

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly in 2014

Diana Yehya Abu Khaled

Lecturer of English, Al Quds Open University – UNRWA teacher

Corresponding Author: Diana Yehya Abu Khaled, E-mail: vip_824@hotmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: March 03, 2019

Accepted: March 22, 2020

Published: March 31, 2020

Volume: 3

Issue: 3

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.3.5

KEYWORDS

political speech, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ideology, discursive strategies

ABSTRACT

In this research, the researcher investigates the Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speech at the United Nations General Assembly on September 29, 2014. The main purpose behind this research is analyzing the language used in Netanyahu's speech. The researcher highlights how ideology influenced Netanyahu's speech using qualitative research and by applying critical discourse analysis. CDA's purpose was to expose how language use in the analyzed speech manipulated power and ideology. The main method of CDA used in the analysis was Discourse Historical Approach, argumentation strategies and the role of social factors. The researcher adopted DHA by Wodak (2009) with focusing on the taxonomy of social actor representation by Van Leeuwen (2008). The findings of the study revealed how language used By Netanyahu reflects the agenda and the ideology of his policy.

Introduction

Critical discourse analysis is widely adopted method to analyze spoken or written materials. For example, news articles, political speeches, novels, advertisements, movies, essays or books. CDA first originated in Britain in 1980s. The analysis of political speeches is beneficial in order to reveal the biased language and raise the readers' consciousness of the way through which language is manipulated. Admittedly, political speeches are embedded with hidden ideologies and manipulated discourse structures. Israel launched a military operation in July 2014 against the Gaza Strip. According to the United Nations Relief and Work Agency (UNRWA) (2015), 300,000 Gazans escaped to its schools and nearly 500,000 people have been displaced by the conflict. Palestinian health officials say more than two thousand people, most of them civilians, including more than 490 children, have been killed in Gaza. Yet, it is not the first time civilians have paid a heavy price. The number of civilians killed during Israel's aggression has raised international concern and condemnation. The UN says the majority of Palestinian deaths are civilian. Large-scale protests against the Israeli war were held in many cities worldwide, often coordinated to occur simultaneously around the world. Accordingly, Benjamin Netanyahu' in his speech, at the United Nations General Assembly on September 29, 2014, justified the war and refute all the massacres committed by his soldiers. The study aims to expose how he manipulated the truth and appealed the sympathy of the addressee through the critical discourse of his speech.

Benjamin Netanyahu is the current Prime Minister of Israel. Netanyahu also serves as a member of the Knesset and Chairman of the Likud party. Netanyahu served as Israeli ambassador to the United Nations from 1984 to 1988. He became leader of the right-wing Likud party in 1993 and has gone on to serve as prime minister for multiple terms, winning reelection in 2015 in a tense campaign. During his time at the U.N., he successfully led a campaign to declassify U.N. archives on Nazi war crimes. (Wikipedia, 2017).

Research Problem

Noticing the manipulation in many of Netanyahu speeches was the motive behind writing this. That was why the researcher decided to analyze one of these speeches using discourse analysis CDA. The purpose of applying CDA in the research was to expose how language use in the analyzed speech reflects the agenda and the ideology of Netanyahu policy. CDA, as explained by Wodak (2009) investigates critically social inequality as it is expressed and legitimized by language use. Furthermore, to question issues of credibility and representations of the truth, and to explore how language in Netanyahu's speech is used to promote hatred and wars. Netanyahu discussed several issues in his speech related to ISIS, Iran, and Hamas, the analysis will be focused on Israel –Hamas conflict.

Research Questions

- a. How language use in Netanyahu's speech constructed in groups and out group?
- b. 2-How does language use in Netanyahu's speech label social actors more or less positively or negatively?
- c. 3-What are the discursive strategies used in the speech to legitimize the actions of the in group and criticize the action of the out group?

Research Significance

The analysis of Netanyahu's speech helps to analyze the ideological function of language. Moreover, it provides a better understanding of the political purpose of any speech. Also, it is essential to highlight the power of speeches in persuading the public to accept and support your policies. The study reveals the truth to the world about the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Considering the teaching and learning process, the research raises the consciousness of students about the manipulated and hidden meaning of any text- written or spoken.

Literature Review

Theoretical background

To Taiwo (2007), CDA is a field of study which has paved the ways for the linguists to find out the hidden ideologies behind seemingly simple and plain words. Language is no longer seen as merely reflecting out reality, but as central to creating reality. Van Dijk (1993) assumes that language is not a neutral tool for transmitting messages, as it constitutes a particular way of understanding the world. CDA in research is used as a critical linguistic approach to testify the overt relationship of struggle and conflict as it is expressed, constituted and legitimized by language use (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). In this context, Van Dijk (1998) demonstrates that Critical Discourse Analysis is a branch of discourse analysis that fundamentally investigate the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are achieved, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. Regarding the DHA, Wodak (2009) clarifies that DHA approach integrates knowledge about historical sources and the background of the social or political field, within which discursive events are embedded. Discourse is defined on DHA as a macro-topic of context-dependent semiotic practices of social action and as a socially constituted and socially constitutive (Wodak, 2009).

