

Waseem MANSOUR

High school teacher of political science in Israel and Postdoctoral Fellow
at the University Adam Mickiewicz University, TIRA – Israel
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6347-3321

A comparative analysis of security issues in the new social media in the US-Israel election campaign

Abstract: This article presents the history of the use of social media in the election campaigns of politicians from the United States and Israel as a modern phenomenon in the current era due to technological changes in the global media. My article answers the research question: is there a difference in the strategy of using Twitter between Netanyahu and Obama, and what is this difference? It should be noted that many articles have dealt with social networks and the political use of social networks, but as far as I know, the topic of comparison and attempt to find differences in political campaigns between two leaders from the United States and Israel has not yet been investigated, and this is the goal of the article, I will focus on presenting data and information examining the allegations appearing in the official Twitter account of former Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu regarding security issues and the Iranian threat expressed in his Twitter tweets, so that he presents himself as “responsible for Israel and its citizens.” So he constantly presents the issue of national security as a winning card against his opponents in order to win the support of the far right electorate in Israel. Compared to the tweets of Obama the first president of the United States who used social media and especially presidential Twitter to win in support of the American electorate in the 2008 and 2012 presidential elections and to win their economic and social contribution.

Key words: Social Media, Israel Election campaigns, Israel Security Issue, US Presidential Communication, Political Campaigns

Methodology and materials

My article is a quality article, so I will base my review of the literature on recent articles, studies and statistics that show the use of social networks in the world in general and former US President Obama’s use of social networks compared to former Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu’s use of social networks. I will present the different techniques and strategies used by the two leaders in the social media election campaigns in order to win over the supporters in their countries. I will focus on the popular Twitter network by presenting number of tweets from the official Twitter accounts of Obama and Netanyahu as examples of the goals and objectives they were trying to achieve through the new social media. Therefore I am going to present the findings that have been made from previous studies. I will answer my research question by a comparative political analysis which illustrates that the candidates themselves had different uses and evaluations of online media (Ho_mann, Sufan, 2017; Marcinkowski, Metag, 2014).

Again I note that as far as I know many articles and studies have been written in the field of social media and political use, but it should be noted that no article has yet been written on the comparison between Obama’s use of Twitter and Netanyahu’s use

of Twitter. So there is a knowledge gap in differences in techniques used by Obama the first president who used the power and role of Twitter and other social networks in the 2008 and 2012 US presidential election campaign and made it a phenomenon and custom among other leaders and politicians in the United States and around the world. Compared to Netanyahu's techniques on Twitter in the Knesset election campaigns in Israel over the past decade by presenting himself as responsible for the security of the State of Israel and the well-being of its citizens. According to statistics used on social networks in both Israel and the United States, there are 4.14 billion people worldwide who currently use social networks (which is 53% of the population) and they spend an average of 15% of their comment hours on social networks two and a half hours (We are social 2020),¹ and surfers in Israel testified that Surf came a time of 2.6 hours on social networks (Internet 2020 report),² and regarding information on social networks, below are the following data; **Facebook:** As of October 2020, Facebook had 2.7 billion active users every month (we are social), in April 2020 over 98% of active Facebook users worldwide entered the social network via mobile (statista),³ 88% of surfers log on to Facebook to keep in touch with family and friends, 33% for entertainment, 23% to receive news, 17% to follow companies and brands, 11% to strengthen a business relationship and 6% for other reasons (Influencer marketing hub),⁴ in Israel 25% of women purchased a product in 2020 through Facebook's Marketplace platform. **Twitter:** There are 186 million active users on Twitter every day (Investor Fact Sheet).⁵ The United States is the country with the most users on Twitter, followed by Japan and Russia (statista). In fact, 21% of adults in the United States use hootsuite, which is one in five Americans (adults), in the U.S., 10% of top tweets contribute 92% of tweets in 2020, compared to 80% in 2018 (Pew Research Center),⁶ 70% of Twitter users are men (hootsuite⁷). These

¹ We are social – a global team of more than 850 people in 15 offices across 13 countries, united by a common purpose: to connect people and brands in meaningful ways. They prepared **Digital 2020 Global Overview Report**. <https://wearesocial.com/blog/2020/01/digital-2020-3-8-billion-people-use-social-media> (02.07.2021).

² Bezeq is the largest and leading communications group in Israel. https://media.bezeq.co.il/pdf/internetreport_2020.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1U52HTCDXQB0bEw13kTj2KqidwZFKp-DHTyNebaDmthiqhbqZ4VWBGzIQU (16.07.2021).

³ Statista.com consolidates statistical data on over 80,000 topics from more than 22,500 sources and makes it available on four platforms: German, English, French and Spanish. <https://www.statista.com/aboutus/> (03.07.2021).

⁴ Founded in 2016, Influencer Marketing Hub is a private media company based in Copenhagen, Denmark. The company specializes in producing how-to guides, courses and research reports in the social media and influencer marketing industry. <https://influencermarketinghub.com/facebook-statistics/> (03.07.2021).

⁵ GYG plc is a market leading Superyacht painting, supply and maintenance company, offering services globally through operations in the Mediterranean, Northern Europe and the United States. The Company primarily trades under the Pinmar, Pinmar Yacht Supply and Technocraft brands. 2020 INVESTOR FACT SHEET, http://s21.q4cdn.com/855213745/files/doc_downloads/fact-sheet/2020-OC-Investor-Fact-Sheet-03.20_FINAL.pdf (03.07.2021).

⁶ Pew Research Center is a nonpartisan fact tank that informs the public about the issues, attitudes and trends shaping the world. We conduct public opinion polling, demographic research, content analysis and other data-driven social science research. <https://www.pewresearch.org> (16.7.201).

