INTERNATIONAL PREMIER JOURNAL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE (IPJLL)
VOLUME 3, ISSUE 2, 2025 p-ISSN: 3007-2336 e-ISSN: 3007-2344

A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF BENJAMIN NETANYAHU'S TWEETS DURING THE CEASEFIRE OF JAN-MARCH 2025

Sultan Asif Zahid zsultanasif@gmail.com	MS Scholar, Department of English Linguistics and Literature, Air University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
Dr. Sajid Iqbal sajid.iqbal@uom.edu.pk	Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Malakand, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
Tahir Shah tahir4ici@gmail.com	PhD Scholar, Department of English, University of Malakand, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
Tariq Ullah tariqullaheng.uom@gmail.com	PhD Scholar, Department of English, University of Malakand, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Abstract

The purpose of using language is not only to communicate but also to serve as an effective tool to construct power relations and ideological narratives. X (formerly Twitter) is increasingly being used by political leaders in order to shape public discourse by the use of language. Taking Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during the Israel-Palestine ceasefire period (Jan 19 to Mar 18, 2025), this research indicates how media discourse influences perceptions and strengthens dominance in conflict situations. This study conducts a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Netanyahu's tweets which linguistically construct power through lexical choices, grammatical structures, and metaphorical framing. It investigates discursive strategies that relegate Palestinian narratives and reinforces Israeli hegemony; and examines the role of religious and historical intertextuality in legalizing unequal power structures. This study applies Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model on Netanyahu's 15 purposively sampled written tweets in order to discuss how linguistic, rhetorical, and discursive resources uncover linguistic and ideological patterns. Tweets in Hebrew from Netanyahu's official X account were taken and translated for analysis of recurrent discursive strategies. It was found that the tweets use active voices, militarized diction, and rhetoric which shape ideological narratives while political authority is legitimized through intertextuality and hegemony with reinforcing Zionist ideology. The research highlights how political discourse is used as a weapon to defend actions, control perceptions, and maintain hegemony during conflict settings. It demonstrates the hidden and inevitable role of social media in maintaining hegemony and underlines the need and importance critical media understanding to decipher power-laden narratives in digital spaces.

Keywords: *Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis Model, Political Discourse, Israel-Palestine Conflict, Ceasefire Agreement, Benjamin Netanyahu's Tweets.*

Corresponding Author: Dr. Sajid Iqbal (Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Malakand, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan).
Email: sajid.iqbal@uom.edu.pk

1. Introduction

The theoretical foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) trace back to the late 20th century where it emerged as an interdisciplinary approach to study language as a social practice which is rooted in power structures, critical theory (e.g., Foucault, 1972; Habermas, 1984), sociolinguistics (e.g., Halliday, 1985), and semiotics (e.g., Barthes, 1967). CDA reveals how language reproduces, challenges, or transforms dominance and ideology in society (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1993).

The core principles of Critical Discourse Analysis contain the critical orientation towards rejection of neutrality which reveals how language sustains power asymmetries (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). It is also distinguished by its emphasis on social problems like it analyzes sexism, racism, political propaganda (van Dijk, 1993). CDA is applied to political discourse, media studies, institutional texts, digital communication and so many more. In the contemporary era, politicians frequently use social media platforms like Twitter (now X) to shape opinion, to spread ideology, and legitimize policy decisions. Benjamin Netanyahu is the longest serving prime minister of Israel who increasingly uses Twitter (now X) particularly during period of ceasefire (2025) between Palestine and Israel. During wars and ceasefire periods, political discourse is never neutral but functions as a battlefield for ideological legitimacy (Van Dijk, 2006). It also neutralizes the violence of the state (Fairclough, 1993).

This study applies Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA to Netanyahu's tweets, which advances the understanding of digital political persuasion and shows how discourse can mask ongoing power struggles. It also offers a framework to analyze social media as a catalyst for hegemony.

Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA was preferred over other models in critical discourse analysis because this model contains more linguistic rigor, exposes genre-blending (religion, militarism, diplomacy), and systematically connects word choices of Netanyahu to Zionist ideology.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

While political discourse in tweets plays a crucial role in shaping perceptions of the Israel-Palestine conflict, the specific linguistic, discursive and sociocultural mechanisms in this political discourse remain under-explored through which Benjamin Netanyahu constructs asymmetrical power relations in his tweets during ceasefire period. This study investigates how Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during Israel-Palestine ceasefire period linguistically construct power relations through strategic lexical choices, grammatical structures, and metaphorical framing and analyzes how discursive features marginalize Palestinian voice and strengthen Israeli hegemony. It also examines the role of intertextual references to history and religion in legitimizing Israeli dominance and sustaining asymmetrical power structures in the Israel-Palestine conflict. Ultimately, it aims to reveal how such discursive strategies perpetuate inequalities in the Israel-Palestine conflict's representation.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

The current research study focuses on the following research objectives:

1. To examine how Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during Israel-Palestine ceasefire period (Jan 19 to Mar 18, 2025) linguistically construct power relations through strategic Lexical choice, grammatical structures, and metaphorical framing.
2. To analyze how discursive features, marginalize alternative narratives and strengthen Israeli hegemony.
3. To investigate the role of intertextual references to history and religion in legitimizing Israeli dominance and sustaining asymmetrical power structures in the Israel-Palestine conflict.