In this study, the CDA is used to investigate the notions of social actors and contexts to analyze the political ideologies in Netanyahu's speech. The researcher adopted DHA by Wodak (2009) with focusing on the taxonomy of social actor representation by Van Leeuwen (2008). The purpose of discourse analysis in the current study is to highlight how language use in Netanyahu's speech can manipulate power to frame people ideology by asserting specific identities and distorting facts to justify crimes (Bazzi, 2009). Accordingly, the researcher considers CDA as the only method that can deeply analyze Netanyahu's speech. CDA is an adequate qualitative method that helps to understand hegemonic order is used to filter information and legitimize reasons for particular war against the other nation (Bazzi, 2009).

Empirical studies

There are different researches being carried out on political speeches discourse (Alrefaee, et al, 2019; Shamkhy, S. Z., & bin Janoory, 2019; Hamdan & Elnadeef, 2020; Hussein & Hussein, 2020). Critical discourse analysis is adopted by many researchers to analyze political speeches of prominent politicians. For example, many studies analyzed Barack Obama's speeches such as Wang (2010) who employed CDA to analyze Obama’s presidential speeches from the point of transitivity and modality, to identify how language serves the ideology and power. He summarized the main features of Obama speeches.

Methodology

Steps and Categories of Analysis

To conduct CDA, the researcher chose a combination of Ruth Wodak's DHA and Theo Van Leeuwen's systematic-functional model of representation of social actors. Since I see them as most appropriate to analyze Netanyahu's speech. The analytical part of this study operates within (In-depth Analysis).

In – depth Analysis

DHA in-depth analysis distinguishes between topics, which are written about, discursive strategies employing; and the linguistic means (Wodak, 2009. p.38)

Strategy	Objectives
Nomination	Construction of in groups and out groups.
Prediction	Labeling social actors more or less positively or negatively.
Argumentation	Justification of positive or negative attributions.
Intensification, mitigation	Modifying the epistemic status of a proposition.

Table (1) description of discursive strategies (Wodak, 2001, p74)

I am interested in the above four types of discursive strategies, because they are all involved in the positive self and negative other presentation, which I will be analyzing in Netanyahu's speech

Representations of social actors

The representations of social actors in my study will be grounded in linguistics and the use of language and grammar in shaping the role of actors in the society (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p.38) The following elements of analysis of Van Leeuwen’s (2008) method function as one of the essential criteria for the analysis: Inclusion/ exclusion, suppression, role allocation, functionalization, and impersonalisation.

Analysis

Discursive strategies or strategies of self- and other presentations are adopted in this study to highlight the political and linguistic aim embedded in Netanyahu's speech.

Nomination: nomination is the construction of in-groups and out groups. Examples in the speech are:

"*Hamas fired thousands of rockets at Israel*", "*That's why Israel's fight against Hamas is not just our fight. It's your fight*".

According to Netanyahu the in group is Israel while the out group is Hamas. The out group classifications revealed images of social unrest, security risk, violence, and crime. On the other hand, the in group was depicted as victims of the escalating violence committed by the Palestinians.

Prediction: prediction is the labeling of social actors more or less positively or negatively. This strategy was evident in Netanyahu's speech. For example, negative presentations of the out-group are:

"Hamas cynically used Palestinian civilians as human shields. It used schools, not just schools-UN schools, private homes, mosques, even hospitals to store and fire rockets at Israel"

"Hamas embedded its missile batteries in residential areas and told Palestinians to ignore Israel's warnings to leave."

"Hamas shares the global ambitions of its fellow militant Islamists. That's why its supporters wildly cheered in the streets of Gaza as thousands of Americans were murdered on 9/11. And that's why its leaders condemned the United States for killing Osama Bin Laden, whom they praised as a holy warrior." Netanyahu clearly depicted Hamas (the out group) as terrorist, inhuman, brutal movement.

On the other hand, examples of positive presentation of the in-group are:

"Israel was doing everything to minimize Palestinian civilian casualties. Hamas was doing everything to maximize Israeli civilian casualties and Palestinian civilian casualties. Israel dropped flyers, made phone calls, sent text messages, broadcast warnings in Arabic on Palestinian television, always to enable Palestinian civilians to evacuate targeted areas".

"Israel was using its missiles to protect its children. Hamas was using its children to protect its missiles." Netanyahu presented Israel positively by using comparison between Hamas inhuman behavior and Israel humane behavior.

The people of Israel pray for peace".