⁷ LinkedIn statistics look a little different than they do for some of the other social networks. It's not the biggest social network, or the one with the largest reach. Some of the numbers are smaller. At

data highlight that the new media has a new role and significant impact on democracy, government and politics, so they have made a drastic change in the way government institutions and political leaders communicate with the public, so the new media has redefined how politicians handle elections and how citizens are ideally involved in politics. The media serves some essential roles in a democratic society. The main purpose is to inform the public and provide citizens with the information to make thoughtful decisions regarding leadership and policy. The media serves as watchdogs that review government actions to set the agenda for the public, discuss various issues and provide a forum for political expression, while enabling users to build a community by helping people find common causes, identify civic groups, and work towards solutions to problems. Socialism, new media has the potential to provide these textbook functions so that they provide unprecedented access to information, also reach audience members without interest through custom, peer-to-peer channels, such as Facebook. As average people combine forces with the press based to perform the role of watchdog, public officials are subject to greater scrutiny. New media can foster community building that transcends physical boundaries through their broad network capabilities. Although media coverage of a previous generation of political events is linked to immigration and political involvement among the masses, ordinary journalists do not believe that encouraging participation is their responsibility (Hayes, Lawless, 2015), but new media explicitly seek to engage directly with public political activity, such as voting. Contacting public figures, volunteering in the role of communities and participating in protest movements. Social media has become a means of communication everywhere for candidates during election campaigns. Platforms such as Facebook and Twitter allow candidates to connect directly with voters, recruit recruitment supporters and influence the public agenda. Social networks, and especially Twitter, are considered a means of communication by the Israeli leadership that contributes to the dissemination of government decisions and actions throughout the public. Inside and outside Israel. According to Kelsey and Bennett (Kelsey, Bennett, 2014), social networks provide room for a new dynamic of political and social power from the bottom up political and social power, as the text producers oppose the institutional discourse. Moreover, various researchers have highlighted cases of political activism on social networks (Cottle, Nolan, 2007; Cottle, 2011; Siapera, 2013; Mor et al., 2016), although the role of social media as a means of top-down discourse remains ambiguous. Specifically, turn to Twitter as a platform that enables communication between its members and an information-sharing site that provides asynchronous but fast-paced public communication (Zappavigna, 2012). As I mentioned earlier in Israel, similar to the United States, there has been a significant increase in the use of social networks among Israeli leaders and politicians in the last decade in the Knesset election campaigns, so the question arises: "Do Israeli leaders and politicians use the new social media in their political election propaganda in a similar or different way than American leaders and politicians approve?" For that I will literary review the historical upheaval of social media and the beginning of political use of the United States and Israel on social networks more than traditional media.

first glance, they may not seem as impressive for marketers looking to make a big impression. <https://blog.hootsuite.com/linkedin-statistics-business> (16.07.2021).

1. Comparison of social media use between US leaders and Israeli Leaders

In this chapter, I emphasize the importance of social media, especially Twitter, as a communication tool in the hands of the Israeli leadership that contributes to the dissemination of government decisions and actions across audiences within and outside Israel, according to various researchers (Cottle, Nolan, 2007; Cottle, 2011; Siapera, 2013; Mor et al., 2016). So I am comparing Obama's use of social media in the 2008 The US presidential election campaign Compared to Netanyahu's use of the Knesset election campaigns at that time, because In Israel there has been a marked increase in the use of social media among Israeli leaders and politicians in the last decade in Knesset election campaigns. For example: Operation "Guardian of the Walls" was an Israeli military operation Lasting 11 days of fighting against Hamas in Gaza in 2021, whose purpose was to deter and harm Hamas in order to reduce the rocket fire that was fired within Israel's borders. Netanyahu emphasized the issue of security and fighting in the terrorist Hamas organization by using social media to strengthen the power of his leadership, but this use was different from the use of Obama in US.

1.1. Facebook and Twitter in U.S. election campaign

Social media is the newest form of communication. After the invention of the radio, the television and the Internet, this technology has grown with time, and so has its influence on campaign communication. Such as the presidential campaigns of 2008 and 2012 were strongly impacted by the utilization of social media, a form of electronic communication using the Internet, so the Internet became a campaign battlefield where the fight for a vote was reduced to "likes," "tweets," and "posts." In the 20th century, campaigning had been mostly a one sided stream of information from the campaigners to the voters. However, social media in the past ten years has allowed for an open dialogue between the candidates and the voters. This two-way street afforded the voter a direct avenue to engage in the conversation, fundamentally transforming the way candidates formulate and execute campaign strategies. Recently, social media has become centrally important to the successful implementation of modern day campaigning much like the emergence of the radio and television were at one point in history (Tom, Amy, 2012). A study done by Pew Research⁸ in 2012 showed that between the 2000 and 2012 elections, there was a 27% increase in the number of Americans who went online for election news. Also the research found that even from the 2000 presidential election to the 2002-midterm elections, there was a 10% increase in the number of Internet users who actively went online to research a candidate's position on certain critical issues. Voters were beginning to realize that there was a significant source of political information available right at home (Andrew, Lee, 2003). Also the voters had become far more comfortable with the Internet making it an enormously important medium through which candidates communicate campaign information. Another study by Pew Research (Tom, Amy, 2012) in 2012 found that presidential candidates

⁸ Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewresearch.org> (16.7.201).

intensively used their websites as the social hub for their campaign. Many of the links on other social networking sites led directly back to their main websites putting much focus and attention on the campaign's key messages and talking points at the center of the most recent online revolution, which began to pick up speed in 2008, are social networking sites (SNSs). Social networking sites consist of websites and applications ("apps") such as Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, Instagram and YouTube whereby users can engage in conversation online with groups of people in their social networks. The users on these SNSs have increased dramatically from 33% of the population in 2008 to 69% of the population in 2012 (Smith, 2013). These mediums have become major forums for presidential candidates. In 2008 60% of Internet users went online for news about politics or the campaign. Additionally 38% of Internet users went online to discuss politics with other users throughout the course of the campaign and a full 59% used social media tools such as email, instant messaging, text messaging and Twitter to share or receive campaign information. In 2012, 66% of SNS users took part in some sort of political activity on an SNS and 39% of all American adults did so (Smith, 2013). According to (Jay, 2013) and Facebook Statistics⁹ in 2013 in the U.S. there are 49 million monthly active Twitter users and 1.1 million monthly Facebook users, and the average U.S. citizen spends 16 minutes out of every hour online on social networking sites or forums (Tatham, 2013), so this is why Obama used Facebook and Twitter in the 2008 and 2012 election campaigns And his strategy began building the campaign on.

