel's defensive measures, the speakers frequently relate current threats to historically traumas like the Holocaust.

A comparison of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech and Dini Sri Istiningdias' research study shows the use of Martin and White's Judgment theory in different contexts. Netanyahu uses negative moral judgments (social sanctions) to portray Israel's enemies as immoral threats, thereby building legitimacy for his country's defensive actions in the eyes of the world. In contrast, the Indonesian Ministry of Health during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic primarily employed positive judgment (social esteem) to build public trust and compliance with health protocols. Thus, although both employ evaluative strategies, Netanyahu emphasizes criticism of external parties to secure international political support, while the Ministry of Health focuses on strengthening domestic solidarity and discipline. These two approaches demonstrate how the Judgment system can be adapted to achieve different rhetorical objectives according to the social and political context.

V. Conclusion

The results show that Netanyahu uses the language of social sanction as described by Martin and White's Judgement theory to structure his speeches in a way that delivers a strong moral judgment

against Israel's enemies, especially Hamas, Hezbollah, and their Iranian patrons. By presenting the war as a fight not only for national survival but also for the protection of civilization as a whole, this strategy aims to create legitimacy and attract international support for Israel's military activities by framing them as legitimate self-defense. Netanyahu wants to change public opinion and international policy by portraying Israel as a victim of unheard-of aggression and as a bulwark against savagery through the use of emotionally charged and morally heavy language. Despite international criticism and peace contests, the rhetorical tactic is successful in generating support, influencing narratives, and defending ongoing military operations. But it's crucial to understand that this kind of framing is essentially subjective and supports particular political goals, which might not necessarily match with more general viewpoints on international law and human rights. The analysis underlines the power of language in conflict factors to convey legitimacy, organize support, and set limits of normal behavior on the world stage.

References

- [1] R. N. Dhia, J. A. Pramesthi, and I. Irwansyah, "Analisis Retorika Aristoteles Pada Kajian Ilmiah Media Sosial Dalam Mempersuasi Publik," *Linimasa J. Ilmu Komun.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 81–103, 2024, doi: 10.23969/linimasa.v4i1.3530.
- [2] Y. Thahara *et al.*, "Attitude and Political Ideology of 2024 Indonesian Presidential Candidates Reported in Jakartapost.com," *Regist. J.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 123–145, 2024, doi: 10.18326/register.v17i1.123-145.
- [3] B. D. Sholehkat, L. A. P. Winarta, P. Wijayanti, and R. C. Rahayu, "Analisis Peran Media Sosial Dalam Konflik Israel-Palestina Ditinjau Dari Teori Orientalisme Edward W Said," *HUMANIS Hum. Resour. Manag. Bus. J.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 31–39, 2024, doi: 10.33830/humanis.v1i1.6962.
- [4] A. Hariyanto and A. Putera, "Konten Kreator Youtube Sebagai Sumber Penghasilan," vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 301–309, 2022.
- [5] G. K. Fahim, "Israel-Palestine Conflict and the Role of International Organizations Author Fahim Ghaffar Khan," *Pakistan Rev. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2022.
- [6] K. Khotimah, "Appraisal System Analysis on News of The Israel-Palestine Conflict on Kompas.com and CNN Indonesia Media," vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 1–23, 2024, doi: 10.26499/jk.v20i2.7025.
- [7] M. Jamaluddin and E. I. Habibillah, "Pengaruh Kebijakan Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa (PBB) Dalam Konflik Palestina-Israel," *J. Tapis Teropong Aspir. Polit. Islam*, vol. 19, no. July, pp. 1–23, 2023.
- [8] M. Ra'afi Nur Azhami, P. Adisha nur Syafira, and M. Zaqi Muttaqin, "Konflik Israel-Palestina: Peran PBB dan Pengaruh Pengakuan Palestina sebagai Negara Pengamat," *Pustaka J. Ilmu-Ilmu Budaya*, vol. 24, no. 2, p. 257, 2024, doi: 10.24843/pjiib.2024.v24.i02.p18.
- [9] J. R. Martin and P. R. R. White, "The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English."
- [10] D. S. Istiningdias, L. M. Indrayani, and E. T. S. S. Wagati, "Judgement system of indonesian health ministry statements to the initial covid-19 pandemic in appraisal framework: A systemic functional linguistics study," *J. Posit. Psychol. Wellbeing*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 887–900, 2022, [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=uv6HIIdcAAAAJ&pagesize=100&citation_for_view=uv6HIIdcAAAAJ:ldfaerwXgEUC
- [11] S. Janthono and M. Nugroho, "Seminar on English Education , Literature and Linguistics Proceeding Appraisal Analysis of Music Reviewed in @ Ybrap ' s Instagram Account," vol. 02, no. July, pp. 143–148, 2023.
- [12] A. R. Adisti and M. Hasbi, "Women's speech, a call for economic empowerment: An

- appraisal analysis,” *Gend. Equal. Int. J. Child Gend. Stud.*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 161, 2022, doi: 10.22373/equality.v8i2.13562.
- [13] J. A. Aljuraywi and H. S. Alyousef, “Attitude in political discourse: an appraisal analysis of attitude in donald Trump and Joe Biden’s interviews on 60 Minutes,” *J. Lang. Linguist. Stud.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 176–193, 2022, [Online]. Available: www.jlls.org
- [14] A. Lestari, ; Mansyur Srisudarso, ; Putri, K. Hakim, and A. Lesstari, “IDEAS Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature Exploring Secondary Students Attitude In Instagram-Assisted Descriptive Writing : An Appraisal Analysis Framework,” vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1590–1600, 2023, doi: 10.24256/ideas.v11i2.4044.
- [15] A. Prayogi and M. A. Kurniawan, “Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif : Suatu Telaah Complex : Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Nasional,” vol. 1, pp. 30–37, 2024.