Intensification/Mitigation: the strategies where incidents are either amplified or reduced. It is evident in the speech where casualties and destruction of the in- group is intensified, but the suffering of out-groups is marginalized, illustrations of this strategy are:

"You wouldn't let terrorists fire rockets at your cities with impunity. Nor would you let terrorists dig dozens of terror tunnels under your borders to infiltrate your towns in order to murder and kidnap your citizens.

"I've come here to expose the brazen lies spoken from this very podium against my country and against the brave soldiers who defend it."

Israeli civilians were being bombarded by rockets day after day, night after night."

Israeli children huddled in bomb shelters" "

Argumentation: the strategy of different forms of political inclusion or exclusion can be discussed by means of topos, which is justifications or positive or negative attributions. I will focus on topos that can be connected to the speech and the research purpose, such as topos of responsibility, humanitarianism, danger and threat, and defense.

Topos of Responsibility

Netanyahu blamed the out group as the responsible party for the war and the bloodshed.

"Hamas was doing everything to maximize Israeli civilian casualties and Palestinian civilian casualties". Netanyahu framed Hamas as responsible of civilians' death. This topos was also used to justify and legitimize the use of force

against Hamas. Interestingly the use of adverbs in the following quotations emphasized the topos of responsibility used by Netanyahu such as "cynically" and "deliberately". Using adverbs in order to indicate strong discourse and to highlight the responsible party behind the killing of civilians.

*Hamas **cynically** used Palestinian civilians as human shields". "*

*Hamas **deliberately** placed its rockets where Palestinian children live and play". "*

"And I say to President Abbas, these are the war crimes committed by your Hamas partners in the national unity government which you head and you are responsible for."

Topos of Humanitarianism

Another topos that appeared in Netanyahu's speech is the topos of humanitarianism. This topos is used to argue that Hamas actions does not conform to human rights, thus there should be action to stop it. He repeated "human rights" eight times and "war crime" three times in order to show Hamas as an outlaw organization while Israel is a law-abiding state. Also, it is implied that Israel cares about human rights.

*"Hamas, which both targeted and hid behind civilians – that a double war crime - Hamas is given a pass."
This is a war crime""*

Topos of danger and threat

Moving to the topos of danger and threat, which was used by Netanyahu as one of the main topos. The topos of danger and threat means that if there was a specific danger or threat, one should do something against it. This argumentation strategy is clear in the following examples:

"But our hopes and the world's hope for peace are in danger. Because everywhere we look, militant Islam is on the march."

As Hamas's charter makes clear, Hamas's immediate goal is to destroy Israel.""

"Iran, the world's most dangerous state in the world's most dangerous region, would obtain the world's most dangerous weapons. Allowing that to happen would pose the gravest threat to us all. "

"Imagine how much more dangerous the Islamic State, ISIS, would be if it possessed chemical weapons".

Netanyahu pointed out the real danger behind Iran, ISIS, and Hamas. Phrases such as 'in danger', 'dangerous', 'and gravest threat' indicated the idea of topos of danger and threat.

Topos of defense

The last topos, defense, is exclusively and extensively used by Netanyahu. This topos is used to argue the right of self-defense to legitimize the violation of human rights and massacres committed by Israel in the war. Additionally, the word defense has been used six times in the speech. In other words, Netanyahu presented Palestinians as violating the security of Israel, while Israel conformed to this.

Israel justly **defended** itself against both rocket attacks and terror tunnels". "

Israel's Iron Dome missile **defense** system knocked Hamas rockets out of the sky""

"Israel was using its missiles to protect its children."

We will **defend** ourselves against our enemies on the battlefield." "

Extra Analysis of extracts of Netanyahu speech

No.	Extracts	Argumentation
1-	"No other country and no other army in history have gone to greater lengths to avoid casualties among the civilian population of their enemies. This concern for Palestinian life was all the more remarkable, given that Israeli civilians were being bombarded by rockets day after day, night after night. As their families were being rocketed by Hamas, Israel's citizen army – the brave soldiers of the IDF, our young boys and girls – they upheld the highest moral values of any army in the world".	-Victim-agent reversal , implication that Israel is law-abiding Demonization of the other-
2-	"By investigating Israel rather than Hamas for war crimes, the UN Human Rights Council has betrayed its noble mission to protect the innocent. In fact, what it's doing is to turn the laws of war upside-down. Israel, which took unprecedented steps to minimize civilian casualties, Israel is condemned. Hamas, which both targeted and hid behind civilians – that a double war crime - Hamas is given a pass."	-Victim/perpetrator dichotomy Manipulation of facts- -Defamation by distortion; implications of the other negative action

Representations of social actors

Some linguistic questions that are suggested by Van Leewen 2008 will be speculated. The main question is: How can text strategy extract one's sympathies towards in-groups, or increase one's hostility towards the out groups? This question will be answered in terms of the following:

Suppression: It means defining which characters are being deleted from the sentence, by the use of the passive voice. The subject is omitted from the following sentence for the sake of reducing their responsibility of the incident.

