

**RESEARCH PAPER****Power, Ideology, and Hegemony in Political Speech: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Pro-Israel speech at the Knesset**

¹Bazif Jabbar, ²Qaisar Sharif and ³Rabya Naim

1. Instructor, Department of Social Sciences, Muhammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Muhammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan
3. Instructor, Department of Social Sciences, Muhammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author | Bazif.jabbar@jinnah.edu

ABSTRACT

In the contemporary geopolitical landscape, political speeches serve as powerful instruments of ideological construction. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) allows researchers to unfold the ways in which ideology, bias, and political favoritism are often strategically embedded and concealed within linguistic structures. The paper uses Norman Fairclough three dimensions model of Critical Discourse Analysis to analyze and identify the ideological meanings of Trump's speech to the Israeli Knesset on 13th October 2025. The analysis is based on all three concepts of the model of Fairclough: textual elements, discursive activities and sociocultural contexts to examine in which the speech establishes a pro-Israel narrative. The research is also concerned with marginalization of Palestinian views. At the textual level, biblical allusions and evaluative lexical choices construct Israel as a morally victimized and civilized nation, while Palestinians are embodied as violent and subhuman. Palestinian misery is largely unacknowledged or marginalized in the discourse. On the discursive practice level, speech is presented in a highly symbolic political space and spread throughout the world, which increases its power in terms of ideology. Trump incorporates the hegemonic discourse of Israel about the conflict and compromises the state power by positioning peace and military action as the goods of his personal leadership. On the sociocultural level, the discourse justifies US Israeli hegemony, legitimizes pre-emptive military violence and the Islamophobic and us versus them worldviews. The study employs the qualitative data analysis to examine Power, Ideology, and Hegemony in Political Speech. The findings of the study indicate that there is an ideological contradiction where militarization and providing arms are put forward as a way of peace. Altogether, the research shows the functioning of political discourse as a power mechanism that perpetuates the existing inequality and creates the perception of the Israel Palestine conflict in society

KEYWORDS Discursive Practice, Donald Trump, Knesset, Israel Palestine Conflict, Narrative, CDA, Hegemony

Introduction

Donald Trump, the 47th President-elect of the United States of America, addressed the Israeli Parliament the Knesset, in Jerusalem on October 13, 2025. Trump addressed the Israeli Parliament because the cease-fire between Israel and Palestine was in effect, and both nations had decided to exchange hostages and prisoners (Wolf, 2025). Donald Trump was invited to this address by the speaker of the Knesset, Amir Ohana, stating that Trump's

efforts were key to the cease-fire and hostage agreement ("Israeli Knesset speaker invites Trump...", 2025).

Donald Trump addressed the Knesset in a triumphant manner. In his own words, this ceasefire marked the conclusion to "2 harrowing years in darkness," marking the end of the "Age of Terror" and the commencement of a "Golden Age" of regional prosperity. However, such speeches are not isolated; these are symbolic events (Shroufi, 2025). This article focuses on how Donald Trump's pro-Israel stance is constructed through language, analyzing his address at the Knesset on October 13th, 2025. Critical Discourse Analysis, developed by scholars like Fairclough (1995), van Dijk (1998), Wodak (2001), and others, is primarily concerned with the connection between discourse and power. CDA does focus on what is said and who said it, but it also assesses who benefits from what is said and whose interests are suppressed by what is said. Political Discourses are central to CDA because they play a key role in shaping ideologies. (Chilton, 2004). In war and conflict times, such speeches are common and carry a lot of linguistic elements that suggest their tilt towards one particular nation/state. Donald Trump's consistent use of phrases like declaring himself "the best friend Israel has ever had" provides room for a critical discourse analysis of his speech and unmask his pro-Israel stance in the much-popular Israel-Palestine conflict.

The Israel-Palestine conflict is not new. This has gone on for decades. The territory dispute, followed by massive Israeli immigration in the 19th century, the Balfour declaration, and the 1947 UN Partition Plan after the holocaust, every single element has contributed to this longstanding conflict (McGreal 2023). The conflict's longstanding history definitely impacts the surrounding regions, and in particular, the role of major superpowers remains crucial in such situations. The latest 2023 attack by Hamas further ignited the conflict, and a two-state solution seemed far away from reality (McGreal 2023).