1.3. Research Questions

Following are the research questions:

- How do Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during the Israel-Palestine ceasefire period (Jan 19 to Mar 18, 2025) linguistically construct power relations through strategic lexical choice, grammatical structures, and metaphorical framing?
- How do discursive features marginalize alternative narratives and strengthen Israeli hegemony?

- What is the role of intertextual references to history and religion in legitimizing Israeli dominance and sustaining asymmetrical power structures in the Israel-Palestine conflict?

2. Literature Review

Tweets serve as both direct outreach and strategic framing tools, according to studies conducted on political leaders on Twitter (Aharony, 2011). CDA in conjunction with corpus or content-analysis techniques reveals patterned use of pronouns, metaphors, threat narratives, and moralising language (e.g., studies of Trump's tweets). This is demonstrated by work on leaders' tweet corpora (e.g., Trump, EU leaders). Therefore, for reliable, repeatable insight into a leader's Twitter rhetoric, mixed-method designs (qualitative CDA and quantitative corpus measures) are advised.

The following recurring strategies have been identified by scholars who have directly applied CDA to Netanyahu's discourse (speeches and tweets): dehumanising metaphors, intensification and presuppositions intended to naturalise policy choices, appeals to external allies for legitimacy, and nomination/prediction to construct in-groups (Israel/"civilization") and out-groups (Hamas/"terror") (Algurjia et al., 2024; recent CDA studies of Netanyahu's public rhetoric). Rhetorical devices that reduce complex geopolitical dynamics to moral dichotomies and security narratives are highlighted in specific studies that examine Netanyahu's Twitter output (and related short-form messaging), using emotional appeals and recurring frames to gain consent. According to these studies, Netanyahu's tweets should be interpreted as calculated discursive actions that engage with both domestic politics and global news cycles rather than as random soundbites.

State leaders, media outlets, and social networks frequently use frames of "self-defence," "terror," and "moral high ground" to defend military action and marginalise opposing narratives, according to analyses of media and social media framing of the Israel-Palestine conflicts conducted in 2021 and after 2023 (Bhowmik & Fisher, 2023; corpus studies from 2023–2024). Political leaders usually use these frames and repurpose images and videos in their tweets during times of escalation to delegitimise opponents and support moral claims about their side's actions. In order to account for intertextual resonances with press releases, speeches, and visual materials, any CDA of Netanyahu's tweets must place messages within the chronology of events (dates of attacks, UN votes, and legal developments). Beyond language strategy, the discursive effect of tweets is shaped by the dissemination context, which includes bots, coordinated accounts, visual information, and platform moderation. Scholars caution that artificial amplification can change perceived

consensus and echo-chamber effects on Twitter, as evidenced by research on networks of fraudulent or inauthentic accounts spreading political messages in Israeli politics and elsewhere (reports 2019; more recent computational work on the Israeli Twittersphere). In order to capture how discourse is disseminated and interpreted, CDA must incorporate multimodal and network-analysis techniques. Recent studies have also mapped the persuasive multimodal signs that visual content and brief videos included with tweets serve in information warfare.

"Power relations are relations of domination and subordination, where dominant groups exercise power over subordinate groups, and where this power is sustained by ideology." (Fairclough, 2001, p. 38). Thus power relations, according to Fairclough, emphasizes that discourse is a site of power struggle, where dominant groups maintain control, and marginalized groups resist. The key elements in power relations are dominance vs resistance, hegemony and access to discourse.

→ Dominance vs. Resistance (How languages reinforce or challenge power structures).

→ Hegemony (Gramscian influence - how power is maintained through consent rather than coercion).

→ Access to Discourse (Who gets to speak, and who is silenced).

3. Methodology

The present study examines how Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during the Israel-Palestine ceasefire period linguistically construct power relations through strategic lexical choice, grammatical structures, and metaphorical framing. Further, it analyzes how textual and discursive features marginalize alternative narratives and strengthen Israeli hegemony, and investigates the role of intertextual references to history and religion in legitimizing Israeli dominance and sustaining asymmetrical power structures in the Israel-Palestine conflict. To obtain the objectives, the study adopts a qualitative research design which comes under interpretivist or constructivist paradigm. Qualitative research is defined by (Creswell, 2018, p. 47) as "an approach which focuses on exploring and understanding the meanings individuals or groups ascribe to social or human problems". Qualitative research collects rich and detailed data about human experiences and behaviors in words, images and narratives. In last, the term qualitative research describes methods of empirical investigation that gather, examine and display data in narrative or thematic form to explore meanings, and experiences (Creswell, 2018). In order to investigate how Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during the Israel-Palestine ceasefire period establish and maintain ideological dominance and asymmetrical power relations, this study used Norman

Fairclough's (1992, 1995) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Textual analysis (micro-level), discursive practice (meso-level), and sociocultural practice (macro-level) were the three interrelated levels through which the analysis was conducted.