1.2. Facebook and Twitter in Israel election campaign

Israel, like the rest of the world's advanced countries technologically and economically, the Internet revolution began in the late 1990s. According to the Israel Democracy Institute for 2021, in 1996 there was no internet in most homes in Israel, and there were no cellular messages and of course there was no Facebook and Twitter then, the main way to convey messages to citizens was through traditional media which is television, so political messages and information were transmitted through two basic channels – Channel One and Channel Two. My point in emphasizing the year 1996, is that year was a change for the first and last time in the system of elections for the Prime Minister of the State of Israel, so that since the establishment of the state in 1948 the system of elections has been a relatively national system. In other words, the method of elections to the Israeli Knesset was to elect the Knesset members, and the Knesset members are the ones who elect the prime minister who makes it up from the coalition members who elected him. But in 1996 there was a change in this method, so that for the first time there were direct elections for prime minister by the citizens, the two candidates who ran Shimon Peres (the ninth president of the State of Israel) and Benjamin – Netanyahu both ran after the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. The political competition between the two candidates took place on television. Moreover, there was a newspaper called "Yedioth Ahronoth" which at the time was a declared monopoly of the Antitrust Au-

⁹ Facebook Statistics, Statistic Brian, last modified June 23, 2013, <http://www.statisticbrain.com/facebook-statistics/>.

thority. Netanyahu claimed at the time that “Yedioth Ahronoth” was acting openly and covertly to choose his rival Shimon Peres, which made Netanyahu think of a new idea that he must maintain his own media (this idea was implemented after 11 years called the “Israel Today” newspaper which is a newspaper affiliated with Netanyahu and belongs to the far right sector). In 1996 Netanyahu won the direct election thanks to a number of key factors; due to the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in 1995, the fierce battle between the far-right parties that supported his assassination and the left-wing parties that condemned his assassination and supported his path to peace caused polls in the traditional media and after political propaganda aired on Television. But in practice the situation was reversed, due to Netanyahu’s political propaganda broadcast on television in 1996 was (“No peace, no security, no reason to vote for Pierce”), so Netanyahu, who represents the far right in Israel, understood that the issue of security in his election propaganda was the key and tool to win public opinion. Netanyahu understood the power of mass media, so in his fourth term as prime minister he held the media portfolio in his hands, and he understood that social media is a result of the digital revolution and Internet technology that has been upgraded in the current era. Netanyahu often uses it as a winning card to speak to an audience without any need for his own TV station, he often sends messages, videos, online propaganda broadcasts via his Twitter and Facebook account to all citizens without any need for the media, because Netanyahu claims there is a bad press and means the corrupt media run by bad politicians who are constantly chasing him and trying to frustrate him.

2. Strategies for Using Social Networks between Obama and Netanyahu

In this part, I will deal with the question: how do Israeli and American politicians use Twitter and Facebook as a means to contribute as political propaganda during the election period, focusing on the differences between Obama and Netanyahu. I will address the techniques used by the leaders of the two countries in the new social media Strategic election campaigning on social media. As is well known in the modern age, social media has become a common occurrence in presidential and world leaders’ election campaigns, so the invention of the Internet and its global accessibility have allowed politicians from all over the world to use it in election campaigns social media and has established for itself an election campaign strategy based on social media and online social networks unlike the controversial traditions in American history.

2.1. Strategies for using social media in Obama’s election campaigns

Building the Team is the secret of President Barack Obama’s success in social media campaigning. For example, in the 2012 Elections, President Barack Obama’s campaign, Organize for Action (OFA),¹⁰ an analysis on the Federal Election Commission (FEC)

¹⁰ Its important to remind that This organization was officially non-partisan, but its agenda and policies were strongly allied with the Democratic Party, which itself succeeded Obama’s 2008 campaign and also in 2012 election campaign.

filings found that President Barack Obama's Campaign spent \$9.3 million on technology services and consulting and \$2 million on internal technology related payroll. Obama decided to build his own tech team, according to OFA's staff amounted Obama's 1,000 staffers, 30–40% were in the data and technology department (Glenn, Reid, Byron, 2013). Obama had some of the brightest minds in new media on his staff including like Joe Rospars who was his New Media Director in 2008 and Chief Digital Strategist in 2012, Rospars was also a cofounder of Blue State Digital, the software tool that guided Obama's social media game by instigating community-building, engagement and mobilization all within Obama's campaign website and social media tools. Additionally, the team of Obama included Facebook Co-founder Chris Hughes and the 2012 Chief Technology Officer and spearhead of Narwhal (the code name for Obama's High-Tech Media platform which built complete data profiles of supporters), Harper Reed. Because social media is still a new tool in presidential campaigning, there was really no "right way" to organize their social media strategy, but by hiring right and investing in his own team, President Barack Obama was able to compile his own data and make assertions and plans based on internal ideas rather than through outsourced and unfamiliar strategies. The fundamental goal of Obama's team was to use the Internet to establish a bottom-up grassroots movement thereby building a core constituency of Internet using followers. Through the Internet, President Barack Obama was able to engage and organize his users into social networks such that they could then transform this group into volunteer programs aimed at fundraising as well as voter recruitment. The purpose of Obama's website was to encourage users to either find more information on President Barack Obama and his stance on certain issues, to get more connected with President Barack Obama through other social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter or blogs, or to encourage voters to "get involved" by "attending an event" or "hosting an event," also to include digital tools and materials to help volunteers carry out their volunteer activities.¹¹ Obama also used the Email new in his campaign. Barack Obama's email campaign seemed to be slightly more useful in his ground game in a myriad of different areas. For starters of 2012 election Obama had a 30 million subscriber email list (Tom, Amy, 2012), because Obama's emails were sent to organic subscribers, he also used the new popular social media – Facebook and Twitter. In fact in 2012, Obama had about 28 million Facebook friends, and 21.5 million Twitter (Denton, 2014). Moreover, Obama was active on an array of other social networking sites. Facebook was easily his chief data source and his most used online network, also Obama received twice the Facebook 18 times the Twitter retweets and about one and a half more YouTube comments, likes and views.