Palestinian civilians were tragically but unintentionally killed"

Role allocation: It is the representation of social actor as criminals or victims. Where the lateral is giving the passive role and the criminals are the active actors. Accordingly, in the speech the active actor is Hamas and the passive actor is Israel.

"Israel, which took unprecedented steps to minimize civilian casualties, Israel is condemned. Hamas, which both targeted and hid behind civilians – that a double war crime - Hamas is given a pass."

Impersonalization-functionalism: it refers to the indication whether the social actors are being dehumanized by abstraction or objectivation. Fictionalization investigates whether social actors are represented in terms of a certain activity. Hamas is associated with terror activities, since where the word 'Hamas' it followed by actions such as firing rockets and killing civilians. While Israel is associated with peace and defense. The following table identifies the traits of each social factor.

Social actors and predications in Netanyahu's speech

NO.	Social actors	Predications
1	The United Nation	-Fighter of terrorism and barbarity A worker toward peace.-
2	Israel	Victims of Hamas bloodshed and bestiality.
3	Hamas	-A murder organization -Deniers of the Jewish people the right to live Shedders of Jews blood. - Seekers to destroy Israel.- -Peace Preventer

Netanyahu emphasized the willingness of Israel to achieve peace in order to win the international support and sympathy by the following statements:

"I'm ready to make a historic compromise, not because Israel is occupying a foreign land. The people of Israel are not occupiers in the Land of Israel. History, archeology and common sense all make clear that we have had a singular attachment to this land for over 3,000 years".

I want peace because I want to create a better future for my people". "

"I"saiah, our great prophet of peace, taught us nearly 3,000 years ago in Jerusalem to speak truth to power".

Also, he repeated the following words to indicate the same idea.

Word	Repetition
Peace	13
Security	8
Defend	6
Civilians	12

Conclusions and Recommendations

Critical discourse Analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech demonstrates that, Netanyahu safeguards Israel from all accusation of committing war crimes in the Gaza Strip in the name of "self-defense". On one hand, he justified their violations of human rights. On the other hand, he exclusively tries to focus on peace, security, and human rights. He tried to shorten the distance between him and his audience by using the word "imagine" and by stating what threatens Israel peace threatens the international peace. Considering the discursive strategies, predication strategy was used intensively in Netanyahu speech. The actions of Israel were presented as a defensive response to the actions of the Palestinians. This was evident by the employing of the topos of defense. One noticeable aspect of Netanyahu speech is the stress on, harm and damage to Israeli citizens caused by the destructive Palestinian behavior. It is obvious that Netanyahu's representation is unequal: while Hamas always assigned responsibility for killing Israelis, Israel responsibility in acts of violence is mitigated. In conclusion, the term Otherness was prominent in Netanyahu speech, which reflects the marginalization of Palestinians. Regarding recommendations, the researcher recommends to analyze many speeches of Netanya by using thematic analysis. Furthermore, Coherence and cohesion approach is highly recommended to analyze Netanyahu speech in at the United Nations General Assembly in 2014.

Pedagogical Implications

As the researcher is interested in applied linguistics, I focus on educational and pedagogical implications. The first implication of this study is related to consciousness-raising which, according to Fairclough (2001) is the main goal of CDA. Second, the results are insightful for improving the students' reading skills of EFL/students. (Asgharzadeh, 2009). Another implication of the present study is related to the critical thinking and critical language awareness of EFL/study. CDA principles help students to explore the world around them more critically in order not to take everything for granted and make questions regarding the raised issues.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Dr. Mosheer Aamer. I owe much appreciation to him for his remarkable effort in Discourse Analysis course. My gratitude also goes to Dr. Sanaa Abu Dagga for her effort during the course of Research Methodology. Also, I thank my colleagues on this program for their help with brainstorming, last-minute editing, and for our discussions about CDA. Finally, I am so thankful to God for directing my paths.

