# AN ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH AGAINST BENJAMIN NETANYAHU ON SOCIAL MEDIA X

**Indah Sri Mayeni[1], M. Zaim[2]**
English Department
Faculty of Languages and Arts
Universitas Negeri Padang
email: indahmayeni06@gmail.com

## Abstract

This research aims to analyze types of hate speech and strategies of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. The method of this research was descriptive research method. This research used the theory of Mondal et al (2017) to analyze types of hate speech and the theory of Culpeper (2016) to analyze strategies of hate speech. The data were collected from the comment section of a tweet posted by Benjamin Netanyahu on the platform X on May 23, 2024. The findings reveal five types of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X including behavior, ethnicity, disability, religion, and others, with behavior being the common prevalent. Additionally, five strategies of hate speech were also identified, including bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off-record impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness, with bald on-record impoliteness emerging as the most dominant strategy.

**Keywords**: Hate Speech, Benjamin Netanyahu, Social Media X

## A. INTRODUCTION

Social media is an integral part of daily life, profoundly influencing communication, information, and entertainment. It is widely used across all segments of society and age groups. Taprial & Kanwar (2017) define social media as a medium that used by individuals to interact socially online by sharing information, news, images, etc. with others. According to George (2024), people engage social media for a variety of purposes, like sharing, learning, interacting, and marketing activities.

Among the various social media platforms, X stands out as one of the most popular, with 556 million users worldwide (We Are Social, 2023). X, formerly known as Twitter, served as a medium for sharing anything through a message referred to as tweet (Yunita, 2019). It was first created in 2006 and has experienced significant changes over the year, including a rebranding in 2023 under the leadership of Elon Musk.

---

[1] English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on March 2025
[2] Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

Social media platforms like X allow users to share opinion and information freely and openly. However, this opportunity also enables users to express negative opinion and hate speech against individuals or groups. Hate speech, as defined by Syarif (2019), refers to any form of communication intended to provoke, insult, or incite harm against individuals or groups based on factors such as race, religion, or ethnicity. It can manifest in various forms, including text, images, and videos. Mondal et al (2017) classify hate speech into categories such as race, behavior, physical appearance, sexual orientation, class, gender, ethnicity, disability, religion, and others.

Hate speech is a critical issue in pragmatics, as it involves the manipulation of language to achieve harmful objectives, often through the dehumanization of individuals or groups. Culpeper (2016) asserts that hate speech can be considered a form of impoliteness, which, in linguistic terms, refers to behavior intended to attack someone's "face" or cause discomfort or hurt. Culpeper (2016) categorizes impoliteness into six strategies including bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off-record impoliteness, withholding politeness, and sarcasm or mock politeness.

Recent studies have explored hate speech on social media using pragmatics perspective. For instance, Siahaan et al (2019) analyzed impoliteness strategies in hate speech directed at Lady Gaga on Instagram, while Sari and Ariatmi (2020) examined hate speech against Prince Charles and Camilla Parker. Similarly, Tanjung et al (2023) investigated hate speech directed at Puan Maharani on Instagram. While these studies primarily focused on identifying types of hate speech, few have explored the strategies used to deliver it.

This study aims to address this gap by analyzing hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on X. The research not only examines the types of hate speech but also investigates the strategies employed in its delivery. This research apply the theory of Mondal et al (2017) to study types of hate speech and the theory of Culpeper (2016) to study strategies of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X.

## B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research used a descriptive research method. Loeb et al (2017) stated that descriptive study characterizes the world or a phenomenon by identifying patterns in the data to answer questions about who, what, where, when, and to what extent. According to Zaim (2014), descriptive method is a research method that describes linguistic phenomena as they are. It observes and records phenomena as they naturally occur. The data for this research consisted of comments containing hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. These data were collected from the comment section of a tweet posted by Benjamin Netanyahu on platform X on May 23, 2024. In analyzing the data, the researcher applied two different theories. First, theory of Mondal et al (2017) was used to analyze the types of hate speech. Second, theory of Culpeper (2016) was employed to analyze the strategies of hate speech.

## C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION
### 1. Research Finding

Based on the analysis, the researcher collected a total of 151 instances of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. The data were then classified into tables according to types of hate speech and strategies of hate speech.

### a. Types of Hate Speech

Based on the research, there were found five types of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. These types included behavior, ethnicity, disability, religion, and other. The finding are presented in the table below.

Table 1. Findings Table of Types of Hate Speech

| No. | Types of Hate Speech | Number |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Behavior | 117 |
| 2. | Ethnicity | 28 |
| 3. | Disability | 1 |
| 4. | Religion | 3 |
| 5. | Others | 2 |
| | **Total** | **151** |

The table shows that the most prominent category is behavior hate speech, with 117 instances. Then followed by ethnicity as the second most common type, which accounted for 28 occurrences. Religion-hate speech ranked third, with 3 instances. Others category of hate speech were relatively rare, comprising only 2 instances, while disability-hate speech category appeared just once, making it the least frequent.

