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**ABSTRACT:** *The study aims to understand how his psychological background, life experiences, and political ideology shaped these policies*. *A literature review method was employed to assess internal political, social, and economic factors influencing U.S. foreign policy.* *The study aims to understand how his psychological background, life experiences, and political ideology shaped these policies. A literature review method was employed to assess internal political, social, and economic factors influencing U.S. foreign policy. This study is limited to a literature review method, relying solely on secondary data and existing interpretations without direct verification through primary sources. Nevertheless, the findings imply that leadership psychology and domestic factors play a significant role in shaping foreign policy directions, particularly in the context of the Israel–Palestine conflict. This study offers a novel perspective by combining historical and psychological analyses to understand the personal and ideological factors behind Donald Trump’s foreign policy decisions in the Israel–Palestine conflict. By emphasizing the role of individual leadership psychology within the broader context of U.S. domestic politics, it contributes to a deeper understanding of how personal attributes can influence international diplomacy. The findings may serve as a foundation for future research exploring the psychological profiles of political leaders and their impact on foreign policy, particularly in prolonged geopolitical conflicts.*
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

The United States has played a central role in addressing the Israel–Palestine conflict, having facilitated various negotiations since 1987. Under President Donald Trump, U.S. foreign policy became notably more assertive, marked by the 2017 recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel (fitri & Faradilla Fadlia, 2019). This decision sparked widespread condemnation from numerous international actors, including the Arab League, the International Court of Justice, the European Union, and others. According to a Gallup International Association survey, 71% of global respondents opposed the policy. Despite the backlash, the Trump administration continued with a series of controversial actions, including the closure of the U.S. consulate for Palestinians in East Jerusalem (Thomas, 2011); (Nandareska, 2018); (Ruhiat & Akim, 2020).

On September 10, 2018, the Trump administration announced the closure of the PLO General Delegation Office in Washington, D.C., which had been established under the Oslo Accords (1993–1995). That same year, all U.S. financial aid to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for Palestinian refugees was also suspended (Jobain & Magdy, 2023). At the 2019 Bahrain Conference, Trump’s administration introduced its Israeli–Palestinian peace plan, known as the “Deal of the Century,” officially launched on January 28, 2020, as the “Peace to Prosperity” plan, or the Trump Peace Plan, crafted by Jared Kushner, Jason Greenblatt, and David Friedman (Paat, 2013); (Robinson, 2011).

The Trump Peace Plan consisted of two primary components: political and economic. Politically, it addressed issues such as borders, Jerusalem, refugees, and infrastructure. Economically, it aimed to strengthen the Palestinian economy and administrative capacities. Key elements included recognizing Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, designating Abu Dis as the capital of Palestine, maintaining Israeli control over the Jordan Valley and regional security, and deferring recognition of a Palestinian state under specific conditions. Palestinian refugees were only allowed to return to the new Palestinian state, not to Israeli territory (Schwartz & Wilf, 2020); (Firdaus & Yani, 2020). Furthermore, the plan stipulated that Israel would retain future security oversight over Palestine, including total disarmament in Gaza. Palestine would only be permitted an internal security force, with borders and airspace remaining under Israeli control—purportedly to prevent terror attacks and ensure safety for tourists and investors (Kifner & Myre, 2024); (Challand, 2009).

Many analysts argue that resolving the Israel–Palestine conflict hinges on two principal actors: the United States and Israel. Some Middle East observers suggest that U.S. involvement has been an obstacle to peace, as evidenced by numerous vetoes defending Israel in the United Nations. of 82 U.S. vetoes, 41 were related to this conflict. Additionally, the U.S. abstained from voting on Resolution 1860, which called for a ceasefire in Gaza. Among the 175 UN Security Council resolutions concerning Israel, 97 opposed Israeli actions, 74 were neutral, and only 4 supported Israel—excluding those vetoed by the United States (Jobain & Magdy, 2023); (Ruhiat & Akim, 2020).