References

- [1] Alrefaee, Y., Khaleel Mohammed Abdul-Ghafour, A. Q., Alazzany, M., & Alrefaee, S. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Selected Opposition and State Printed Media on the Representation of Southern Mobility in Yemen. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(2), 116-124
- [2] Asgharzadeh, R. (2009). The effect of teaching critical reading through critical discourse analysis on high school EFL learners' reading comprehension. *Master's thesis. University of Shiraz, Shiraz, Iran.*
- [3] Bazzi, S. (2009). *Arab news and conflict : A multidisciplinary discourse study* (Vol. 34). John Benjamins Publishing.
- [4] Benjamin Netanyahu (2017). Retrieved from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Netanyahu
- [5] Billig, M. (1998). Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique. In *Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 35-46). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- [6] Fairclough. (2001). *Language and power*. Longman. London.
- [7] Full text of Prime Minister Netanyahu's UN speech. (2014). Retrieved from: <http://www.jpost.com/>
- [8] Hamdan, A. H. E., & Elnadeef, E. A. E. (2020). Analysis of the Prime Minister Abdulla Hamdok's Speech from Rhetoric and Linguistic Perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(7), 30-34
- [9] Hussein, A., & Hussein, M. (2020). Pragma-Linguistic Analysis Of Assertion In May's And Trump's Inaugural Addresses. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* 3(2), 78-88
- [10] Shamkhy, S. Z., & bin Janoory, L. (2019). Surveillance and Torture: A Foucauldian Reading in Mahmoud Saeed's Saddam City and Sinan Antoon's Ijaam. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(5), 297-308
- [11] Taiwo, R. (2004). Speech as headline in Nigerian newspapers. *The domestication of English in Nigeria*, 323-335.
- [12] UN Gaza Inquiry finds credible allegations of war crimes committed in 2014 by both Israel and Palestinian armed groups. (2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Pages/Home.aspx>
- [13] Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249-281.
- [14] Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- [15] Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 254-261.
- [16] Wodak, R. (2009). *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. London: Palgrave macmillan.
- [17] Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE.

Transcription of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly September 29, 2014

Thank you, Mr. President, Distinguished delegates, I come here from Jerusalem to speak on behalf of my people, the people of Israel. I've come here to speak about the dangers we face and about the opportunities we see. I've come here to expose the brazen lies spoken from this very podium against my country and against the brave soldiers who defend it.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the people of Israel pray for peace.

But our hopes and the world's hope for peace are in danger. Because everywhere we look, militant Islam is on the march.

It's not militants. It's not Islam. It's militant Islam. Typically, its first victims are other Muslims, but it spares no one. Christians, Jews, Yazidis, Kurds – no creed, no faith, no ethnic group is beyond its sights. And it's rapidly spreading in every part of the world. You know the famous American saying: "All politics is local"? For the militant Islamists, "All politics is global." Because their ultimate goal is to dominate the world.

Now, that threat might seem exaggerated to some, since it starts out small, like a cancer that attacks a particular part of the body. But left unchecked, the cancer grows, metastasizing over wider and wider areas. To protect the peace and security of the world, we must remove this cancer before it's too late. Last week, many of the countries represented here rightly applauded President Obama for leading the effort to confront ISIS. And yet weeks before, some of these same countries, the same countries that now support confronting ISIS, opposed Israel for confronting Hamas. They evidently don't understand that ISIS and Hamas are branches of the same poisonous tree.

ISIS and Hamas share a fanatical creed, which they both seek to impose well beyond the territory under their control.

Listen to ISIS's self-declared caliph, Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi. This is what he said two months ago: A day will soon come when the Muslim will walk everywhere as a master... The Muslims will cause the world to hear and understand the meaning of terrorism... and destroy the idol of democracy. Now listen to Khaled Meshaal, the leader of Hamas. He proclaims a similar vision of the future: We say this to the West... By Allah you will be defeated. Tomorrow our nation will sit on the throne of the world.

As Hamas's charter makes clear, Hamas's immediate goal is to destroy Israel. But Hamas has a broader objective. They also want a caliphate. Hamas shares the global ambitions of its fellow militant Islamists. That's why its supporters wildly cheered in the streets of Gaza as thousands of Americans were murdered on 9/11. And that's why its leaders condemned the United States for killing Osama Bin Laden, whom they praised as a holy warrior.

So when it comes to their ultimate goals, Hamas is ISIS and ISIS is Hamas.

And what they share in common, all militant Islamists share in common: • Boko Haram in Nigeria; • Ash-Shabab in Somalia; • Hezbollah in Lebanon; • An-Nusrah in Syria; • The Mahdi Army in Iraq; • And the Al-Qaeda branches in Yemen, Libya, the Philippines, India and elsewhere.

Some are radical Sunnis, some are radical Shi'ites. Some want to restore a pre-medieval caliphate from the 7th century. Others want to trigger the apocalyptic return of an imam from the 9th century. They operate in different

lands, they target different victims and they even kill each other in their quest for supremacy. But they all share a fanatic ideology. They all seek to create ever expanding enclaves of militant Islam where there is no freedom and no tolerance – Where women are treated as chattel, Christians are decimated, and minorities are subjugated, sometimes given the stark choice: convert or die. For them, anyone can be an infidel, including fellow Muslims.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Militant Islam's ambition to dominate the world seems mad. But so too did the global ambitions of another fanatic ideology that swept to power eight decades ago.