Donald Trump's first presidency, which spanned from 2017 to 2021, sparked a lot of debate on his policies for the Arab World and his ideological alignment with Israel. Placing the U.S. embassy in Jerusalem in 2018, strengthening diplomatic ties, recognizing Israeli sovereignty over the Golan Heights in 2019, and presenting the "Deal of the Century" peace plan in 2020. Renowned scholars argue that these actions broke with long-standing U.S. policies that emphasized neutrality and support for a two-state solution (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2007; Smith, 2010). The United States of America has never been against Israel at all. However, Donald Trump has often been on the radar of criticism for promoting Islamophobia or anti-Islam sentiments. Scholars have always put Donald Trump under scrutiny for his foreign policy. His infamous executive order that barred Muslim Immigrants from seven countries to enter America was also a display of his anti-Islam policy (Ahmad et al. 2017).

Donald Trump's language at the Knesset on October 13th, 2025, reassured that Israel has always been a moral ally and defender of Western values, while his lack of mention of Palestinian voices hinted towards his bias on the issue. Critical Discourse Analysis argues that such bias in language is not neutral. Van Dijk (1998) argues that political discourses always play a crucial role in normalizing any sentiment or concept among the general public. Role of media, politicians, known figures, etc. in shaping political views, pursuing public and promoting personal ideologies has been central to CDA. Critical Discourse Analysis assists in exposing such hypocrisies. The use of language plays a crucial role in this regard. Critical Discourse Analysis of Western Media on the Israel-Palestine conflict highlighted the bias of Western media as they portrayed attempts of Israeli forces as acts of defense or reaction, while the similar efforts of the Palestinian people were shown as aggressive and provoking. Words like combatants, militants,

terrorists, etc., are often associated with Palestinian forces, shedding light on a potential double standard of the West (Kareem and Najm 2025). A similar observation can be made in Donald Trump's regard, as he globally claims that he stopped the war or played a crucial role in ending the war; however, he is often seen openly supporting Israel's cause and acknowledging the supply of firearms to Israel. Trump's double standards will also be highlighted in the current study.

The current study, equipped with Norman Fairclough's Three-dimensional model, aims to analyze Trump's October 13th address at the Knesset and highlight his pro-Israelism. This is achieved through critically studying the political scenario and the choice of discourse that President Trump made. This will help to understand America's stance on the ongoing Israel-Palestine issue. The primary focus of CDA is not on individuals but on society. While discourse and power are different elements, they do flow into each other. The normative element of CDA is to unmask social wrongs and suggest how they can be negotiated or reduced (Fairclough, 2013). Fairclough's model has 3 dimensions. The first dimension focuses on the analysis of spoken or written language, often referred to as textual analysis. Text production, consumption, and distribution are what this model studies next. The second dimension is purely concerned with genre, intertextuality, etc. The third and final dimension is the sociocultural practice. This layer focuses on how different institutions of society practice their power through discourse, and what explicit or implicit ideologies are being promoted through discourse (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010).

Literature Review

The critical discourse analysis of political speeches or talks is not new. A lot of different social actors, major countries, and international organizations have come under scrutiny for their bias or unjust discourse on the longstanding and unresolved Israel-Palestine conflict. Moonakal (2025) studied the stance of China on the Israel-Palestine Conflict. The study argued that while China has been advocating for the Palestinian people, there stance is rather political rather than humanitarian. China positions itself as Global leader of the South. China is benefitting from this conflict by highlighting America's hypocrisy and support for violence in the Palestinian region. China's motive to maintain peace and stability in this region is also to protect the massive investments that China has made in different middle-eastern and Asian Countries. As Israel-Palestine conflict disturbs the entire region, China's approach to establish peace and goodwill is more important for their own nation. Moonakal (2025) asserts that China's peace plans and attempts to resolve conflicts are often vague, lacking clear directions and often China is just a by-stander in the major conflicts of the world.