America’s perceived partiality is a key factor in the longstanding stagnation of the peace process. Although both Barack Obama and Donald Trump showed support for Israel, their approaches differed significantly. Obama emphasized diplomacy and persuasive dialogue, while Trump adopted a more unilateral and aggressive stance, which arguably undermined existing peace efforts (Viveash, 2021).

The shift in U.S. foreign policy under Trump was influenced by internal factors that differentiated him from Obama. These factors include psychological and familial backgrounds that shaped each leader's character and worldview. On an individual level, personality differences significantly impacted decision-making: Trump, from a business-oriented family, exhibited assertive and impulsive traits, whereas Obama, raised in an academic and minority background, tended to be reflective and tolerant. Their political ideologies, shaped by differing social contexts, further influenced their responses to global challenges(Zubaidah & Herningtyas, 2021). At the group level, Trump, who lacked prior political experience, relied heavily on close confidants for policy decisions. In this context, Trump’s psycho-historical background emerges as a key determinant in understanding his unconventional political style regarding the Israel–Palestine conflict.

This study incorporates a review of prior research on U.S. foreign policy in the Israel–Palestine conflict and Trump’s peace proposals. The analysis draws on relevant data, including Trump’s social background, education, and career, which significantly influenced his political behavior as President (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2006).

Specifically, the study seeks to identify the role of psych historical factors and Donald Trump’s personal perspectives on the conflict as critical influences on the direction of U.S. foreign policy. Understanding these psych historical elements is vital to uncovering how a leader’s characteristics, life experiences, and personal attitudes can shape state policy, especially in complex international contexts. The research centers on how Trump’s psychological background and personal experiences influenced his administration’s foreign policy decisions.

To gather relevant data, the study relies on both primary and secondary sources, such as government reports, official speeches, and scholarly articles. These sources provide direct insight into the domestic factors that influenced U.S. foreign policy during Trump’s term, particularly regarding the Israel–Palestine conflict. These findings help to further explore how leadership ideology and personal worldview impact international policymaking (Khan & Mehdi, 2023).

Through in-depth analysis of psych historical factors in U.S. foreign policy, this study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how shifts in domestic leadership ideology can affect the international posture of a major global actor. In particular, it explores how such factors influence the U.S. approach to resolving major global and regional conflicts, such as the Israel–Palestine dispute. Trump's foreign policy, shaped by personal and political orientations, serves as a crucial example of how individual leadership can influence a nation’s international behavior in critical geopolitical issues.

This study also aims to contribute to the academic literature on the history of Islamic civilization in West Asia, particularly concerning the historical roots of the Israel–Palestine conflict. By analyzing the policy shifts under Donald Trump, it offers new insights into how changes in U.S. foreign policy reshape understandings of the conflict’s historical trajectory, enriching scholarly discourse on international political dynamics and providing valuable perspectives for academics and policymakers alike.

1. **METHOD**

This study adopts a qualitative approach using library research as the primary method for data collection. This method was chosen because the main focus of the research is to analyze the foreign policy of the United States during the Donald Trump administration from a psycho-historical perspective. Such an approach requires an in-depth review of relevant literature, documents, and political history sources.

Data were gathered from a variety of written sources, both primary and secondary, including official documents from the U.S. government, speeches by President Donald Trump, reports from international organizations, academic journal articles, biographical books, media archives, and previous studies related to U.S. foreign policy, the Israel–Palestine conflict, and psycho-historical theory.

The psycho-historical approach is employed to analyze the relationship between Donald Trump's psychological and social background and the foreign policies he implemented during his presidency, particularly in the context of the Israel–Palestine conflict. The analysis focuses on identifying elements of personality, life experiences, and ideological constructs that are reflected in Trump’s political actions and foreign policy decisions.

The data analysis techniques used include content analysis and contextual analysis of the documents and sources reviewed. All collected data are thematically analyzed to identify patterns linking psycho-historical factors to political decisions related to the Israel–Palestine issue. Interpretation is conducted holistically, taking into account the temporal context, geopolitical conditions, and domestic dynamics underlying the formulation of these policies.

The findings of this study are presented in a descriptive-analytical format, aiming to provide a comprehensive understanding of how psycho-historical factors can act as determinants in shaping a nation's foreign policy, and their implications for the dynamics of international conflict (Gunawan, 2016).