### 1) Behavior

Behavior is a type of hate speech that targets individuals or groups based on their action, habits, or personal lifestyles.

Datum 1

You **killed nearly 40.000 palestinians**, stfu, you **criminal**.



The datum above represents behavior type of hate speech because it directly targets an individual or group based on their actions or behavior. The statement accuses Netanyahu of committing a specific act like "killed nearly 40,000 Palestinians" and labels him as a "criminal," which is a judgment based on perceived behavior. Hate speech related to behavior focuses on condemning or attacking someone for what they have done or

are alleged to have done. In this case, the accusation and derogatory language "stfu, you criminal" are tied to Netanyahu's actions, making it fall under the behavior category of hate speech.

## 2) Ethnicity

Ethnicity is a type of hate speech that attacks individual based on their ethnic identity, which is refers to shared cultural, linguistic, or ancestral traits.

Datum 2

**ISRAEL** is a TERRORIST STATE



The datum above represents ethnicity type of hate speech because it targets a group based on their ethnic background. The keyword here is "ISRAEL", which refers to a nation-state predominantly associated with the Jewish people, an ethnic group with shared cultural, historical, and ancestral ties. By labeling Israel as a "terrorist state," the statement generalizes and assigns a negative stereotype to an entire ethnic group (Jewish people) associated with that nation. This perpetuates harmful biases and incites hostility against individuals based on their ethnic identity, aligning with the definition of ethnicity-based hate speech, which involves discrimination or prejudice tied to ethnic background.

## 3) Disability

Disability is a type of hate speech that targets individuals with physical, mental, or developmental impairments.

Datum 3

Go to hell **retard**



The datum above represents disability type of hate speech because it includes the keyword "retard", which is a derogatory term historically used to demean individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities. The term "retard" (short for "retardation") refers to a delay or limitation in mental or physical development, and its use as an insult perpetuates stigma and discrimination against people with disabilities. By employing this term, the statement directly targets and devalues individuals based on their disabilities, aligning it with the definition of disability-based hate speech, which involves hateful or harmful language directed at individuals or groups due to their disabilities or impairments.

### 4) Religion

Religion is a type of hate speech that targets individuals or groups based on religious beliefs or practices.

Datum 4

Defund the "**Jewish state**"!



The datum above represents religion type of hate speech. It is because the statement targets a group based on their religious identity and affiliation. The term "Jewish state" refers to Israel, a nation deeply tied to Jewish identity and religion. By calling to "defund" the Jewish state, the statement implicitly attacks the Jewish people as a religious and cultural group, suggesting hostility toward their collective existence and rights. Therefore, the statement qualifies as religion hate speech, as it singles out a group based on their religious belief.

### 5) Others

Others means a type of hate speech that attacks individuals or groups based on other characteristics that is not covered by the previous categories, such as age, marital status, political membership or personal choices.

Datum 5

You WILL **burn in hell** for eternity



The datum above represents other type of hate speech because it does not explicitly target a specific characteristic such as race, gender, or religion. While the statement "burn in hell" contains religious imagery, it does not directly attack a person's religious beliefs or practices, which would fall under religion category. Instead, it is constitutes a generalized expression of hostility or condemnation that may stem from personal, moral, or ideological disagreement. The lack of a clear connection to a specific category such as race, gender, or religion make it classified under others category which is reserved for hate speech that does not fit into the previous type of hate speech.

### b. Strategies of Hate Speech

Based on research, there were identified five types of hate speech strategies against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. These strategies included bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative

impoliteness, off-record impoliteness and sarcasm or mock politeness. The finding are presented in the table below.

Table 2. Findings Table of Strategies of Hate Speech

| No. | Strategies of Hate Speech | Number |
|-----|---------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Bald on-record impoliteness | 83 |
| 2. | Positive impoliteness | 6 |
| 3. | Negative impoliteness | 46 |
| 4. | Off-record impoliteness | 9 |
| 5. | Sarcasm or mock politeness | 7 |
| **Total** | | **151** |

The most frequently used strategy was bald on-record impoliteness, with 83 occurrences. The second most common strategy was negative impoliteness, which appeared 46 times. Off-record impoliteness ranked third, occurring 9 times, indicating a less common but still relevant strategy. Sarcasm or mock politeness was observed in 7 instances. Finally, positive impoliteness, was the least common strategy, with only 6 occurrences.