Politicians being on the radar of Critical Discourse Analysis is not a new convention. In June 2021, during an interview with HBO's Jonathan Swan, Pakistan's then Prime-Minister Imran Khan used a phrase "Absolutely Not" in reply to a question regarding the provision of military bases to the United States for operations in Afghanistan. In the light of the 3d model of Norman Fairclough's for analysis, Khan's phrase was termed a moral standpoint against the anti-peace keeping policies. This was a clear and concise response from Imran Khan to the United States of America. The response was timely but the choice of words (first dimension of Fairclough's model) was not liked by many higher ups and eventually led to Khan being out of the office before his complete tenure could be completed (Amjad et al. 2024). News agencies are often scrutinized for their bias in reporting as well. The portrayal of Palestinians in Israel-Palestine conflict is a common nuisance for researchers. Using Van Dijk's ideological square, six reports, 3 each from, United Kingdom's "The Independent" and United States' "The Washington" were studied by Ahmed et al. (2022). The study covered the period from 2001 to 2012. The Consistent

negative portrayal of the Palestinians was concluded by the study, as they were labeled as aggressors, militants, kidnappers, terrorists etc. On the contrary, Israelis were depicted as innocent, sufferers, and victims. While the study used Van Dijk's model and not Fairclough's, it is still a testament of the fact that CDA uncovers the heinous double standards of media, politicians and other social actors, and becomes voice for the voiceless. The same aim will be pursued in the current study.

In global conflicts and in the modern age, social media platforms are widely used by the elites to frame narratives or brainwash the general public to accept the ideologies that are preferred by the dominant class. Discursive strategies used by the international political leaders on social media platform X (formerly Twitter) suggested that the lexical choices by the world leaders are not coincidental, rather ideological, much like CDA suggests. With a sample of 100 tweets of 20 renowned global leaders, the usage of words like "Self-defense" and "Terrorist Organizations" was fairly common among the pro-West and pro-Israeli leaders, portraying their attacks as an act to defend themselves. Similarly, leaders supporting the other side of the spectrum (Palestine) constantly used the words "genocide", "barbarism", "martyrs", etc., to highlight the victimhood of Palestinians (Shah et al. 2025). The findings were not free from historical roots. Global South leaders often linked this violence from Israel to the colonial era and its aggression. Moreover, neutrality was also another choice that many figures opted for by criticizing military actions in careful legal language, maintaining the middle-ground, and not totally refusing to comment.

There remains a significant gap in the analysis of Donald Trump's speech, as it was delivered only recently in October 2025 at the Knesset, and the Israel-Palestine issue is currently a globally trending yet unresolved conflict. The present study aims to highlight the implicit support extended to Israel by the United States of America. As the USA is a global superpower, its support for any particular party in an international conflict carries considerable significance. However, such support, when exercised without accountability, often contributes to large-scale violence and the illegal use of power. Moreover, despite its clear alignment with one side, the attempt to present this stance as neutral is itself problematic, and the current study seeks to shed light on this obscured aspect as well.

Material and Methods

CDA plays a vital role in analyzing different discourses in different situations, and it explores how a language constructs and reflects the phenomenon that happens in society. CDA serves as an exposure to examine how language constructs ideologies and goes beyond the surface level, aiming to find out the intended meaning of the speech or any discourse. This study is based on a qualitative research framework to analyze the speech of the Political personality, **President** Donald Trump, that was delivered at the Knesset two years after the October 7th attack. For this, the speech was transcribed and used as the data of this study to highlight pro-Israelism elements in the speech. Critical Discourse Analysis facilitates a detailed and critical analysis of how language operates as a type of social practice, and the way in which political discourse is constructed, endorsing not to say reproduces power relations and ideologies. Political speeches are not regarded either as neutral texts or in instrumental terms but as strategic interventions that have the power to construct specific public perceptions of social and political realities.

CDA has been used as a theoretical framework while following Norman Fairclough (1989, 2001). Fairclough introduced CDA as an integrated three-dimensional model, which investigates discourse through three interconnected dimensions

- Textual Level

- Discursive Practice
- Social practice

This framework will lead us to analyze speech, highlighting linguistic features and how a language reflects and shapes social structures, power relations, and ideologies. These three dimensions are used to analyze the speech, which

Textual level: This is the first dimension that has been introduced by Fairclough in CDA to identify the linguistic features, such as vocabulary, metaphors, and grammatical choices that have been used to construct a pro-Israeli narrative.

Trump uses intentionally religious and persuasive language to describe the Israeli people, and he considers Israel a "Holy Land". As we can listen to his speech, he deliberately uses "them and us"; here, it can be found that the binary opposition characteristics of populist rhetoric are present. He uses many other phrases, sentences such as God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, just because of having these types of phrases and utterance, it shows linguistically that he aligns with Jewish Biblical discourse to seek spiritual connection and emotional touch with the audience, so that the speech can be attractive and inspiring.