2.2. Netanyahu's strategies on social media

Netanyahu glances at his account of important events such as wars, demonstrations, patrols and election campaigns, at the same time. In his tweets, he emphasizes the issue of national security and the importance of the wars against terrorism that pose threats to Israel's security and its existence, for example: A military operation

¹¹ Website – The Office of Barack and Michelle Obama, "Organize For Action," last modified 2013, http://www.barackobama.com/?source=site_20131001_splash#get-the-facts (20.7.2021).

launched by Israel against Hamas in Gaza in 2014 known as “Operation Wall Shield” in which more than 2,100 Palestinians were killed in the Gaza Strip, including 66 Israeli soldiers and seven Israeli civilians. Netanyahu regularly tweeted about the operation and stressed Hamas’ threat to the Israeli nation. The purpose of the tweets was to support the campaign, for example;¹² *Tweet 1*:¹³ “Israel targets Hamas terrorists, Hamas, on the other hand, is targeting the innocent Israeli citizens hiding behind civilians” (July 8, 2014).

Tweet 2:¹⁴ “Hamas assimilates its terrorists in hospitals, schools, mosques and apartment buildings throughout the Gaza Strip and thus commits a double war crime” (July 9, 2014). In the above tweets, Netanyahu openly characterizes the threatening Hamas terrorists. Not only innocent Israeli citizens, but also Palestinian civilians in that they are “hiding behind them.” And in the term “committing a double war crime,” Netanyahu presents Hamas as cruel terrorists. In addition, Netanyahu explains that Hamas is a synonym for desperate and jealous terrorists, calling them “they,” who threaten and pose a danger to the citizens of Israel, especially the Jews who call them “us.” The analysis of the above tweets illustrates how the Prime Minister of Israel “Benjamin Netanyahu” legitimized his political agenda in the face of the conflict in Gaza Via Twitter. The rhetoric of the Israeli leader regarding the threat of terrorism and appeal the fear contributed to the building of groups and foreign groups and fostered a policy of seclusion through securitization derived from the use of debate programs. From tradition provides a systematic analysis of rods Conversations and discursive construction of a dichotomy of ‘we’ and ‘they’ and in this case, he can offer an in-depth insight into Netanyahu’s Twitter discourse on the subject Operation Resilient Cliff and the March 2015 election campaign. In the case of the Israeli Prime Minister, Twitter has become a platform where there has been securitization and politics of fear to legitimize the government’s political decisions and ensure its hegemony in the name of unity and national security. Netanyahu shows in his tweets that Israeli citizens are victims because of terrorist organizations, so he backs the invincible Israeli army that guarantees the security of the nation, and he does so in a method of climbing responsibility. Based on the logic if the State of Israel is responsible for the security of the Israeli nation the government must act against Hamas, moreover, Netanyahu presents the united nation against terrorism that ignores all the voices of the opposition parties in the Israeli Knesset, *Tweet 3*:¹⁵ “Hamas will pay a heavy price for firing on Israeli citizens. Security, The citizens of Israel are our main consideration” (July 9, 2014).

Twitter serves Netanyahu as a platform for public communication and weapons of war that provides selective information and conveys the messages of leadership to the nation in times of crisis and wartime. Another examples that illustrate Netanyahu’s use of tweets against terrorist organizations and Netanyahu’s responsibility for Israeli national security, he compares Hamas to the ISIS organization that is a danger to all countries

¹² Below I present some tweets from Netanyahu’s official Twitter account “Benjamin Netanyahu” that appeared in July 2014 while he was serving as Prime Minister of Israel, <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08> (26.7.2021).

¹³ <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, July 8, 2014 (26.7.2021).

¹⁴ <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, July 9, 2014 (26.07.2021).

¹⁵ <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, July 9, 2014 (26.7.2021).

in the world, *Tweet 4*:¹⁶ “‘ Hamas’ continues to do these horrible things that ISIS does: Christian persecutors, Gays, women and actually rejecting modernity (August 13, 2014), he also tweeted:¹⁷ “‘The simple truth: ‘ Hamas is ISIS, ISIS is Hamas, Public appearance, mass executions in cold blood’” (August 23, 2014). In the above tweets Netanyahu presents to Israeli citizens and his followers from all over the world that Hamas is a terrorist organization that poses a danger to Israel’s security and existence similar to the danger created by ISIS on the security of various world countries, in that both organizations are terrorists who kill people in cold blood because of their race, gender and nationality.

Netanyahu used Twitter as a platform to criticize the voices from the Israeli opposition and from the countries of the world that defamed Israel and its tactics in wars and operations such as Turkey and the United States (the Obama administration during the operations), such as Operation Resilient Cliff in Gaza in 2014, In August 3, 2014, Netanyahu Tweeted:¹⁸ “‘We do what we do in the face of criminal aggression by terrorist organizations against our citizens and soldiers but what will you do?’” And in another tweet: “‘Will you stand by Israel, a democratic and moral state that is Working to protect its citizens or continue to oppose?’” Netanyahu builds an dichotomy between Israel and Hamas, a strategy that legitimizes Israeli tactics against Palestinian terrorism through securitization by continuing to deter a cruel enemy (Williams, 2003). In this Netanyahu tries to emphasize and highlight to Israeli citizens through his Twitter tweets the idea that he and his government are responsible for the security of Israel and its citizens. In other words, Benjamin Netanyahu is trying to gain the consent of people by using a politics of fear (Wodak, 2015). Based on generalizations and controversial plans, the implication is that in the absence of any reference to the political leadership of Palestine and the fact that Palestinians are represented only under the umbrella of Hamas, will result in a policy of exclusion of the ‘other’ (Wodak, 2015) and consent to Netanyahu’s political decisions. Netanyahu uses Twitter To shape a new form of politics by implementing plea plans, which although not always conceivable, justify political decisions especially in times of crisis and times of emergency.