"Population is a group of individuals who have the same characteristic" (Creswell, 2014, p. 142). In this study, the target population is "all tweets posted by Benjamin Netanyahu during the Israel-Palestine ceasefire period ", which are 30 in total including written tweets and videos (ceasefire period is from Jan 19, 2025 to Mar 18, 2025. "A sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researchers plan to study" (Creswell, 2014, p. 142). The sample is "15 written tweets selected from 30 tweets posted by Benjamin Netanyahu during ceasefire period ", ceasefire period is from Jan 19, 2025 to Mar 18, 2025.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1. Text (Description-Micro-Level Analysis)

In textual analysis, lexical choices, grammar, syntax, metaphors, rhetorical devices, modality, transitivity, intertextuality and presuppositions are focused.

4.1.1. Lexical choices (Word Selection and Connotations)

The word "launched" is used instead of "began" or "stated" which means a strategic action making it more official. The word "eradicate" is used instead of "flight" or "reduce" which suggests total elimination making the enemy like a plague that must be eliminated completely. The tweet also uses words like "terrorism" instead of "militants" or "armed groups" which frames the Palestinians as universal evil. "Judea and Samaria", instead of "West bank" is used which is an Israeli nationalist term.

4.1.2. Grammar and Syntax (Sentence Structure, Active/ Passive Voice)

The tweet uses complex sentences like "Under the direction… launched a large-scale …." which creates a formal tone and establishes Israeli authority.

4.1.3. Dominant Use of Active Voice

The tweet dominantly preferences active voice as in "We are acting systematically", "the IDF… launched" which emphasizes Israeli deliberate control. The tweet strategically avoids the use of passive voice which prevents ambiguity and dominating the Israeli agency.

4.1.4. Parallel structure

"Parallel structure is also observed in the tweet like, "In Gaza, Lebanon, Syria, Yamen and

Judea and Samaria" which creates persuasion in rhythmical way along with emphasis on geographical scope.

4.1.5. Metaphors and Rhetorical Devices (Persuasive Language)

Metaphors like "Iron wall" evokes historical Zionist security concept and connotes strength, "Extends its arms" personifies Iran as a threatening country having limbs, frames creeping danger and implies that there is a need to "cut off" these limbs.

4.1.6. Modality

Netanyahu's tweet shows high modality rather than weak modality which is strong and certain language. Like in "launched a large-scale and significant military operation", "to eradicate terrorism". The statement "launched a large-scale and significant military operation to eradicate terrorism" demonstrates high modality through its forceful, absolute language, despite lacking explicit modal verbs. The use of "large-scale and significant" conveys unwavering commitment, while "to eradicate" (rather than softer terms like "reduce") signals a definitive, uncompromising goal. The absence of hedging words (e.g., "might," "could") further reinforces certainty and resolve, aligning with high-modality communication by leaving no room for doubt. This dominant use of high modality makes the statement more authoritative, reinforces the claims that Israel's actions are necessary and non-negotiable. It is also a sort of justification that actions of Israeli military are absolute imperative, not a debatable choice. Weak modality like "Hedges" is notable absent which projects total confidence. (Hedges are might, could, possible etc).

4.2. Transitivity

Assignment of Agency: "IDF, Shin Bet and Israeli Police" are primary agents and actors which are granted agency. Government/military is represented as unified actor through the use of "we" in "We are acting".

Actors Denied Agency: Palestinian combatants are reduced to "terrorism" and civilians are completely erased.

Material Processes: Framing of Actions:"Launched... operation" represents material processes.

Relation processes: Like in "this is another step" naturalizes violence as continuation while "strengthening security" presents outcome as inevitable.

Mental processes: which address emotions are avoided along with behavioral processes (hide human experiences).

Background Elements: The tweet systematically erases Palestinian casualties and injuries, property destruction and historical context of Israeli occupation of Palestinians.

4.3. Intertextuality

The tweet implies biblical and Jewish historical intertextuality. Like in "generation of the desert" is a reference to the Israelites who left Egypt but had to endure the difficulties before entering the Promised Land. This personalizes Ethiopian Jews as modern-day Israelites completing their exodus. "Exile vs. Home" references the contrast between the Jewish concepts; Galut (exile) with Geulah (redemption) which is a frequent occurring subject matter in Jewish thought specifically in Zionist ideology. Longing vs. fulfillment resonates with Moses (1984), a real-world event named after the biblical Moses who led the Israelites to freedom.