Discursive practice: this is the second dimension which has been introduced by Fairclough, and it is a unique way to construct meanings, or it shows how text and speech have been produced and consumed, and how it reflects the existing realities in society. Here, the purpose of using this dimension is to look at how the speech has been delivered by Donald Trump, where the speech has been delivered, and how the audience might interpret it.

The speech has transcript in the document for as it is, he has been delivered to the Israeli Knesset to use as the main data of this study. The purpose of choosing this data is to highlight the hidden realities and ideology that shape the realities, and deliberate touch on issues such as:

US-Israel relations

Ideological alignment between states

This research used publicly available texts (political speech) so it does not involve human participants or require informed consent. However, ethical responsibility remains central because Critical Discourse Analysis involves interpretation and critique of politically sensitive material. Care is taken to represent Donald Trump's statements accurately and within their proper political and historical context, avoiding selective quotation or misrepresentation. Excerpts were taken out of the speech of Donald Trump and used in different stages of Fairclough's Three-dimensional model.

Dimension 1 - Text: Linguistic and Rhetorical Features

This dimension involves a close reading of the speech's linguistic choices, including vocabulary, grammar, metaphors, and rhetorical structures.

Donald Trump started his speech at the Knesset on October 13th, 2025, by thanking God. The following is what he said.

"We gather on a day of profound joy... to give our deepest thanks to the almighty God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."

Donald Trump immediately established a shared theological foundation, specifically invoking the patriarchs of Judaism. The "God" referred here is not neutral but the God of the Hebrew Bible, constructing an exclusive in-group that spiritually binds the Christian-majority United States (as he sees it) with the Jewish state of Israel. The starting words of his speech foreshadowed what the rest of the speech would sound like. This was essentially a thesis that clearly highlighted Donald Trump's stance. The use of the pronoun "We" also highlights the shared identity construction, as Donald Trump shows a sign of unity with the people of Israel, and his prejudice towards the in-group (Israel) is already highlighted at the start.

Moving on in his speech, Trump termed the current war situation between Israel and Palestine as the worst slaughter of Jews since the Holocaust. His exact words were:

"The worst slaughter of Jews since the Holocaust... the forces of chaos, terror and ruin... the enemies of all civilization are in retreat."

The intertextuality here is important. Trump's reference to the Holocaust is something deliberately done. This was not unintentional; this was on purpose to gain the sympathy of the world. The word "slaughter" refers to something inhumane. Humans are not slaughtered. Israeli suffering is historicized through the benchmark of Jewish trauma ("Holocaust"), demanding unquestioned moral sympathy. Moving on, he has tried to frame Palestinians as the forces of chaos, terror, and ruin. He purposefully positioned Palestinians as "enemies of all civilization." The lexical choice here was highly biased and one-sided. He only focused on showing Israel as the sufferers. However, the record books show something else. The kind of slaughtering Israel performed remained unhighlighted. Trump focused again and again only on Israel's suffering and had no sympathy for the Palestinians. Right from the start of his speech, his pro-Israelism was visible, and the so-called stakeholder of peace actually turned out to be a hypocrite. Trump's language dehumanized the Palestinian and placed Israel and the U.S. as the protectors of civilization itself.

Moreover, Donald Trump did not indulge in the war for peace. Rather, he wanted to build a narrative for his own public image. His quote: *"I rebuilt the military... We settled eight wars in eight months... I set up a meeting... He did it in four weeks, less than four,"* clearly suggested that he wanted to take the credit himself. The syntax consistently places Trump as the active subject ("I," "we" meaning his administration) and peace or victory as the direct object. He repeatedly bragged about settling 8 wars. Later, Trump made headlines for claiming the Nobel Peace Prize. The Nobel Committee was also criticized by the White House for failing to grant Donald Trump the peace prize (BBC News, 2025). His main story of transactional, personal efficacy was strengthened by this sentence construction. This passage clarifies Donald Trump's effort to claim that the US or himself is the only force behind eight wars or the only force bringing about world peace; later on in this analysis, the study observed how Trump admitted the supply of weapons and arms to Israel for this war, highlighting his double standards once again.