**III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**Result**

Personalistic Populism

H.C. Warren, as cited in Kurnia, L.F. (2019), defines personalistic populism as a comprehensive mindset developed throughout an individual's life, encompassing various aspects such as character, intellect, temperament, moral capacity, and attitudes shaped by life experiences. These traits, in turn, influence the individual's political orientation. Based on this, Herman and Falkowski identify several personal characteristics that reflect political personality, such as high nationalism, strong self-control, a strong desire for affiliation, high conceptual complexity, distrust of others, and a great passion for power. Conversely, there are also characteristics with lower levels, such as low nationalism, weak self-control, and so on (Kurnia, 2019).

In general, developed countries tend to view the state's role as a primary factor in determining their foreign policy. On the other hand, developing countries are more influenced by the idiosyncratic factors of decision-makers or leaders in shaping their foreign policy orientation. According to Rosenau, this difference occurs because developing countries often face more challenges related to bureaucracy compared to developed countries.

The unique style or behavior (often anti-mainstream) that influences a leader's foreign policy decisions includes four important interrelated aspects. Each leader has distinct characteristics and approaches, shaped by various elements in their lives. The first aspect is family background. This factor involves social background, economic conditions, and how the leader interacts with society around them. Family is often the first place where an individual learns social and cultural values, which subsequently shape their worldview. If a leader grows up in a family with a high social status and extensive social networks, this can broaden their perspective in making foreign policy decisions, especially in the context of broader international relations (Rizal et al., 2024); (Keita et al., 2023).

The second aspect is education. A leader's academic journey, from primary to higher education, provides an important foundation for their thinking and actions. Education not only includes formal knowledge gained in schools or universities but also non-formal learning experiences, such as training or international experiences that can enrich their understanding. Leaders with diverse and global educational backgrounds often have a more open approach to international cooperation, while those with limited education may be more conservative in their foreign policy. Therefore, a leader's academic journey can significantly influence how they view the world and formulate foreign policy.

Third, the experiences and lessons a leader gain from social dynamics they have encountered throughout their life play a crucial role. These experiences may include their interactions with various societal groups, involvement in organizations or social movements, and their understanding of social conflicts in their country or even globally. Such experiences can shape a leader’s stance on various global issues and determine how they respond to international crises. Leaders with field experience, such as in diplomacy or international relations, tend to be more pragmatic and realistic in decision-making, while those with less experience may be more influenced by ideologies or idealistic approaches.

The fourth aspect is affiliation with political elites, which also plays a decisive role in a leader’s foreign policy. The political party or elite group supporting the leader plays an essential role in shaping their political views. This affiliation often leads to the formulation of foreign policies consistent with the ideology and political interests of the ruling party. For example, a leader from a party with a certain political orientation may be more likely to follow a foreign policy that supports alliances with ideologically aligned countries. Conversely, a leader with a more independent background or not tied to a particular elite group may be freer to make more flexible and unpredictable foreign policy decisions.

In addition to these four aspects, a leader's unique style or anti-mainstream behavior is also influenced by how they process the knowledge gained from their social and educational backgrounds. Leaders who can integrate various information and perspectives from their life experiences tend to have a more holistic and bold approach to global issues. How they combine this knowledge, through analytical skills or sharp political instincts, will greatly determine how foreign policy is shaped.

This unique leadership style, which may not align with mainstream views or approaches, often creates foreign policies that are controversial or innovative but can also have a significant impact on international relations. Thus, a leader's foreign policy decisions are not the result of a single factor, but rather a combination of various elements that mutually influence each other. Factors such as family background, education, life experiences, and political elite affiliation shape a leader’s worldview, while their unique or anti-mainstream style or behavior creates new approaches in formulating foreign policies that differ from existing norms.