4.4. Presuppositions

"There is exile, here is home". It presupposes that life in diaspora is incomplete and life in Israel is complete. "We applaud the generation of the desert...". It presupposes the struggle of Ethiopian Jews as divinely ordained, parallel to the biblical exodus. "I am proud of you; I am proud of them." It presupposes the Netanyahu's pride in both perseverance of Ethiopian Jews and the role of Israel in their rescue. All these presuppositions reinforce a Zionist narrative of exile and redemption and frame Israel as the final Jewish people destination.

Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during Israel-Palestine ceasefire period linguistically construct power relations through strategic use of lexical choices. This is shown in table number 1.

Table 1: Strategic Lexical Choices Serve Ideological Function and the Power Relations Constructed

Strategic Lexical Choices	Alternative Term	Ideological Function	Power Relation Constructed

Special operation	Military aid	Legitimizes actions, implies exclusivity and precision.	Frames Israeli intervention as necessary and controlled.
Launched	Began	Implies strategic, official action.	Makes actions appear deliberate and authoritative, rather than spontaneous.
Eradicate	Reduce	Suggests total elimination (dehumanizing enemy).	Frames the enemy as plague that must be completely destroyed, justifying extreme measures.
Terrorism	Militants	Universalizes Palestinian resistance as evil.	Denies political legitimacy-framing opposition as inherently immoral.
Judea and Samaria	West Bank	Uses Israeli nationalist terminology.	Asserts territorial claims, normalizing Israeli sovereignty over Palestinian occupied land.
False leftist claims	Opposing views	Implies intentional deception (not just disagreement).	Discredits critics as malicious, not merely mistaken, reinforcing
			distrust.
Obstacle	Resisted	Positions Hamas as blocking peace (not resisting occupation).	Shifts blame for conflict into Hamas, framing Israel as seeking peace.

Maximalist demands	Key demands	Implies Hamas is unreasonable, unwilling to negotiate.	Justifies refusal to engage diplomatically by portraying Hamas as inflexible
Did not seriously intend	Did not agree	Suggests deceit (bad faith) rather than mere disagreement.	Reinforces narrative that the opponent (Hamas) cannot be trusted.

Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during Israel-Palestine ceasefire period linguistically construct power relations through strategic use of grammatical structures. This is shown in table 2.

Table 2: Strategic Use of Grammatical Structures Linguistically Construct Power Relations

Feature	**Example**	**Effect on Power Relations**
Dominant active voice	"We returned", "we completed", "we will continue".	Reinforces Israeli agency and control; avoids ambiguity in responsibility.
Avoidance of passive voice	Prefers "we returned" over passive alternatives (e.g., "host ages were returned").	Keeps focus on Israeli actions, obscuring external influence or shared responsibility.
Complex embedded clause	"The picture… has been placed before my eyes... as daily testimony".	Adds gravitas and authority, framing statements as solemn or historically significant.
Parallel structure	"Mission to restore Oron… mission to restore Hacter".	Creates persuasive rhythm and reinforces ideological consistency.
Formal complex sentences	"Under the direction... launched large-scale... "	Establishes authority through structured, official-sounding language.

Geographical parallelism	"In Gaza, Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, and Judea, and Samaria".	Emphasis scope of Israeli influences/actions while maintaining rhetorical flow.
Passive voice for blaming-shifts	"A deal that was supposed to take place... "(omits who failed)".	Shifts responsibility (e.g., onto Hamas or others) while avoiding direct accusation of Israel.
Declarative statements	"Hamas is the only one who posed an obstacle to the deal".	Asserts blame definitively, closing off counterarguments.
Reported speech for legitimacy	"McGurk reveals the truth".	Uses external sources to frame claims as objective facts.
Biblical/universal parallelism	"There is exile, here is home... There is longing, how is fulfillment".	Elevates Israel's role to myth/biblical level, reinforcing Ideological dichotomies.
Short declarative sentences	"I am proud of you. We applaud the generation of the desert".	Adds emotional weight and directness, reducing ambiguity.

4.5. Discursive Practices (Interpretation - Meso-Level Analysis)

To examine discursive practices, elements like interdiscursivity, intertextuality, hegemony, power, genre, and style in the Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets were focused.

Table 3: Pronominal Strategy

Pronoun	**Frequency**	**Function**
"We"	8x	Collective Israeli Authority
"Our"	7x	Possessive Nationalism
"They"	5x	Hamas as Absolute Other

Table 3 shows that pronominal choices are not neutral but serve as ideological functions. They show how language is used in political discourse to perpetuate power structures. In textual analysis, "we" as a linguistic effect, merges speaker and audience

into a single authoritative entity. “Our” excludes other and “they” reinforces binary opposition. In discursive practices, these pronouns are produced from political discourse, consumed by Israelis in specific and international observers in specific. In social practice, these pronouns reinforce state authority and as an ideological effect sustains Israeli nationalism.