Additionally evident in his address was Donald Trump's liking or fondness for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Whereas the repeated words for Netanyahu as "*Bibi*" suggested that the two rulers shared a strong bond with each other, rather than just politics. *"Bibi, please stand up. And he is not easy, I want to tell you. He's not the easiest guy to deal with, but that's what makes him great."* The use of the moniker "Bibi"

violated diplomatic protocol. This served a dual purpose: it projected authenticity and strong personal relationships while also personalizing political power. Trump called Netanyahu "not the easiest person to deal with" because Netanyahu is famously stubborn and intense. Then he adds, "That's what makes him great." He's admiring Netanyahu for fighting relentlessly for his country and destroying the lives of millions of Palestinians. This is the same stakeholder of peace who said he has resolved 8 wars. There is also a bit of ego in it. By saying Netanyahu is hard to deal with, Trump is quietly admiring himself, too, claiming that he still managed to work with him. This makes Trump look like the one leader tough enough to handle another tough guy.

After sympathizing enough with Israelis and framing them as the in-group, finally Donald Trump realized to speak a little bit for Palestinians as well. *"But now at last, not only for Israelis, but also for Palestinians and many others, the long and painful nightmare is finally over."* Even here, it is visible that he first mentioned Israel, then the Palestinians, believing that Israelis were right too. This is the speech's most direct reference to Palestinians. Notably, they are the passive beneficiaries ("for Palestinians") of an active peace achieved by others (Israel, Trump). The "nightmare" is described as generically "long and painful," with no specific cause, agency, or acknowledgment of Palestinian casualties or displacement. While many global news outlets reported how inhumane the Israelis were in this war, Trump's choice of a grammatical structure that refused to put blame on any agency is, of course, doubtful, and another piece of evidence of his bias towards Israel. This was a textual erasure; the Palestinian experience is submerged into a narrative resolved by external saviors.

"the greatest and most powerful military in the right now history of the world... weapons that nobody's ever dreamt of... the level of power is so enormous. It's so dangerous, so bad," claimed by Trump. illustrates the atrocious mindset of the US. The language constructs an aura of mythic, unparalleled power. The use of superlatives ("greatest," "most powerful") creates a feeling of fear and terror. This serves a dual purpose: it instills pride and fear simultaneously. Although he did say that he wishes that they never have to use them, with his choice of vocabulary, he gives a clear message to the world of the heinous massacres they can cause if someone even thinks of messing with America. The next statement further testifies to America as the aggressor. *"I rebuilt the military... I hated to do... We make the best weapons... We dropped 14 bombs... we stopped the number one state sponsor of terror."* Agency is consistently claimed by the first-person singular ("I") and the collective "we" (the U.S. under Trump). This statement further testifies that the USA itself is the aggressor. While at the start of his speech, Trump portrayed himself as the peacemaker, but he also admitted that he dropped 14 bombs. The number one state sponsor of terror is Iran. One can think that if he can solve 8 wars globally, why can't America settle its issues with Iran without the use of weapons?

Lastly, when Trump says, *"We make the best weapons in the world. And we've got a lot of them. And we've given a lot to Israel, frankly,"* he's doing a few things at once, and none of them are accidental. The key part is *"we've given a lot to Israel."* This line openly admits something that politicians often soften or hide. Trump isn't being subtle here. He says it frankly, as if it's simple and justifiable. The term candidly at the end implies that he has no remorse or regret about providing armaments to Israel. This contradicts Trump's attempt to project a peaceful image at the beginning of his address. What is surprising is that Trump does not even hesitate; he demonstrates no empathy. There is no pause to reflect on what weapons do, who they harm, or the human cost. The emphasis remains on strength and charity. Giving Israel weaponry, according to Trump, is not an issue; rather, it demonstrates dedication and partnership. This comment once again demonstrates his strong support for Israel. Trump continually states that he dislikes violence and prefers

peace, but here he is gleefully discussing sending huge weapons. In his perspective, this is not a contradiction.

Overall, based on his linguistic choices, Trump clearly speaks emotionally about Israeli suffering, but there is no mention of Palestinians. Weapons are described without indicating who may be on the receiving end. Silence is important. It subtly normalizes Palestinian fatalities by rendering them invisible.