To understand the unique style or behavior (anti-mainstream) of a leader, a psych historical approach is needed, aiming to classify the personality types of individuals. Psych-historical research has been conducted since the 1920s to delve deeper into the personality traits, characteristics, and motivations of individuals behind their political actions. James David Barber, a political scientist, argued that a leader's character significantly influences how they carry out leadership throughout their tenure. According to Barber, as cited by Kegley & Wittkopf (1996), a president can be understood by looking at their style (the usual way they perform their political role), worldview (politically relevant beliefs), and, most importantly, their character in how they face life—not just for a moment but consistently throughout their term (Zubaidah & Herningtyas, 2021).

Background of Donald Trump

Donald John Trump, born on June 14, 1946, in Queens, New York, is one of the most controversial figures in the history of American politics and business. As the fourth child of Fred Trump, a real estate developer from the Bronx and a German immigrant, and Mary Anne MacLeod Trump, who was of Scottish descent, Trump grew up in an affluent environment full of opportunities (Bard, 2020). From an early age, he was surrounded by the world of business through his father, who was successful in the real estate industry. After completing his early education at Fordham University in 1964, Trump continued his studies at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania, where he earned a Bachelor of Science in Economics in 1968. His prestigious educational background provided an important foundation for his career in business.

As an heir to The Trump Organization, Trump began his professional journey by taking over the family business in 1971. As an entrepreneur, he became known for his ability to develop large-scale real estate projects, although his business journey was not always smooth. Trump faced several significant challenges, including financial losses that nearly led to bankruptcy during the 1990s recession in the United States. However, he managed to recover and maintain his position as one of the leading entrepreneurs globally by venturing into other sectors, such as Trump Airlines, Trump University, Trump Vodka, Trump Mortgage, and Trump Steaks. His remarkable success in the business world, despite the challenges, earned him widespread recognition as "The Donald," a figure known for his adaptability and resilience in overcoming crises (Kumaraswamy, 2020); (Kurnia, 2019).

Outside the business world, Trump also built a career in entertainment, particularly as the host of the popular television show The Apprentice, which further solidified his image as a prominent figure in the United States. However, his political career revealed that Trump had a unique viewpoint and approach, often at odds with mainstream American politics. Trump's political career began with his affiliation with the Republican Party in 1987, although he changed parties several times, including joining the Independence Party in 1999, the Reform Party in 1999, the Democratic Party in 2001, and returning to the Republican Party in 2009. In 2011, he was briefly unaffiliated with any party but eventually returned to the Republican Party in 2012. His first political speech took place in 2011 at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), where he expressed his views on the primaries.

Trump’s decision to run for President of the United States in 2015 brought a wave of change to the American political landscape. During his campaign, Trump became known for several controversial ideas that drew public attention, one of which was his stance on illegal immigration. He called for Mexico to pay for the construction of a wall on the U.S.-Mexico border, which he claimed would solve the problem of illegal immigration, which he saw as a source of poverty and crime in the U.S. Additionally, Trump’s views on Islam became a focal point, as he frequently made statements considered Islamophobic. These views were reflected in his speeches condemning Muslims and Islamic countries. This stance reinforced the perception that Trump often exploited the public’s fear of immigrants and terrorism to gain political support, highlighting violence and racism in his rhetoric.

In terms of foreign policy, Trump made his position on the U.S.-Israel-Palestine conflict clear. From the onset of his presidential campaign, Trump developed a close relationship with AIPAC (American Israel Public Affairs Committee) and publicly declared his support for Israel. In March 2016, he attended an AIPAC meeting and delivered a speech reiterating the U.S. commitment to Israel (Robinson, 2011). His relationship with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu grew closer over time. In September 2016, a day before the first presidential debate, Trump met with Netanyahu to discuss key issues such as U.S.-Israel relations, military aid, and regional stability in the Middle East. As the election approached, surveys indicated that many people, including U.S.-Israeli dual citizens, expected a Trump administration to be more favorable to Israel, with 37% of respondents believing this (Viveash, 2021).

In the context of foreign policy, Trump demonstrated a different stance from his predecessor, Barack Obama, regarding Israel and Palestine. One notable moment was his rejection of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334, which condemned Israeli settlement construction in the occupied Palestinian territories. Prior to the resolution being discussed, Trump had publicly expressed his opposition to it. Furthermore, Trump succeeded in intervening in Egypt’s decision concerning a draft resolution in the UN Security Council, through a phone call with Egyptian President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi, urging Egypt to withdraw the resolution (Guardian, 2006).