4.6. Interdiscursivity

"Israel decided to withdraw from it about a month ago" is a political or diplomatic discourse. "Crimes against humanity and war crimes committed by Hamas … worst massacre since the Holocaust", is a moral or legal discourse. "This is not the Human Rights Council, this is The Blood Rights Council", is a satirical or propaganda discourse. "Terrorist organization Hamas... false accusations.", is a counterterrorism discourse.

4.7. Intertextuality

"Israel decided to withdraw from it about a month ago". This statement uses manifest intertextuality by explicitly referencing an official decision of Israel to leave the UNHRC. It also functions while presenting the response as justified. “Worst massacre committed against the Jewish people since the Holocaust. This statement is a manifest intertextuality because it explicitly references to Holocaust discourse. "Terrorist organization Hamas ... crimes against humanity" uses constitutive intertextuality by implicitly referencing to post-9/11 counter-terrorism frameworks. "Exposed as... false accusations." is a conspiracy discourse which is also constitutive intertextuality whereas implicitly referencing incorporation of elements of conspiracy rhetoric. It also echoes populist "fake news" narratives.

4.8. Hegemony and Power

"Anti-Semitic, rotten, terrorist-supporting" (UN) vs. victims of worst massacre since Holocaust" (Israel). This statement presents absolute moral dichotomy which constructs moral authority. As hegemonic effect, non-negotiable moral positions are created where criticism gives space to "antisemitism". In "worse massacre ... since the Holocaust" implies hegemonic function as a monopolization of Jewish suffering in order to shield Jews from contemporary criticism. "False accusations ... unfounded accusations". This statement erases counter-narratives with declaration that opposing claims are invalid without the engagement of UN. Israel as a dominant group constructs complete monopoly without mentioning the UN documentation of Palestinians rights violations.

4.9. Style Analysis

By analyzing style, the construction of identity through pronominal strategy was found.

Table 4: Pronominal Strategy

Pronoun/Noun Phrase	Frequency	Function
The anti-Israel circus called the UN "Human Rights" council.	1	Dehumanizes the UNHRC.
It refers to "UNHRC"	2	Denies agency.
"Israel" (proper noun as subject)	1	Grants full agency.
"The terrorist organization Hamas"	1	Pre-emptively delegitimizes Hamas. Denies neutral reference.
"The UN" (collective noun)	1	Personifies the UN as a singular antagonist.
"This" (cataphoric reference)	1	Creates a binary opposition. Reinforces demonization.

Table 4 shows that pronominal and noun phrase choices are never neutral but instead serve ideological functions, shaping perceptions in political discourse.in linguistic analysis, terms like "the anti-Israel circus" dehumanize the UNHRC, while "it" denies agency, and "the terrorist organization Hamas" preemptively delegitimizes. On the other hand, "Israel" as a proper noun gives full agency, strengthening its legitimacy, whereas collective nouns like "the UN" personify it as a singular antagonist. Cataphoric references like "this" enforce binary opposition, deepening demonization. In discursive practices, these discursive strategies are produced in political rhetoric, consumed by targeted audiences. In social practices, these pronominal strategies strengthen state authority by framing Israel as rational and its opponents as irrational or threatening, thus sustaining nationalist ideologies.

Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during Israel-Palestine ceasefire period marginalize alternative narratives and strengthen Israeli hegemony through discursive features. This is shown in table 5.

Table 5: Discursive Features Marginalize Alternatives Roles and Strengthen Hegemony

Discursive Feature	Example from Tweet	Function in Marginalizing Alternatives	Role in Strengthening Hegemony
War & Counterterrorism Discourse	“Hamas is responsible...target Hamas Terrorists”.	Frames conflict as a necessary counter-terrorism operation, silencing critiques of Israeli military actions.	Naturalizes Israeli violence as self-defense, reinforcing state authority.
Human Rights and Victimhood Discourse	"Murdered our people, raped our women..."	Positions Israel as the sole victims, erasing Palestinian suffering and historical context.	Justifies Israeli policies by portraying them as morally righteous.

The role of religious and historical intertextuality in legitimizing Israeli dominance and sustaining asymmetrical power structures in the Israel-Palestine conflict in Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during Israel-Palestine ceasefire period.

4.10. Sociocultural Practices (Explanation - Macro Level Analysis)

To examine sociocultural practices, power relations, ideology and social change in the Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets were analyzed.

4.10.1. Dominance vs. Resistance:

Dominanc

"An Anti-American and antisemitic corrupt court". This statement portrays the ICC as an illegitimate institution which reinforces US-Israeli geopolitical power. "Defend America and Israel". This statement constructs a binary opposition between Us (sovereign nations) vs. Them (ICC as a hostile entity). The suggestion that legal proceedings are an attack rather than justice is weaponization through "Lawfare" which delegitimizes ICC actions.