Dimension

Production

The address is presented in front of the Knesset, the most important and symbolic institution in Israeli democracy. The Knesset is Israel's parliament, and Trump adopts an Israel-centric narrative of the conflict, commencing his account on October 7th, demonstrating which version of history he supports. Speaking as a foreign leader, particularly of a global superpower nation, his statements carry additional weight and serve as strong outside confirmation of the Israeli government's actions. The speech was broadcast live across the world. Its distribution was not limited to the Knesset but was aimed at a global audience: reassuring pro-Israel Americans, displaying strength to opponents such as Iran, and demonstrating diplomatic achievement to the world. Delivering these lines in the Knesset was a deliberately discursive act. It serves as an assurance of ongoing material support for Israel. The audience (Israeli lawmakers) is not only hearing a policy statement but also witnessing a ritual reaffirmation of the "special relationship," in which Trump repeatedly praises Israel's proper use of weapons and openly testifies that it was America who provided all of the weapons and supported Israel during this heinous bloodshed.

When Trump talks about rebuilding a military that was supposedly halt by prior administrations and boasts that "we stopped" serious threats by tactical action, he is not making up a fresh story. These narratives center on the premise that the United States was in decline, timid, restricted, and exploited, and that only strong, decisive leadership could restore its strength. Within this viewpoint, acting alone against so-called rogue regimes is viewed as a moral responsibility, particularly when portrayed as stopping nuclear proliferation or terrorism. By repeating these notions, Trump chews on old ideological scripts while also presenting his own views, showing himself as the only leader capable of acting and doing something. This personalizing is most evident in Excerpt 3, where Trump details a specific military operation and claims that the US "dropped 14 bombs and obliterated them." Trump turns military power into a personal triumph. What would ordinarily remain classified or abstract is displayed as a visible measure of achievement, similar to a scorecard. This technique removes the distance and complexity of military action and repackages it for public consumption. War is no longer a sad or ethically charged last choice; rather, it demonstrates that the president is effective, resolute, and in command. Trump uses this genre blending to redefine state violence as a public performance, positioning himself as its center, heroic protagonist.

Sociocultural Practice

Following are some major ideologies or thoughts or sociocultural practices that Donald Trump tried to promote or internalize in people

First, the proud declaration "We make the best weapons in the world" is a direct legitimization of the U.S. military-industrial complex as a crucial necessary national

industry. The discourse frames weapons development and stockpiling ("we've got a lot of them") not as a choice within a spectrum of foreign policy tools, but as the foundational, non-negotiable precondition for security. However, if the same weapons are used by other nations, they are either tagged as terrorist or enemies of civilizations. This naturalizes a state of permanent militarized readiness. Trump has tried to normalize America's production of weapons for mass destruction but if another country does it, he sees it as a threat to global peace. Here, Donald Trump is not only legitimizing America's production of weapons and arms, rather reinforcing the fact that America is the only sane state who can manage weapons and decide who can use it or not. In a way, he is enforcing the ideology that the US must have total control of the world.

Secondly, the statement, "*So we dropped 14 bombs on Iran's key nuclear facilities... Together, we stopped the number one state sponsor of terror...*" performs the sociocultural practice of **normalizing pre-emptive war**. The act is presented without reference to international law, UN sanctions, or diplomatic channels. It is narrated as a simple, logical, and successful executive decision ("So we dropped..."). The target is pre-defined as absolute evil ("number one state sponsor of terror"), removing any need for legal or ethical justification. No statistics, no evidence, no references, just a direct allegation over a country to justify dropping of bomb, this discourse actively constructs a world where the so-called "good" powers have the inherent right to use devastating force to enforce their non-proliferation preferences, establishing a dangerous norm of unilateralism. The speech consistently performs the sociocultural practice of legitimizing a U.S.-Israeli hegemony over the Middle East. By praising the destruction of Iranian nuclear facilities and the defeat of what he calls the "forces of chaos," the speech presents pre-emptive military action as normal and justified. At the same time, Palestinians are almost completely left out of the story. They are not shown as people with political voices or rights, but as passive recipients of decisions made by stronger powers. In this framing, peace is not something Palestinians help shape or agree to; it is something imposed on them. By presenting this unequal situation as natural and positive, the discourse reinforces existing power imbalances instead of questioning them.