The Nazis believed in a master race. The militant Islamists believe in a master faith. They just disagree about who among them will be the master... of the master faith. That's what they truly disagree about. Therefore, the question before us is whether militant Islam will have the power to realize its unbridled ambitions.

There is one place where that could soon happen: The Islamic State of Iran. For 35 years, Iran has relentlessly pursued the global mission which was set forth by its founding ruler, Ayatollah Khomeini, in these words: We will export our revolution to the entire world.

Until the cry "There is no God but Allah" will echo throughout the world over... And ever since, the regime's brutal enforcers, Iran's Revolutionary Guards, have done exactly that.

Listen to its current commander, General Muhammad Ali Ja'afari. And he clearly stated this goal. He said: Our Imam did not limit the Islamic Revolution to this country... Our duty is to prepare the way for an Islamic world government... Iran's President Rouhani stood here last week, and shed crocodile tears over what he called "the globalization of terrorism." Maybe he should spare us those phony tears and have a word instead with the commanders of Iran's Revolutionary Guards. He could ask them to call off Iran's global terror campaign, which has included attacks in two dozen countries on five continents since 2011 alone. To say that Iran doesn't practice terrorism is like saying Derek Jeter never played shortstop for the New York Yankees.

This bemoaning of the Iranian president of the spread of terrorism has got to be one of history's greatest displays of doubletalk.

Now, Some still argue that Iran's global terror campaign, its subversion of countries throughout the Middle East and well beyond the Middle East, some argue that this is the work of the extremists. They say things are changing. They point to last year's elections in Iran. They claim that Iran's smooth talking President and Foreign Minister, they've changed not only the tone of Iran's foreign policy but also its substance. They believe Rouhani and Zarif genuinely want to reconcile with the West, that they've abandoned the global mission of the Islamic Revolution.

Really? So let's look at what Foreign Minister Zarif wrote in his book just a few years ago: We have a fundamental problem with the West, and especially with America. This is because we are heirs to a global mission, which is tied to our *raison d'etre*... A global mission which is tied to our very reason of being.

And then Zarif asks a question, I think an interesting one. He says: How come Malaysia [he's referring to an overwhelmingly Muslim country] – how come Malaysia doesn't have similar problems? And he answers: Because Malaysia is not trying to change the international order.

That's your moderate. So don't be fooled by Iran's manipulative charm offensive. It's designed for one purpose, and for one purpose only: To lift the sanctions and remove the obstacles to Iran's path to the bomb. The Islamic Republic is now trying to bamboozle its way to an agreement that will remove the sanctions it still faces, and leave it with the capacity of thousands of centrifuges to enrich uranium. This would effectively cement Iran's place as a

threshold military nuclear power. In the future, at a time of its choosing, Iran, the world's most dangerous state in the world's most dangerous region, would obtain the world's most dangerous weapons.

Allowing that to happen would pose the gravest threat to us all. It's one thing to confront militant Islamists on pick-up trucks, armed with Kalashnikov rifles. It's another thing to confront militant Islamists armed with weapons of mass destruction. I remember that last year, everyone here was rightly concerned about the chemical weapons in Syria, including the possibility that they would fall into the hands of terrorists. That didn't happen. And President Obama deserves great credit for leading the diplomatic effort to dismantle virtually all of Syria's chemical weapons capability. Imagine how much more dangerous the Islamic State, ISIS, would be if it possessed chemical weapons. Now imagine how much more dangerous the Islamic state of Iran would be if it possessed nuclear weapons. Ladies and Gentlemen, Would you let ISIS enrich uranium? Would you let ISIS build a heavy water reactor? Would you let ISIS develop intercontinental ballistic missiles? Of course you wouldn't. Then you mustn't let the Islamic State of Iran do those things either.

Because here's what will happen: Once Iran produces atomic bombs, all the charm and all the smiles will suddenly disappear. They'll just vanish. It's then that the ayatollahs will show their true face and unleash their aggressive fanaticism on the entire world. There is only one responsible course of action to address this threat: Iran's nuclear military capabilities must be fully dismantled. Make no mistake – ISIS must be defeated. But to defeat ISIS and leave Iran as a threshold nuclear power is to win the battle and lose the war.

To defeat ISIS and leave Iran as a threshold nuclear power is to win the battle and lose the war.

Ladies and Gentlemen, The fight against militant Islam is indivisible. When militant Islam succeeds anywhere, it's emboldened everywhere. When it suffers a blow in one place, it's set back in every place. That's why Israel's fight against Hamas is not just our fight. It's your fight. Israel is fighting a fanaticism today that your countries may be forced to fight tomorrow.