Results

Campaign success appears to be a fusion of technology and campaign strategy. With traditional broadcasting methods, i.e. radio and television, communication worked only one way, from the candidate to the electorate. However, social media, via the Internet, has created a two way street of open dialogue between users and candidates as well as from user to user. Dr. Wu (One of the leading thinkers pertaining to online social media today), he suggests that the fostering of online social communities is what will really result in voter turnout and engagement: “‘A lot of citizens today actually feel that ;whether I vote or not, it doesn’t make a difference, so that a lot of people don’t do anything, they don’t engage civically. If you have a community where the citizen can engage with the government, then that’s a really great platform for them to be able to communicate

¹⁶ <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, July 8, 2014 (26.7.2021); <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, August 13, 2014 (26.7.2021).

¹⁷ <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, August 23, 2014 (26.7.2021).

¹⁸ <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, August 3, 2014 (26.7.2021).

their needs to the government” (Wu, 2010). Obama is considered the first president in the United States to adopt the use of modern social networks and even used it within the White House. Today his active Twitter account has more than 127 million followers, he created a new organization model for online communication, “making it an equal part of the campaign team rather than subservient to the rest of the team.” (Baumgartner, Morris, 2008). The Obama campaign understood the power and importance of the Internet and put resources and staff towards digital strategy that his competitors ultimately did not. The campaign of Obama understood that people were already on the internet and social media sites; thus, the campaign prioritized its efforts to make sure that there was plenty of content on the internet as well as every social media website. Obama typically used the address for his campaign website in his tweets, so that followers were constantly encouraged to go to the campaign website and read recent speeches, watch videos of campaign appearances, watch live events and learn about the location of polling stations. According to a report published in the OECD in 2015 on the subject which surveys the government in a comparative and comparative way on the social networks of the country leader, the prime minister, or the government in general, among the OECD countries. For each country the account with the highest number of followers among the relevant accounts was tested. The popularity index is determined by the distribution of the number of followers on Twitter, by the number of local residents. Also government Twitter accounts have been activated in 28 of the 34 OECD countries, and government Facebook pages have been activated in 21 countries. Israel is ranked seventh among OECD countries in popularity on Twitter, with 1.3% of the country’s citizens following the account of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.¹⁹ The role of the new social media in Israel different from the main role of the media in the United States. In the United States, there is no federal body that summarizes the results of public elections, and there is no central election commission that will announce the results of the final election. Therefore, the role of the media in the United States, which undertakes to announce the results in each country in terms of the number of votes and the number of electors that sweeps each of the two presidential candidates. The role of the media in the election campaign developed mainly according to a practice that began in the beginning of American history, because the elections were spread over many days, and not all countries voted that day, so the identity of each country was transmitted by telegraph, but there was concern that one country would affect another. Therefore, it was decided to change the electoral system to a uniform election day for all 50 US states.²⁰ Compared to Israel there is an election committee headed by a judge from the Supreme Court and its members are assistant representatives represented in the outgoing Knesset. The committee announces the final results of the election to the various media whether it is traditional or its social network.²¹ Netanyahu in his tweets presents himself as a responsible leader who can promise Is-

¹⁹ Data on Israel on Agriculture, Development, Economy, Education, Energy, Environment, Finance, Government, Health and a variety of other topics; <https://data.oecd.org/israel.htm> (16.07.2021).

²⁰ Ynet is an Israeli news site and content portal, which is part of the Yedioth Ahronoth group. As of July 2020, Ynet is the most watched news site in Israel and the third of all sites. <https://www.ynet.co.il/news/article/rkny2wtFw> (16.07.2021).

²¹ The official Knesset website of the State of Israel <https://main.knesset.gov.il/About/Lexicon/Pages/subcommittee.aspx> (16.07.2021).

rael's security and prosperity from the enemies who endanger Israeli citizens and their right to exist in their country. Benjamin Netanyahu has legitimized his political agenda in the face of the conflict in Gaza and the issue of the existing national security against Israel from the rivals – " Hamas" – " Hezbollah" "and the Iranian threat."

Discussion

Regarding the research question in this article;" Is there a difference between Obama's strategy for using social media and Netanyahu's strategy for using social media ? " in order to answer a question, it is necessary to review the history of the development of social media in the two countries, the United States and Israel. Since the founding of the United States, political marketing and strategic communications have been used to persuade the people to vote in a certain way. While social conventions in early America saw it as inappropriate for a candidate to run on his behalf, candidates could rely on the campaign efforts of their parties, For example; during the third presidential election between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, Adams supporters slammed Jefferson as "an evil, short-tempered guy, the son of a half-breed squa, the father of multi-Virginia," while Jefferson's. Supporters condemned Adams as a "monarchist who sought to be king." with limited technological capabilities, parties were limited to small newspapers and face-to-face conversations with voters, where supporters could speak for or against a candidate (Eddins, 2014), The history of presidential elections in America, campaign strategies have evolved commensurate with the changing technologies of the time, From word of mouth, to whistle stop stump speeches on the caboose of a traveling train, to fireside chats on the radio, to television debates, to the revolution of the Internet. The underlying notion remains that as technology changes, so do the methods by which candidates convey their platforms, Each new technological advancement has brought with it new ways to understand and communicate to the electorate, By tracking voter engagement on and through the new frontier of social media, presidential candidates are able to engage differently in hopes of potentially impacting voter turnout much like the revolution of television revealed a completely new voter demographic. The political landscape was forever changed with the introduction of television, Prior to the wide adoption of the television era, most voters received their news through alternate sources, mostly print and radio. But Obama's use of social media in the 2008 and 2012 elections once again created a new voter demographic and formed a deeper understanding of the electorate, he use the social media in his 2012 campaign, Obama's strategies combined multiple different data sets on voter characteristics such as donation trends, ideology and geographical location in order to create a more complete voter profile. This voter profile informed campaign strategists about attributes such as which voters were most likely to be politically engaged online, which candidates were most likely to volunteer and even, which voters were most likely to switch their vote By understanding voters better through this data, campaign strategists could then use social media as a means to communicate specific interests using narrowcasting, Targeting users proved far easier using social media platforms such as email and Facebook because unlike television or the radio,