Overall, Trump’s foreign policy, especially in relation to the Israel-Palestine conflict, reflected an approach that was more focused on bilateral relations with Israel. This marked a significant shift from previous U.S. foreign policies that emphasized a two-state solution to the conflict. Trump’s approach demonstrates how foreign policy can be influenced by the personal views of a leader and how domestic factors, as well as personal beliefs, can shape critical decisions in international relations

**Discussion**

Psycho-Historical Factors Influencing Donald Trump’s Foreign Policy

When comparing the psycho-historical backgrounds of Barack Obama and Donald Trump, it becomes clear that both figures exhibit profoundly different psychological orientations. According to the idiosyncratic approach outlined by Warren, psychological aspects such as intellectuality, temperament, morality, and life-formed attitudes significantly influence an individual's political personality orientation. Therefore, the psychological disparities between Obama and Trump can be seen as key factors shaping their respective political personalities.

These psychological dimensions are deeply influenced by the environments in which individuals are raised—physically, mentally, and spiritually. Obama’s upbringing in a multiracial family and his lived experiences across diverse regions, from Hawaii and Indonesia to Chicago and the broader United States, along with his education at prestigious universities, significantly informed his worldview. His political behavior can be characterized by the following indicators.

* 1. Lower Nationalism: As a global leader, Obama possessed an inclusive and open form of nationalism. His multiracial heritage and African-Muslim lineage from his father granted him a unique perspective on international relations. Additionally, his experiences in developing countries like Indonesia enriched his understanding of global dynamics. This global orientation allowed him to contextualize American national interests within a framework of interdependence, facilitating international cooperation in addressing transnational issues such as climate change, global poverty, and international terrorism.
  2. Low Distrust of Others: Obama demonstrated high tolerance for differences—racial, ethnic, and ideological. His multicultural upbringing cultivated an inclusive attitude, which translated into his political behavior, notably his tendency to listen attentively to diverse aspirations, especially during his tenure as senator and president. His low level of distrust enabled him to collaborate effectively with various domestic and international actors.
  3. High Need for Affiliation: Obama had a strong desire to foster relationships and affiliations. Early in his career, he was actively involved in social organizations like the Developing Communities Project and the Gamaliel Foundation, both of which championed civil rights and community empowerment. Even as president, Obama promoted multisectoral engagement to address major issues such as healthcare reform and the post-2008 economic recovery. His foreign policy approach also emphasized multilateral cooperation, as exemplified in the Iran nuclear agreement (JCPOA) and his commitment to combating climate (Gondo, 2012);(Kumaraswamy, 2020).
  4. High Conceptual Complexity: Obama was noted for his rational and analytical approach to resolving complex issues, including the Israeli–Palestinian conflict and North Korea's nuclear threat. His high conceptual complexity was reflected in his capacity to understand multi-variable, multifaceted international challenges. His multicultural upbringing contributed to his open and adaptive mindset. Major decisions such as the normalization of relations with Cuba and the “pivot to Asia” strategy illustrate the depth of his strategic thinking
  5. Low Belief in Control: Obama was not a leader who prioritized dominance or total control. Instead, he embraced collaborative and participatory decision-making. His approach to leadership, domestically and globally, emphasized consensus-building. For example, in the Israeli–Palestinian peace process, he acted as a mediator who encouraged both Benjamin Netanyahu and Mahmoud Abbas to engage directly, reflecting a governance style focused on trust-building and shared authority (Firdaus & Yani, 2020).