Furthermore, the speech of the USA president also reinforces a power hierarchy within the alliance. The U.S. is the manufacturer and distributor ("We make... we've given"), while Israel is the recipient and consumer ("given a lot to Israel"). This discursive framing underpins the material reality of the relationship, where the U.S. retains strategic leverage. It promotes an ideology of dependency, ensuring the client state's alignment flows from its reliance on a continuous supply of superior military technology, thereby locking the regional ally into a specific strategic posture.

Furthermore, Donald Trump's statement: "*The enemies of all civilization are in retreat,*" is a rhetoric that aligns with the ideological construct of a civilizational clash between the Judeo-Christian West (represented by the U.S. and Israel) and a barbaric, terroristic force often associated with Islamism in Western discourse. By defining the adversary as an enemy of "all civilization," Trump removes the conflict from the political realm (territorial disputes, occupation, nationalism) and places it in an apocalyptic, existential realm where no negotiation is possible, only defeat. This serves to justify extreme measures and solidify a paranoid, defensive identity for the in-group. His constant attempt to spread Islamophobia is not something new. Trump spreading Islamophobia is what researchers have claimed multiple times in the past as well. Trump strategically uses language to marginalize people of different ethnic identities, particularly Muslims, by employing demagogic rhetoric that constructs a clear divide between "us" and "them," thereby reinforcing his vision of "Making America Great Again" (Khan et al. 2021). Trump did the same in his address at the Knesset too.

Finally, by saying: "We've given a lot to Israel, frankly... And my personality actually is all about stopping wars." Trump unintentionally exposed a core ideological contradiction within the discourse. Trump boasts of being the primary arms supplier ("I made them") that made Israel "strong and powerful" enough to wage a devastating war. Simultaneously, he claims his "personality" is "all about stopping wars." The sociocultural practice here is the normalization of this contradiction: immense profit and power are derived from fueling conflict, while political capital is derived from claiming to end it. The discourse seamlessly stitches together the identities of militant patron and peacemaker, a duality that serves to maintain a perpetual state of managed conflict amenable to U.S. intervention and influence.

Discussion

This study's findings shed light on Donald Trump's partisanship and support for Israel in his Knesset speech. Instead of the neutral or balanced tone he claimed to adopt for a peace speech, we have a carefully worded political narrative that gushingly supports Israel while ignoring the suffering and atrocities that innocent Palestinians have been forced to endure as a result of Donald Trump's revealed bias and pro-Israelism in his Knesset address. He didn't take a neutral or balanced tone for a peace speech; it is at best a heavily framed political narrative that overwhelmingly favors Israel while dismissing the experiences and atrocities faced by innocent Palestinians. Trump makes Israel, and not the Palestinians, a victim by referring to the 11th-century ibn al-Athir – who described massacres against his people perpetrated by both Muslims and Christians – as an "Arab historian," using his latest exogenous designation for Palestinian Arabs. Palestinians as invisible or even, in some cases, as a threat to peace and the United States as the indispensable protector.

Trump consistently uses emotionally charged words and symbolic references (mostly for Jews) to change how people see things. He uses the Holocaust and talks about how bad things are for Israelis in very strong terms to create a moral framework in which Israel's actions seem completely justified. At the same time, people either ignore or talk about Palestinian suffering in a vague way, without saying what caused it or who is to blame.

The study also implies that Trump directs this narrative. While His usage of "I" and "we" makes intricate worldwide events appear personally. He depicts disputes as hurdles he addressed alone and military operations as evidence of his success, rather than acts that affected humans. Trump's self-centered narrative appears him nice, even while discussing murder.

It is observed that the speech place matters for message delivery. It clearly refers that Trump upheld Israeli policy in his Knesset speech, by highlighting and making his words significant. Trump supports a particular historical narrative by excluding the Palestinians' perspectives and selecting Israel's preferable origin of the conflict. The speech's global dissemination reinforces this worldview in Israel and spreads it as a trustworthy narrative.

The unregulated regard for military force is also notable. Trump enjoys in weaponry, armament, and military and he considers it might for peace. These activities show lacking in consideration for their consequences on people. Making Israel armed is seen as a show of loyalty and charity, not an moral choice. Trump encourages violence while he does show his expression a wish for peace. In the discourse, this contradiction is accepted.