Resistance

"Investigation of war crimes" is one US-Israeli policy. It is resisted by ICC which represents a counterpower. Netanyahu resists international legal authority by preferencing

national sovereignty over global justice by disapproving the ICC as "ruthless" and "corrupt".

4.10.2. Hegemony (Gramscian Influence)

"Protects brave soldiers" is a moral justification and naturalizes US-Israeli dominance. "No jurisdiction or basis" sets a hegemonic perspective which frames Western powers as ultimate settler of legal norms by implying that ICC's authority is fabricated.

4.10.3. Access to Discourse

The narrative of Trump is amplified by the speaker (Netanyahu) which strengthens elite power structures. Tagging @realDonaldTrump is the mobilization of partisan discourse which ensures among his followers.

Table 6: Conclusion: Power Relations in the Tweet

Power Aspect	**How it Manifests**
Dominance	US/Isreal framed as defenders; ICC as illegitimate.
Resistance	Rejection of ICC authority as “Lawfare”
Hegemony	Sovereignty naturalized, criticism dismissed as “antisemitic”
Access	Pro-Trump voice amplified; ICC perspective excluded.

4.11. Naturalization of Power Structures

"Corrupt court that has no jurisdiction". This statement assumes that "the ICC has no legitimate authority over the U.S. or Israel. This assumption strengthens the idea that powerful nations are excluded and exempted from international law which strengthens sovereignty as absolute. “Anti-American and antisemitic corrupt court." This statement assumes that The ICC's actions are inherently "anti-American" and "antisemitic." This delegitimizes criticism of Israel or the US by associating it with bigotry, making opposition seem morally wrong rather than legally justified.

4.11.1. Legitimation of Military Power

"Protects the sovereignty of both countries and its brave soldiers." This statement assumes that the protection of "brave soldiers" is the justification which defies the ICC.

This heroic framing legitimizes military actions (even controversial ones) as inherently noble which discourages scrutiny.

Table 7: Ideological Work in The Tweet

Ideological Mechanism	How it Works in the Text
Naturalization	The idea that ICC is inherently biased.
Legitimation	The heroic framing of military actions, sovereignty and soldier-protection justify defying ICC.

4.11.2. Discursive Shifts

"No jurisdiction or basis to engage in law fare against us". This statement shifts from traditional discourse "rule of law" (ICC is framed as a neutral arbiter of international justice) to "law fare" discourse – which is a term used that legal actions are politically motivated attacks rather than legitimate judicial processes. The social change effect is observed in normalizing the idea that powerful nations can reject legal accountability.

"Protects the sovereignty of both countries and its brave soldiers". This statement shifts from traditional discourse "accountability (International courts exist to hold nations accountable for human rights violations) to "sovereignty protection" actions that the attacks of ICC's are showed as attack on sovereignty. The social change effect is observed that it strengthens the nationalist exceptionalism, where actions of military are framed as shield from criticism under the banner of "self-defense".

4.12. Institutional Re-contextualizations

Political Discourse → Media Amplification: In the original context, Trump's executive was a political maneuver which serves to sanction ICC officials. But as a recontextualization, the order is made as a moral defense against "antisemitic" court. As a result, this changes the debate from legal arguments to cultural-political warfare which makes opposition unpatriotic.

National Security Discourse → Populist Rhetoric: In the original context, the U.S. has long resisted ICC jurisdiction. But as a recontextualization, resistance is showed as a way of protection of "brave soldiers". As a result, this portrays ICC as an enemy of the people which mobilizes populist support. In conclusion, the social change effects of this discourse as they normalize defiance of international law which exempt the US and Israel from global accountability. They also politicize judicial institutions in a way which shifts the ICC from a legal body into a political enemy in public discourse. This discourse shows

a wider trend in right-wing populism: rejecting multilateralism in favor of unilateral sovereignty.

5.FINDINGS

5.1. Common Patterns in Textual Analysis and Discourse Strategies

Lexical Choices: Netanyahu's tweets employ strategic word choices (e.g., "eradicate," "terrorism,""Judea and Samaria") to frame Israel's actions as necessary and precise while delegitimizing Palestinian resistance. These terms construct power relations by portraying Israel as morally justified, Hamas as irredeemably evil, and Palestinian territories as inherently Israeli. Grammatical Structures: Through dominant active voice, parallelism, and declarative statements, Netanyahu's language reinforces Israeli agency and control while shifting blame to Hamas. Complex clauses and biblical references add authority, while passive voice selectively obscures responsibility, sustaining Israel's dominant narrative. Metaphorical Framing: Metaphors like the "Iron Wall" and "sacred duty" militarize Israel's actions as divinely ordained, while familial and obstacle metaphors cast Netanyahu as a protector and Hamas as a barrier to peace. These devices naturalize Israeli hegemony and dehumanize Palestinian resistance. Discursive Marginalization: By framing the conflict through war, victimhood, and geopolitical discourse, Netanyahu silences Palestinian perspectives. Pronominal strategies ("we" vs. "they") and genre conventions (blame attribution) reinforce Israeli moral superiority and justify asymmetrical power structures. Religious-Historical Intertextuality: References to Zionist ideology ("Iron Wall"), Jewish theology ("exile vs. home"), and U.S. counter-terrorism rhetoric legitimize Israeli dominance. These intertextual links sanctify military actions while erasing Palestinian narratives, sustaining an unequal status quo.