messages via email can contain content specified to the users' interests thus making that user feel more important and more connected to the candidate's platform, targeting voters online resulted in increases in voter engagement and voter turnout at the polls for some of President Obama's key constituents. For example; younger voters became far more politically engaged on social media sites than ever before coinciding perfectly with President Obama's landslide victory of the 18–29 age group, in both 2008 and 2012. Further, throughout the last six elections, voter turnout for African American voters has slowly increased. Still in 2012 it increased so much so that voter turnout for African Americans fell by only one percentage point as compared to Whites. Concluding Remarks In both the 2008 and 2012 campaigns, President Barack Obama utilized social media in three major ways to organize a strong and effective ground game; a campaign website, email and SNS accounts, Obama's campaign website became central for uniting and equipping volunteers for many activities, primarily going door-to-door. Email was utilized to personalize content based on the voter's location in order to make users feel needed as well as to increase the likelihood of their ability to attend events. Furthermore, Obama lead campaign strategists were able to filter information to users by employing content creators as content sharers of campaign information working off the assumption that users on SNS are more likely to take action when campaign information comes from a "friend" or "follower" versus a campaign coordinator. Unlike his competitors Obama saw social media not only as an information hub or a campaign financing center, but also as a ground game organizer. Obama understood how social networks can be shaped online in order to communicate information to volunteers effectively and efficiently saving his campaign time and money in the process. In Israel, on the other hand, traditional media was common among politicians such as newspapers, election propaganda broadcasts and interviews on television or radio, the new social media gained momentum in the late 1990s due to technological changes in Israel, Netanyahu is one of the first political leaders Who began using social media similar to United States leaders Obama and Trump, as role models, Netanyahu uses Twitter and Facebook, he often uses his private and official Twitter accounts as a means to achieve personal political goals by constructing an emotional dialogue and charged with national debate on Twitter by using the enemy's deterrence strategy such as – Iran, Hamas, Hezbollah, which pose a threat to Israel's security and its citizens and he presents them to the world and to Israeli citizens as terrorist organizations that kill in cold blood, compared to the Israeli citizens who are the victim, in addition to that he also positions himself as a representative of the entire Jewish people by using a metonymic candidacy for Jerusalem – the exclusive and undivided capital of Israel, And that he is the right leader who can secure the future and utopia for the Israeli nation and ensure its security and existence against terrorism. The speeches and statements he constantly makes on television and in the press he often peeks at his private and official Twitter accounts in both Hebrew and English to show to the whole world that "Hamas" and Iran are International Terrorist organizations. Netanyahu uses Twitter a lot to present an dichotomy between "Us" (Israel that fights against the threat of genocide) and "they" (refers to the West and the terrorist organizations – Iran, Hamas and Hezbollah), he is claiming that they are sponsoring international terrorism and a threat to the West.

Summary

My conclusion in the article which I was able to reach according to the question of my research is that there is a difference between Netanyahu's use of social media compared to Obama's use of social media. So, according to the articles and studies that dealt with this issue and the political discourse, I was able to present the difference between the two leaders from the two different countries in the consumption of social networks by comparing Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets on Twitter and Obama's tweets in different periods and during the US and Israeli election campaigns. This has led to results that differ in the political strategy used by the two leaders in their administration and there is a difference in the method of using Twitter, so Netanyahu used his two Twitter accounts the official "Israeli prime minister" and his private account "Benjamin Netanyahu" used both languages but mostly used English, Compared to Obama used the private account in the 2008 election campaign and then moved to the official presidential account and used it until the end of his term. In summary, these are the main differences in the use of the two leaders in terms of strategies and tactics in using Twitter ; Netanyahu constantly tweets in the name of unity and the security of the people, So that he constantly presents himself on Twitter as an Israeli leader responsible for the security of the State of Israel and its citizens against the terrorist threats and the various terrorist organizations that endanger the existence and security of the State of Israel, This is why Netanyahu is trying to justify and back up his decisions in operations in Israel and in the wars against Hamas in Gaza or against Hezbollah in Lebanon and ignores the opposition and the voices against him inside and outside Israel, Netanyahu uses the method of intimidation, so he constantly warns of the enemies that pose a real danger to the security of the State of Israel, and uses the dichotomy of "we" and "them," "We" – refers to the citizens of Israel who are presented as victims of the various terrorist organizations, so they have the right to protect their existence and security, Compared to "them" – referring to the international terrorist organizations – Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran that endanger the whole world like ISIS. On the other hand, Obama is the first president Who used the immense power of the social media giants Twitter and Facebook, with the help of a team of technology experts who used successful strategies to achieve a number of goals; such as Raising donations in the 2008 and 2012 United States presidential election campaigns, And to update its voters on the schedule of election conferences and their location, And to broadcast his speeches live or recorded on the website or social media to broadcast to voters information about Obama and his program of activities, In addition, Obama appealed to young voters as a target audience by taking advantage of their use of the new social networks and persuading them to vote for him. Furthermore, Obama has made sure that celebrities and important people in the United States express their support on social media by the hashtags or likes expressing their support for him Obama took advantage of the social outcry to raise a variety of issues in his action plan as president even before he was elected president and continued to update his fan base on government action such as; "Obama's Care" health plan and social equality programs and various plans to be close to citizens. Obama has engaged social media users in a way that no other candidate has reached before; he has served as a role model among other leaders from around the world.

My suggestion to political leaders is as the use of the Internet continues to evolve and influence politics in America, Israel and all the countries of the world, social networks must be utilized effectively to address the needs of citizens, their rights and demands.