The study also highlights that Trump's statements does support a greater "us versus them" attitude. By bordering enemies as risks to "all civilization," war begins to shift focus from politics to culture. It clearly reflects that many of Trump's statements have influenced to the spread of Islamophobic ideas by relating Muslims and countries with a Muslim majority to terrorist criticisms and danger.

The findings uphold chapter one's claim that Donald Trump's October 13, 2025, Knesset speech remained pro-Israel. Trump's Knesset address is viewed as a power show rather than a harmony and peace. It raises US and Israeli power, normalizes militaristic solutions, and marginalizes Palestinian intervention. This study examines Trump's Knesset address, but future study may investigate pro-Israel framing, militarized rhetoric, and Palestinian marginalization in other U.S. or Western leaders' speeches to regulate if they reflect individual situations or a build Western political narrative.

Conclusion

Following the three-dimensional model introduced by Fairclough, the speech of Trump at the Knesset turns not merely into political discourse, but rather into the weapon of ideology. In this speech, a very divisive world is formed at the text level. Trump applies militarized speech and religious references to group the actors based on their moral worth. The United States and Israel are seen as the champions of civilization and morality whereas their enemies are seen as violent and illogical adversaries. Such framing makes the audience perceive the conflict as one of absolute morality in which there is no room to consider any subtext or possible complexity.

The speech, as a method of discursiveness, reinvigorates familiar and highly established accounts about Trump. The religious language of the sacred and historical trauma are also used and recycled to legitimize present political and military decisions. It is also at this point that the state power becomes individualized. Trump often puts himself in the middle of the decisions and actions and makes security, peace, and even violence seem to fall out of his free will. By doing that, the speech transforms leadership into the performance and the politics of the mass into individual achievement.

Discourse supports a broader ideology at the sociocultural practice level that standardizes peace as supremacy and military dominance and superiority as opposed to justice, communication, or mutual recognition. As Palestinian agency is downgraded or eliminated altogether, U.S.-Israeli domination of the territory is depicted as normal, necessary and, ultimately, beneficial to all. Palestinians are described as inactive receivers to the decision of actions taken by more influential actors but not as political subjects with rights and voices. The speech helps sustain the same systems which do not allow the conflict to be resolved by rendering an active reproduction of existing power inequalities instead of questioning them.

Taken together, the analyzed excerpts point to a paradox at the heart of the Trump speech, namely, an ideological one. He depicts himself as both the reluctant protector who tells him that he hated to have to exercise such power and the destroyer of devastating power, bragging about weapons that no one has ever dreamed of. Meanwhile, he is the dealer of war and he is proud of the fact that the United States have the best weapons that one could buy and the so-called hero who takes this power so that he would make peace by eliminating terror. This is not a mere coincidence or nonsensical of the discourse. Instead, it has got an important ideological role to play.

The expansion of military strength appears to be an issue created by the speech, a moral act because violent intervention and huge military armaments are described as an unwilling, yet needed, measure of protection. Domination is re-defined as peacekeeping and war is re-defined as the way of preventing war. This story has allowed justification of the continued armament and intervention politically because it is the only way to achieve a secure and stable situation. In so doing discourse in effect perpetuates the process of militarization, fear and threat that it claims to eliminate thus ensuring that the prerequisites to war remain securely in their positions.

References

- Ahmed, M. S., Abed, T. M., & Hussain, K. H. (2022). Israeli-Palestinian struggle: A critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S8), 3676–3688.
- Amjad, M., Ahmad, M., & Bano, A. (2024). The power of an “absolutely not” by the Pakistani PM Imran Khan: A critical discourse analysis. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 8(1), 316–324.
- Anadolu Agency. (2025, October 14). Israeli Knesset speaker invites Trump to deliver speech in parliament. *Anadolu Agency*.
- BBC News. (2025, October 10). White House blasts Nobel Committee for not awarding Trump. *BBC News*.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse*. Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical discourse analysis in organizational studies: Towards an integrationist methodology. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(6), 1213–1218.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Kareem, A. H., & Najm, Y. M. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of the biased role of Western media in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Journal of Language Studies*, 8(6), 200–215.
- Khan, M. H., Qazalbash, F., Adnan, H. M., Yaqin, L. N., & Khuhro, R. A. (2021). Trump and Muslims: A critical discourse analysis of Islamophobic rhetoric in Donald Trump’s selected tweets. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), 21582440211004172.