The strategic use of words in this discourse serves the function to construct a specific ideological narrative which frames actions of Israel as legitimate and portrays its opponents (Palestinians) as illegitimate and threatening. The use of euphemistic terms like "special operation" and "launched," the text puts action of military as official and strategic, while words like "terrorism" and "eradicate" dehumanize Palestinian resistance. Biblical language ("my dears," "Judea and Samaria," "Operation Moshe") strengthens Israeli nationalism and Jewish religious legitimacy, presents Israeli leadership as both paternal and historically justified. At the same time, phrases like "false leftist claims" and "maximalist demands" discredit critics and depict Hamas as deceitful and unreasonable. Ultimately, these discursive tactics frame perception through reinforcement of power structures, justify Israeli political actions, and marginalize opposing viewpoints of

Palestinians and Muslim World, demonstrate that how language can be used as a tool of ideological control and persuasion.

In this study, grammar and syntax such as active/passive voice, sentence structure, and parallelism help to reveal how language constructs power and ideology. The dominant use of active voice ("we returned," "we will continue") strengthens the speaker's authority and avoids passive voice which prevents shifting responsibility. Complex sentences and embedded clauses add authority, while parallel structures create persuasive rhythms for the purpose to reinforce key ideas (e.g., Israeli actions vs. Hamas blame). Declarative statements and strategic passive constructions presents arguments the argument of speaker as objective truths. Ultimately, these discursive tactics serve to assert dominance, legitimize actions, and effects public perception by focusing on control, assigning blame, and reinforcing ideological narratives.

The use of high modality by the speaker functions to assert power, legitimize his authority, and naturalize ideological claims as objective truths. By employing definitive language ("we will not rest," "this is not true," "to eradicate terrorism"), a discourse of unquestionable certainty is constructed by the speaker, presents Israel's actions as morally and historically justified and the opposing viewpoints are marginalized. This erasure of weak modality (hedges, qualifiers) eliminates space for critique, and frames a binary opposition such as Israel as righteous, Hamas as deceptive and aligning his narrative with Zionist and theological ideologies. Ultimately, these discursive tactics strengthens domination, frames public perception by presenting his view as the only absolute truth.

Transitivity in the study reveals that how language constructs power relations, agency, and ideological positioning through the use of foregrounding or backgrounding certain actors and processes. The analysis shows that material processes (e.g., "we returned," "launched operation") emphasize Israeli state efficacy and military dominance while omitting Palestinian agency and suffering. Relational processes (e.g., "who fell," "this is another step") naturalize violence from the side of Israel, strengthens dominant narratives. Meanwhile, the strategic erasure of Palestinian experiences, the attribution of violence solely to Hamas, and the passive presentation of Ethiopian Jews all function to legitimize Israeli state actions, obscure accountability, and reinforce asymmetrical power structures. the analysis exposes how discourse perpetuates ideological control and social hierarchies. By examining who is given agency and whose actions are omitted, the analysis exposes that how discourse perpetuates ideological control and social hierarchies.

Presuppositions in the study serve to construct and strengthen dominant ideological narratives that legitimize state power, justify military actions, and marginalize opposing perspectives. By implicit assumptions within discourse, the speaker naturalizes Israeli state

authority, portrays Israeli military operations as morally justified, and presents resistance movements like Hamas as irrational which as a byproduct delegitimize Palestinian authority. Additionally, the Zionist narrative of exile and redemption is perpetuated, positioning Israel as the mother homeland for Jews and dismisses diasporic experiences. These presuppositions serve to shape public perception, maintain hegemonic control, and obscure critiques, ultimately reinforcing ideological goals of the speaker and the Israeli state.

5.2. Broader Existing Ideologies Supported and Challenged by Discourse

The discourse in tweets of Benjamin Netanyahu supports several dominant ideologies, primarily nationalist militarism, Western-style counter-terrorism, and Zionist exceptionalism. Through war rhetoric, this discourse frames actions of Israel as morally justified ("terrorists," "self-defense"), it aligns with neoconservative security doctrines that prioritize military solutions. The emphasis on Jewish victimhood ("worst massacre since the Holocaust") strengthen trauma nationalism, which weaponizes historical suffering to justify contemporary Israeli state violence. Moreover, the discourse upholds U.S.-aligned geopolitical hegemony through celebration of Trump's support which position Israel as a frontline ally in the "clash of civilizations" narrative. These ideologies collectively naturalize Israeli state power and marginalize internal and external critiques as illegitimate or antisemitic.