For 50 days this past summer, Hamas fired thousands of rockets at Israel, many of them supplied by Iran. I want you to think about what your countries would do if thousands of rockets were fired at your cities. Imagine millions of your citizens having seconds at most to scramble to bomb shelters, day after day. You wouldn't let terrorists fire rockets at your cities with impunity. Nor would you let terrorists dig dozens of terror tunnels under your borders to infiltrate your towns in order to murder and kidnap your citizens. Israel justly defended itself against both rocket attacks and terror tunnels. Yet Israel also faced another challenge. We faced a propaganda war. Because, in an attempt to win the world's sympathy, Hamas cynically used Palestinian civilians as human shields. It used schools, not just schools - UN schools, private homes, mosques, even hospitals to store and fire rockets at Israel.

As Israel surgically struck at the rocket launchers and at the tunnels, Palestinian civilians were tragically but unintentionally killed. There are heartrending images that resulted, and these fueled libelous charges that Israel was deliberately targeting civilians.

We were not. We deeply regret every single civilian casualty. And the truth is this: Israel was doing everything to minimize Palestinian civilian casualties. Hamas was doing everything to maximize Israeli civilian casualties and Palestinian civilian casualties. Israel dropped flyers, made phone calls, sent text messages, broadcast warnings in Arabic on Palestinian television, always to enable Palestinian civilians to evacuate targeted areas.

No other country and no other army in history have gone to greater lengths to avoid casualties among the civilian population of their enemies. This concern for Palestinian life was all the more remarkable, given that Israeli civilians were being bombarded by rockets day after day, night after night. As their families were being rocketed

by Hamas, Israel's citizen army – the brave soldiers of the IDF, our young boys and girls – they upheld the highest moral values of any army in the world. Israel's soldiers deserve not condemnation, but admiration. Admiration from decent people everywhere.

Now here's what Hamas did: Hamas embedded its missile batteries in residential areas and told Palestinians to ignore Israel's warnings to leave. And just in case people didn't get the message, they executed Palestinian civilians in Gaza who dared to protest.

No less reprehensible, Hamas deliberately placed its rockets where Palestinian children live and play. Let me show you a photograph. It was taken by a France 24 crew during the recent conflict. It shows two Hamas rocket launchers, which were used to attack us. You see three children playing next to them. Hamas deliberately put its rockets in hundreds of residential areas like this. Hundreds of them.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a war crime. And I say to President Abbas, these are the war crimes committed by your Hamas partners in the national unity government which you head and you are responsible for. And these are the real war crimes you should have investigated, or spoken out against from this podium last week.

Ladies and Gentlemen, As Israeli children huddled in bomb shelters and Israel's Iron Dome missile defense system knocked Hamas rockets out of the sky, the profound moral difference between Israel and Hamas couldn't have been clearer: Israel was using its missiles to protect its children. Hamas was using its children to protect its missiles.

By investigating Israel rather than Hamas for war crimes, the UN Human Rights Council has betrayed its noble mission to protect the innocent. In fact, what it's doing is to turn the laws of war upside-down. Israel, which took unprecedented steps to minimize civilian casualties, Israel is condemned. Hamas, which both targeted and hid behind civilians – that a double war crime - Hamas is given a pass.

The Human Rights Council is thus sending a clear message to terrorists everywhere: Use civilians as human shields. Use them again and again and again. You know why? Because sadly, it works.

By granting international legitimacy to the use of human shields, the UN's Human Rights Council has thus become a Terrorist Rights Council, and it will have repercussions. It probably already has, about the use of civilians as human shields.

It's not just our interest. It's not just our values that are under attack. It's your interests and your values.

Ladies and Gentlemen, We live in a world steeped in tyranny and terror, where gays are hanged from cranes in Tehran, political prisoners are executed in Gaza, young girls are abducted en masse in Nigeria and hundreds of thousands are butchered in Syria, Libya and Iraq. Yet nearly half, nearly half of the UN Human Rights Council's resolutions focusing on a single country have been directed against Israel, the one true democracy in the Middle East – Israel. where issues are openly debated in a boisterous parliament, where human rights are protected by independent courts and where women, gays and minorities live in a genuinely free society.

The Human Rights... (that's an oxymoron, the UN Human Rights Council, but I'll use it just the same), the Council's biased treatment of Israel is only one manifestation of the return of the world's oldest prejudices. We hear mobs today in Europe call for the gassing of Jews. We hear some national leaders compare Israel to the Nazis. This is not a function of Israel's policies. It's a function of diseased minds. And that disease has a name. It's called anti-Semitism.

It is now spreading in polite society, where it masquerades as legitimate criticism of Israel. For centuries the Jewish people have been demonized with blood libels and charges of deicide. Today, the Jewish state is demonized with the apartheid libel and charges of genocide. Genocide? In what moral universe does genocide include warning the enemy's civilian population to get out of harm's way? Or ensuring that they receive tons, tons of humanitarian aid each day, even as thousands of rockets are being fired at us? Or setting up a field hospital to aid for their wounded? Well, I suppose it's the same moral universe where a man who wrote a dissertation of lies about the Holocaust, and who insists on a Palestine free of Jews, Judenrein, can stand at this podium and shamelessly accuse Israel of genocide and ethnic cleansing.