Bibliography

- Alexa Top 500 Global Sites (2015), <http://www.alexa.com/topsites>.
- Andrew K., Lee R. (2003), *Political Sites Gain, But Major News Sites Still Dominant*, Pew Research Journalism Project, 1, <http://www.peoplepress.org/2003/01/05/political-sites-gain-but-major-news-sites-still-dominant/>.
- Balmas M., Rahat G., Sheaffer T., Shenhav S. R. (2014), *Two routes to personalized politics: Centralized and decentralized personalization*, Party Politics, 20, pp. 37–51.
- Baumgartner J. C., Morris J. S., *Who Wants to Be My Friend? Obama, Youth, and Social Networks in the 2008 Campaign*, 56.
- Bender A. (2012, April 9), *Labor party on Netanyahu's likes: It's a mirage*, NRG, <http://www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART2/356/323.html>.
- Cottle S. (2011), *Media and the Arab Uprisings of 2011: Research Notes*, "Journalism", 12(5), pp. 647–659, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884911410017>.
- Cottle S., Nolan D. (2007), *Global Humanitarianism and the Changing Aid Field: Everyone was Dying for Coverage*, "Journalism Studies" 8 (6), pp. 862–878, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700701556104>.
- Denton R. E. jr. (ed.) (2014), *The 2012 Presidential Campaign*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, Maryland, pp. 136–139.
- Diamond E., McKay M., Silverman R. (1993), *Pop Goes Politics: New Media, Interactive Formats, and the 1992 Presidential Campaign*, "American Behavioral Scientist", vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 257–261.
- Dulio D., Goff D., Thurber J. (1999), *Untangled web: Internet use during the 1998 election*, "PS: Political Science & Politics", 32, pp. 53–59.
- Eddins G. Z., *Persuading the People: Presidential Campaigns*, Our White House, November 27, 2014, <http://www.ourwhitehouse.org/persuading.html>.
- Epstein M. (2013, May 23), *Israelis "like" Facebook more than any other nation*, "Haaretz", <http://www.haaretz.com/business/israelis-like-facebook-more-than-any-other-nation.premium-1.525547>.
- Gil de Zuniga H., Jung N., Valenzuela S. (2010), *"Social Media Use for News and Individuals' Social Capital, Civic Engagement, and Political Participation"*, "Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication", vol. 17, pp. 319–336.
- Glenn T., Reid E. J., Byron J. (January 17, 2013), *Obama unveils 'Organizing for Action'*, "Politico. Retrieved", January 21.
- Hayes D., Lawless J. L. (2015), *As Local News Goes, So Goes Citizen Engagement: Media, Knowledge, and Participation in U.S. House Elections*, "The Journal of Politics", vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 447–462.
- Ho_mann C. P., Suphan A. (2017), *Stuck with 'electronic brochures'?*, How boundary management strategies shape politicians' social media use, "Information, Communication & Society", 20 (4), pp. 551–569, DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1200646.
- Internet Gains Most as Campaign News Source but Cable TV Still Leads* (2012), Pew Research Journalism Project: 1, <http://www.journalism.org/2012/10/25/socialmedia-doubles-remains-limited/>.
- Jay Y. (2013), *Twitter Has A Surprisingly Small Number of US Users*, Business Insider, last modified October 4, <http://www.businessinsider.com/twitter-has-surprisingly-small-number-of-us-users-2013-10> (26.07.2021).

- Jebril N., Albaek E., deVreese C. H. (2013), "Infotainment, Cynicism and Democracy: The Effects of Privatization vs. Personalization in the News," *European Journal of Communication*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 105–121.
- Karniel Y., Lavie-Dinur A. (2010), *2006 elections in Israel: Marking the end of an era for the controlled televised election campaign broadcast*, "Journal of Media and Communication Studies", 2, pp. 29–38.
- Katz Y., *The Global Media and the Media in Israel: Changes in Approach to Defense-Related Coverage: 1987–2020* (No. 1–55), Tel Aviv University, https://www.jstor.org/stable/23913658?read-now=1&refreqid=excelsior%3A994ff16bc6208dcfd467a2e119c4adf3&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents (16.07.2021).
- Kelsey D., Bennett L. (2014), *Discipline and Resistance on Social Media: Discourse, Power and Context in the Paul Chambers 'Twitter Joke Trial'*, "Discourse, Context and Media", 3, pp. 37–45, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2013.12.001>.
- Kishik Y. (2012, October 10), *The first Facebook elections are launched. Mako*, <http://www.mako.co.il/newsselections-2013/Article-3607a3df11b4a31006.htm>.
- Lev-On A. (2011), *Campaigning online: Use of the Internet by parties, candidates and voters in national and local election campaigns in Israel*, "Policy & Internet", 3, pp. 1–28.
- Linder M. (2016), *Block. Mute. Unfriend. Tensions Rise on Facebook After Election Results*, "Chicago Tribune", November 9, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/lifestyles/ct-facebook-electionreaction-family-1109-20161109-story.html>.
- Marcinkowski F., Metag J. (2014), *Why Do Candidates Use Online Media in Constituency Campaigning? An Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior*, "Journal of Information Technology & Politics" 11(2).
- Mor Y., Yiftach R., Maoz I. (2016), 'Likes' for Peace: Can Facebook Promote Dialogue in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict?, "Media and Communication", 4(1), pp. 15–26.
- Moy P., Xenos M. A., Hess V. K. (2009), *Communication and Citizenship: Mapping the Political Effects of Infotainment*, "Mass Communication and Society", vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 111–131.
- Nissan Y. (2011, September 6), *Israelis spend most time on social networking sites*, "The Jerusalem Post", <http://www.jpost.com/Enviro-Tech/Israelis-spend-most-time-onsocial-networking-sites>.
- Wolffe R. (2013), *The Message*, Hachette Book Group, New York, 81.
- Samuel-Azran T., Yarchi M., Wolfsfeld G. (2015), *Aristotelian rhetoric and Facebook success in Israel's 2013 election campaign*, "Online Information Review", 39, pp. 149–162.
- Siapera E. (2013), *Tweeting #Palestine: Twitter and the Mediation of Palestine*, "International Journal of Cultural Studies", 1–17.
- Smith A. (2003), *Civic Engagement in the Digital Age*, Pew Research B. Bimber, R. Davies, Campaigning online: The Internet in U.S. elections, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Smith A. (2013), *Civic Engagement in the Digital Age*, Pew Research Journalism Project, 7, <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2013/Civic-Engagement/Summary-of-Findings.aspx>.
- Stone D. (1990), *Old guard versus new partisans: Think tanks in transition*, "Australian Journal of Political Science", 26, pp. 197–215.
- Tatham M. (2013), *For Every Hour Online Americans Spend 16 Minutes on Social Networks*, Experian Marketing Services, last modified April 18, <http://www.experian.com/blogs/marketing-forward/2013/04/18/for-every-hour-onlineamericans-spend-16-minutes-on-social-networks/>.
- Tom R., Amy M. (2012), *How the Presidential Candidates Use the Web and Social Media*, Pew Research Journalism Project, 1, <http://www.journalism.org/2012/08/15/how-presidential-candidates-use-web-and-socialmedia/>.
- Wallsten K. (2010), "Yes We Can": How Online Viewership, Blog Discussion, Campaign Statements, and Mainstream Media Coverage Produced a Viral Video Phenomenon, "Journal of Information Technology & Politics", vol. 7, no. 2–3, pp. 163–181.