**1)   Bald on-record impoliteness**
Bald on-record impoliteness is a strategy of hate speech that characterized by direct, clear, and unambiguous statement without any attempt to soften the impact of the message.

Datum 6
**You evil motherfucking butcher**, Samaria was always on your mind.



The datum above represents hate speech utterances that use bald on-record impoliteness strategy because it delivers a direct, clear, and unambiguous offensive message. The use of explicit and harsh language, such as "evil motherfucking butcher," leaves no room for interpretation or ambiguity. The keywords "evil" (meaning profoundly immoral or wicked) and "motherfucking" (a vulgar intensifier used to express extreme disdain) are highly offensive and directly attack the addressee's character. Additionally, "butcher" (a term implying cruelty or violence) is used metaphorically to insult the person, further emphasizing the directness of the attack. The statement openly and aggressively conveys hostility, which makes it a clear example of bald on-record impoliteness.

### 2) Positive impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is a strategy of hate speech that aims to damage the addressee's positive face wants, which is their desire to be liked, appreciated, and approved of by others.

Datum 7

The International Criminal Court has now listed you as a wanted criminal
**You don't have anyone to stand by your side**



The datum above represents hate speech utterances that use positive impoliteness strategy because it directly attacks the addressee's positive face, which refers to their desire to be liked, appreciated, and valued by others. The keyword in this statement that aligns with positive impoliteness is "You don't have anyone to stand by your side." This phrase explicitly undermines the addressee's social bonds and sense of belonging, suggesting that they are isolated and unsupported. By emphasizing the lack of support, the statement damages the addressee's self-esteem and their need for social approval, which is a core aspect of positive face. The use of such language is intentionally hurtful and dismissive, aiming to make the addressee feel rejected or unworthy, thereby fulfilling the definition of positive impoliteness as a strategy that harms the addressee's desire to be liked and accepted.

### 3) Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is a strategy of hate speech that targets the addressee's negative face wants, which is their desire to be unimpeded and to have their personal freedom respected.

Datum 8

I think it is funny how you are still **playing the victim** and **blaming others** for things not going your way. When **it's your bad choices** that got you where you are. **Grow up**!

The datum above represents hate speech utterances that use negative impoliteness strategy because it directly targets the addressee's negative face wants, which refers to their desire for autonomy, personal freedom, and respect for their choices. The phrase "playing the victim" dismisses the addressee's feelings or perspective, implying that their emotions or actions are invalid or manipulative. This is intrusive and imposes on their right to express themselves freely. Additionally, the phrase "blaming others" accuses the addressee of avoiding responsibility, which can feel like a personal attack and undermine their autonomy. The statement "it's your bad choices" further imposes judgment, directly criticizing their decisions and disregarding their right to make choices without interference. Finally, the command "Grow up!" is a demand that imposes on the addressee's personal space and choices, implying they are immature and need to change. These elements collectively attack the addressee's negative face, making the statement a clear example of negative impoliteness.

### 4) Off-record impoliteness

Off-record impoliteness is a strategy of hate speech that uses indirect language, often through implicature, to convey an offensive message.

Datum 9

Apropos of nothing. I can't help but **wonder** what Hitler would've said if he had an X (Twitter) account?



The datum above represents hate speech utterances that use off-record impoliteness strategy because it uses indirect language and implicature to convey a provocative and offensive message. The keyword "wonder" (meaning to think curiously or doubtfully) frames the statement as a hypothetical question, but the implication is deeply critical. By invoking Hitler—a figure universally associated with extreme violence, hatred, and authoritarianism—the speaker indirectly compares the addressee to Hitler, possibly insinuating that the target's actions are similarly harmful or extreme. This comparison is not explicitly stated but is implied through the question, leaving the audience to infer the offensive connection. The indirectness of the statement, combined with its provocative nature, aligns it with off-record impoliteness, as the speaker avoids direct confrontation while still delivering a cutting and offensive message.

### 5) Sarcasm or mock politeness

Sarcasm or mock politeness is a strategy of hate speech that involves using polite language in an insincere way to convey the opposite meaning.

Datum 10

**Thank you** for your statement, it will make Israel die as a state even quicker.



The datum above represents hate speech utterances that use sarcasm or mock politeness strategy because it uses polite language in an insincere way to convey a negative or offensive meaning. The keyword in this statement is "Thank you", which is typically used to express gratitude or appreciation. However, in this context, the phrase is not genuinely expressing thanks but is instead being used ironically to mock or criticize the addressee. The combination of the polite phrase "Thank you" with the harsh and offensive prediction that "it will make Israel die as a state even quicker" creates a stark contrast, revealing the insincerity of politeness. This is a hallmark of sarcasm or mock politeness, where the speaker uses polite language to mask or emphasize their true, often negative, intent. The statement is not meant to be taken literally as gratitude but rather as a veiled attack or criticism, making it a clear example of this strategy.