In the past, outrageous lies against the Jews were the precursors to the wholesale slaughter of our people.

But no more.

Today we, the Jewish people, have the power to defend ourselves. We will defend ourselves against our enemies on the battlefield. We will expose their lies against us in the court of public opinion. Israel will continue to stand proud and unbowed.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Despite the enormous challenges facing Israel, I believe we have an historic opportunity.

After decades of seeing Israel as their enemy, leading states in the Arab world increasingly recognize that together we and they face many of the same dangers: principally this means a nuclear-armed Iran and militant Islamist movements gaining ground in the Sunni world.

Our challenge is to transform these common interests to create a productive partnership. One that would build a more secure, peaceful and prosperous Middle East.

Together we can strengthen regional security. We can advance projects in water, agriculture, in transportation, in health, in energy, in so many fields.

I believe the partnership between us can also help facilitate peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Many have long assumed that an Israeli-Palestinian peace can help facilitate a broader rapprochement between Israel and the Arab World. But these days I think it may work the other way around: Namely that a broader rapprochement between Israel and the Arab world may help facilitate an Israeli-Palestinian peace.

And therefore, to achieve that peace, we must look not only to Jerusalem and Ramallah, but also to Cairo, to Amman, Abu Dhabi, Riyadh and elsewhere. I believe peace can be realized with the active involvement of Arab countries, those that are willing to provide political, material and other indispensable support. I'm ready to make a historic compromise, not because Israel is occupying a foreign land. The people of Israel are not occupiers in the Land of Israel. History, archeology and common sense all make clear that we have had a singular attachment to this land for over 3,000 years.

I want peace because I want to create a better future for my people. But it must be a genuine peace, one that is anchored in mutual recognition and enduring security arrangements, rock solid security arrangements on the ground. Because you see, Israel's withdrawals from Lebanon and Gaza created two militant Islamic enclaves on our borders from which tens of thousands of rockets have been fired at Israel.

These sobering experiences heighten Israel's security concerns regarding potential territorial concessions in the future. Those security concerns are even greater today. Just look around you.

The Middle East is in chaos. States are disintegrating. Militant Islamists are filling the void.

Israel cannot have territories from which it withdraws taken over by Islamic militants yet again, as happened in Gaza and Lebanon. That would place the likes of ISIS within mortar range – a few miles – of 80% of our population.

Think about that. The distance between the 1967 lines and the suburbs of Tel Aviv is like the distance between the UN building here and Times Square. Israel's a tiny country. That's why in any peace agreement, which will obviously necessitate a territorial compromise, I will always insist that Israel be able to defend itself by itself against any threat. Yet despite all that has happened, some still don't take Israel's security concerns seriously. But I do, and I always will. Because, as Prime Minister of Israel, I am entrusted with the awesome responsibility of ensuring the future of the Jewish people and the future of the Jewish state.

And no matter what pressure is brought to bear, I will never waver in fulfilling that responsibility.

I believe that with a fresh approach from our neighbors, we can advance peace despite the difficulties we face.

In Israel, we have a record of making the impossible possible. We've made a desolate land flourish. And with very few natural resources, we have used the fertile minds of our people to turn Israel into a global center of technology and innovation.

Peace, of course, would enable Israel to realize its full potential and to bring a promising future not only for our people, not only for the Palestinian people, but for many, many others in our region.

But the old template for peace must be updated. It must take into account new realities and new roles and responsibilities for our Arab neighbors. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is a new Middle East. It presents new dangers, but also new opportunities. Israel is prepared to work with Arab partners and the international community to confront those dangers and to seize those opportunities. Together we must recognize the global threat of militant Islam, the primacy of dismantling Iran's nuclear weapons capability and the indispensable role of Arab states in advancing peace with the Palestinians.

All this may fly in the face of conventional wisdom, but it's the truth. And the truth must always be spoken, especially here, in the United Nations.

Isaiah, our great prophet of peace, taught us nearly 3,000 years ago in Jerusalem to speak truth to power. לְמַעַן צִיּוֹן לֹא אֶחְשָׁה וּלְמַעַן יְרוּשָׁלַם לֹא אֶשְׁקוּט עַד-וַיֵּצֵא בְּנִגְהָ צְדָקָה וַיְשׁוּעַתָּה בְּלִפְיֵי יְבֻרָה.

For the sake of Zion, I will not be silent.

For the sake of Jerusalem, I will not be still.

Until her justice shines bright, And her salvation glows like a flaming torch.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Let's light a torch of truth and justice to safeguard our common future.

Thank you.