This discourse stands in opposition to several counter-hegemonic ideologies, particularly anti-colonial critiques, Palestinian liberation narratives, and international human rights frameworks which challenge Israel's military occupation and settlement policies. Decolonization discourse is rejected by showing all resistance as "terrorism," which views Palestinian armed struggle as legitimate resistance to occupation. The discourse also opposes cosmopolitan humanitarianism which advocates for equal rights and protections for both Israelis and Palestinians, instead promoting an exclusionary ethnonationalist vision. Moreover, it marginalizes critical anti-war perspectives that question militarized solutions, as well as post-nationalist ideologies that envision shared sovereignty or binational coexistence. The step by step and strategic delegitimization of UN institutions and human rights organizations reveals its antagonism toward global governance frameworks that seek to hold states accountable for violations of international law.

6. Conclusion

Using Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model, the current study critically analysed Benjamin Netanyahu's tweets during the

Israel-Palestine ceasefire period in order to identify the ideological and power-laden elements present in his online political message. Through grammatical agency, metaphorical framing, and selective lexical choices, Netanyahu's language strategically creates asymmetrical power relations that justify Israeli dominance and present state actions as morally acceptable responses to terrorism, according to the analysis. Intertextual allusions to historical victimization and global security discourses uphold a hegemonic worldview, while his tweets combine political, religious, and counter-terrorism narratives to strengthen collective national identity and silence dissenting voices. These linguistic and discursive tactics normalize Israel's political and military actions in the eyes of the world by reproducing larger ideologies of nationalism, militarism, and moral exceptionalism on a sociocultural level. Overall, Netanyahu's speech is a prime example of how social media can be a potent ideological tool that, in the modern mediated world, redefines global views of justice and conflict, legitimizes dominance through digital narrative control, and turns political rhetoric into moral truth.

References

Aharony, N. (2011). Twitter use by three political leaders: An exploratory analysis. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 63(6), 733–744.

Algurjia, H. D. A., Almukhtar, A. T. A., Mahdi, A. A., & Essa, S. M. (2024). *Manufacturing consent: A critical discourse analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech to the United States Congress in 2024. Journal of International Conflict, Rhetoric and Communication*, (issue/volume not always available online). [PDF]. Retrieved from JICRCR.

Atmawijaya, T. D. (2024). Reclaiming the narrative: A critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's 2024 Super Tuesday campaign speech. *k@ta, 26*(2), 87–102.

Barthes, R. (1967). *Elements of semiology*. Jonathan Cape.

Bhowmik, S., & Fisher, J. (2023). Framing the Israel–Palestine conflict 2021: Investigation of CNN's coverage from a peace journalism perspective. *Media, Culture & Society*. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231154766.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.) Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.) Sage publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.) Sage.

Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Introduction: the role of discourse analysis in society*. In Handbook of discourse analysis (Vol. 1). T. A. van Dijk (Ed). London: Academic Press.16.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* Longman.

Fairclough, N., &Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse social interaction*. Sage.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*. Pantheon Book.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method (4th ed.)*.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Eds) International Publishers.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*; Vol. 1. *Reason and the rationalization of society*. Beacon Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.

Hameleers, M. (2025). The visual nature of information warfare: the construction of visual disinformation narratives on social media. *Journal of Communication*, 75(2), 90

Kadim, E. N. (2023). A critical discourse analysis of Vladimir Putin‟s speech announcing „special military operation‟ in Ukraine. *International Journal of Humanities and Educational Research, 5*(1).

Kumar, R. (2019). Research methodology: *A step-by-step guide for beginners* (5th ed.). Sage.

Mumtaz, I., Zahra, F. T., & Hussain, I. K. (2023). A critical discourse analysis of President Barack Obama's Cairo speech "A new beginning." *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review, 7*(4), 606–618.

Nusrat, A., Sardaraz, K., & Shehzadi, S. (2020). Critical discourse analysis of Imran Khan‟s dharna speeches in socio-political perspective. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research (SJESR), 3*(1), 9–19.

Pressman, J. (2025). Israel's response to allegations of human rights violations. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*. (Article discussing Netanyahu tweets in context).

Rangkuti, R., & Yusuf, M. (2021). The impoliteness strategies of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Twitter. *LingPoet Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research, 2*(2), 24–37.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). SAGE.

Routledge.

Tzelgov, E. (2024). The political Twittersphere as a breeding ground for populist ideas: A neural-network analysis of the Israeli Twittersphere. *Social Media + Society*.

Van Dijk, T. A (2001). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, 35(1-2), 11-40.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1990). *Discourse and society: A new journal for a new research focus.Discourse and society*, 1(1), 5.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Principles of critical discourse analysis. Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). Blackwell.

Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Wodak, R. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Sage.