## 2. Discussion

According to Mondal et al (2017), there are ten types of hate speech, but only five were identified in this study including behavior, ethnicity, disability, religion, and others. The most prominent category was behavior, with 118 instances, where users targeted Netanyahu based on his actions as a political leader, frequently accusing him of war crimes or criminal behavior. The prevalence of hate speech focusing on behavior can be attributed to Netanyahu's controversial decisions, particularly in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This finding aligned with a study conducted by Annisa & Rosita (2024), who also identified behavior as the most common type of hate speech in Denise Chariesta's Instagram comments due to her controversial actions. Similarly, Sari & Ariatmi (2020) found that behavior was the dominant category of hate speech directed at Prince Charles and Camilla Parker, largely due to their past relationship as discussed on social media. These studies collectively suggested that behavior was a common target of hate speech across different contexts and individuals, especially public figures.

Culpeper (2016) outline six strategies of hate speech, but only five were identified in this study including bald on-record impoliteness,

positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off-record impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. The most frequently used strategy was bald on-record impoliteness, with 83 instances. This strategy involves direct and unambiguous attacks, reflecting strong political opposition and dissatisfaction with Netanyahu's policies and actions. In the context of Netanyahu, this reflected the intensity of emotions surrounding his policies and actions, leading to direct and unfiltered expressions of hate. According to Culpeper (2016), bald-on record impoliteness was common in online discourse, where users felt emboldened by the anonymity and distance that social media provided. This aligned with the findings of Riyadisty & Fauziati (2022), where bald on-record impoliteness was also the most common strategy on Twitter as a Response to Meghan Markle.

## D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research was conducted to find out types of hate speech and strategies of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. The researcher applied two different theories. First, theory of Mondal et al (2017) was used to analyze the types of hate speech. Second, theory of Culpeper (2016) was employed to analyze the strategies of hate speech. The findings revealed five types of hate speech found on Benjamin Netanyahu's X social media including behavior, ethnicity, disability, religion, and others. Behavior was the most common type, indicating a significant focus on Netanyahu's political actions and decisions, particularly regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Additionally, five strategies of hate speech were also identified, including bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off-record impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. Bald on-record impoliteness was the most dominant strategy, demonstrating a tendency for direct and unambiguous expressions of hostility.

This research focused on analyzing types of hate speech and strategies of hate speech against Benjamin Netanyahu on social media X. However, the analysis of hate speech phenomena should not be limited to a single public figure, social media platform, or country. The researcher suggests that future studies compare hate speech directed at two public figures across different social media platforms or in different countries. Furthermore, future researchers could expand the scope of such studies by incorporating a broader context, extending beyond politics, to better understand the evolving nature of hate speech in contemporary society.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anissa, D., & Rosita, N. (2024). An Analysis of Hate Speech in Denise Chariesta's Instagram Comment Section. *English Language and Literature*, *13*(1), 140-151.

Culpeper, J. (2016). Impoliteness strategies. *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society*, 421-445.

George, A. (2024). A Study on Social Media as a Major Source of Income Among Youth. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 12(2).

Loeb, S., Dynarski, S., McFarland, D., Morris, P., Reardon, S., & Reber, S. (2017). Descriptive Analysis in Education: A Guide for Researchers. NCEE 2017-4023. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*.

Mondal, M., Silva, L. A., & Benevenuto, F. (2017). A measurement study of hate speech in social media. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM conference on hypertext and social media* (pp. 85-94).

Riyadisty, A. P., & Fauziati, E. (2022). Hate Expression Found on Twitter as a Response to Meghan Markle. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies (IJELS)*, *8*(1), 45-51.

Sari, F. P., & Ariatmi, S. Z. (2020). *Pragmatic Analysis Of Hate Speech In Social Media As Response To Prince Charles And Camilla's Past Relationship* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).

Siahaan, I. P. S., Rangkuti, R., & Ganie, R. (2019). Hate speech used by haters of Lady Gaga on social media. *Nusa: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*, *14*(4), 573-582.

Tanjung, A. F., Wardana, M. K., & Mayasari, M. (2023). Hate Speech Addressed to Puan Maharani on Social Media: Pragmatic Approach. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, *2*(3), 245-255.

Taprial, V., & Kanwar, P. (2017). *Understanding Social Media*. Colorado: Ventus Publishing.

Yunita, R. (2019). Aktivitas pengungkapan diri remaja putri melalui sosial media twitter. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, *10*(1), 26-32.

Zaim, M. (2014). Metode penelitian bahasa: Pendekatan struktural. Padang: Sukabina Press.