- Williamson A., Miller L., Fallon F. (2010), *Behind the digital campaign. An exploration of the use, impact and regulation of digital campaigning*. Hansard Society, London, England.
- Williams B. A., Delli Carpini M. X. (2011), *After Broadcast News*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Williams M. (2003), *Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics*, "International Studies Quarterly", 47, pp. 511–531, <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0020-8833.2003.00277.x>.
- Wodak R. (2001), *The Discourse Historical Approach*, in: *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak, Michael Meyer, Sage, London, pp. 63–94.
- Wodak R. (2015), *The Politics of Fear: What Right-wing Populist Discourses Mean*, Sage, London, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446270073>.
- Wring D., Horrocks I. (2000), *The transformation of political parties?*, in: *New media and politics*, eds. B. Axford, R. Huggins, SAGE, London, England, pp. 191–209.
- Wu M. Dr. (2010), *Community vs. Social Network*, "Lithosphere", June 6, <http://lithosphere.lithium.com/t5/science-of-social-blog/Community-vs-SocialNetwork/ba-p/5283>.
- Zappavigna M. (2012), *Discourse of Twitter and Social Media: How we Use Language to Create Affiliation on the Web*, Continuum, New York.
- <https://www.alexacom/topsites> (16.7.2021).
- http://www.barackobama.com/?source=site_20131001_splash#get-the-facts (20.7.2021).
- <https://www.calcalist.co.il/internet/articles/0,7340,L-3742764,00.html> (14/7/2021).
- <https://data.oecd.org/israel.htm> (16.07.2021).
- <https://influencermarketinghub.com/facebook-statistics/> (03.07.2021).
- https://media.bezeq.co.il/pdf/internetreport_2020.pdf?fbclid=IwAR1U52HTCDXQB0bEw13kT-j2KqidwZFKpDHTyNebaDmthiqhbqZ4VWBGzIQU (16.7.2021).
- <https://main.knesset.gov.il/About/Lexicon/Pages/subcommittee.aspx> (16.07.2021).
- <https://www.pewresearch.org> (16.7.2021).
- <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, July 8, 2014 (26.7.2021).
- <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, July 9, 2014 (26.7.2021).
- <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, August 3, 2014 (26.7.2021).
- <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, August 13, 2014 (26.7.2021).
- <https://twitter.com/netanyahu?s=08>, August 23, 2014 (26.7.2021).
- <https://wearesocial.com/blog/2020/10/social-media-users-pass-the-4-billion-mark-as-global-adoption-soars> (02.7.2021).
- <https://www.ynet.co.il/news/article/rkny2wtFw> (16.07.2021).
- https://s22.q4cdn.com/826641620/files/doc_financials/2020/q2/Q2_20__InvestorFactSheet.pdf (03.07.2021).

Analiza porównawcza kwestii bezpieczeństwa w nowych mediach społecznościowych w kampanii wyborczej USA-Izrael

Streszczenie

Artykuł przedstawia historię wykorzystania mediów społecznościowych w kampaniach wyborczych polityków ze Stanów Zjednoczonych i Izraela jako współczesnego zjawiska w obecnej epoce ze względu na zmiany technologiczne w światowych mediach. Artykuł odpowiada na pytanie badawcze: Czy istnieje różnica w strategii korzystania z Twittera między Netanjahu a Obamą i na czym polega ta różnica? Należy zauważyć, że wiele artykułów dotyczyło sieci społecznościowych i politycznego

wykorzystania sieci, ale o ile mi wiadomo, temat porównania i próby znalezienia różnic w kampaniach politycznych między dwoma przywódcami ze Stanów Zjednoczonych i Izraela nie został jeszcze zbadany. Celem artykułu, jest przedstawienie danych oraz analiza informacji z oficjalnego konta na Twitterze byłego premiera Izraela Netanjahu dotyczących kwestii bezpieczeństwa i zagrożenia ze strony Iranu wyrażonych w jego tweedach. Przedstawia się on w nich, jako “[...] odpowiedzialny za Izrael i jego obywateli [...]” Przedstawia on kwestię bezpieczeństwa narodowego jako wygrywającą kartę przeciwko swoim przeciwnikom, aby zdobyć poparcie skrajnie prawicowego elektoratu w Izraelu. Tweety Obamy, który był pierwszy prezydent Stanów Zjednoczonych, wykorzystującym media społecznościowe, tworzą warstwę porównawczą. Przedstawiono prezydenckiego Twittera, służącego zdobyciu poparcia amerykańskiego elektoratu w wyborach prezydenckich w 2008 i 2012 r. Zwycięstwo zawdzięczał on jednak prezentowaniu treści ekonomicznych i społecznych.

Słowa kluczowe: Media społecznościowe, kampanie wyborcze w Izraelu, kwestia bezpieczeństwa w Izraelu, komunikat prezydenta USA, kampanie polityczne