In contrast, Donald Trump—raised in a wealthy business-oriented family—was shaped by an environment of privilege and autonomy, which heavily influenced his political personality. Based on idiosyncratic theory, Trump’s political characteristics can be outlined as follows.

a. High Nationalism: Trump espoused strong nationalist views, prioritizing U.S. interests in all aspects of policy, including foreign affairs. His protectionist tendencies were evident in policies that explicitly favored American interests, notably his strong support for Israel in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. This stance aimed not only to support a key U.S. ally in the Middle East but also to solidify America’s strategic position in the region. His "America First" doctrine reflected a belief in leveraging alliances to bolster U.S. dominance, often at the expense of broader international consensus.

b. High Need for Power: As a businessman accustomed to control, Trump exhibited a high need for power and assertiveness. He frequently pursued unilateral decisions that favored direct U.S. advantages, such as the relocation of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem. He also employed economic leverage as a tool of foreign policy, including the imposition of tariffs and coercive diplomacy aimed at swaying countries away from supporting Palestine. These policies highlight Trump's inclination toward consolidating power and dominance in international affairs.

c. Low Conceptual Complexity: Unlike leaders who rely on multidimensional policy analysis, Trump favored straightforward, measurable solutions. He avoided complex, nuanced policy deliberations and instead pursued quick, decisive actions. This was evident in his simplistic approach to the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, which largely ignored the nuanced dynamics of the Palestinian side. Actions like moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, while symbolically significant, reflected a disregard for the long-term diplomatic implications.

d. High Need for Affiliation: Despite being a political outsider, Trump quickly recognized the importance of building networks and affiliations. He relied on close advisers, such as his son-in-law Jared Kushner, and cultivated relationships with influential groups like AIPAC. His political maneuvering demonstrated a pragmatic use of affiliations to advance his foreign policy agenda, especially regarding the Middle East. This need for affiliation was also visible in his strategic alignment with key political, business, and media figures.

Obama and Trump represent two fundamentally different political figures, both ideologically and in leadership approach. Obama, as a liberal Democrat, emphasized equity, social justice, and active government involvement in public welfare. His leadership was marked by a cooperative, diplomatic style, striving for inclusivity and consensus. His foreign policy prioritized multilateralism, diplomacy, and global collaboration on issues such as climate change, Iran's nuclear program, and the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.

Trump, on the other hand, as a right-wing conservative Republican, adopted a markedly different approach. He favored unilateralism, prioritizing American interests with little regard for international balance or the needs of other nations. His leadership was often characterized by bold, controversial policies that deviated from traditional norms. Guided by "America First," Trump emphasized domestic economic protection and national security, withdrawing from international agreements and undermining multilateral alliances.

Though from different parties, Trump also frequently acted outside traditional Republican boundaries, often clashing with party orthodoxy. His populist tendencies led him to respond directly to public sentiment, bypassing party structures and established governmental norms. This approach caused tensions within the Republican Party, which at times viewed his policies as overly radical or damaging to the party’s credibility.

These ideological contrasts profoundly shaped their respective foreign policies. Obama emphasized diplomacy and international dialogue, while Trump preferred to leverage economic and political power, even at the cost of escalating tensions. Each led the U.S. during distinct global contexts, with Obama championing democratic values, human rights, and multilateralism, and Trump emphasizing pragmatic nationalism, often at odds with international norms. As such, while both leaders wielded considerable global influence, their leadership styles illustrate a stark contrast in political philosophy and practice.

1. **CONCLUSION**

A conclusion section must be included and should indicate the paper's advantages, limitations, and possible applications. Although a conclusion may review the paper's main points, do not replicate the abstract as the conclusion.

Shifts in the foreign policy model of the President of the United States, particularly during Donald Trump’s administration, were influenced by various factors, with internal factors serving as the primary variable. These policy differences were largely driven by the psychological and historical backgrounds of each leader, as well as the family environments in which they were raised—factors that ultimately shaped their worldview and personal character. The psycho-historical approach employed in this study emphasizes the individual and group levels of analysis. This approach posits that a leader’s lived experiences and the psychological aspects shaped by their historical background are central in determining the direction of their policy decisions.

At the individual level, personality and belief systems are considered foundational to a leader’s political orientation and decision-making. In this context, Donald Trump’s personal character played a significant role in shaping his policies. Trump's upbringing in a wealthy business-oriented family contributed to the development of a personality marked by assertiveness, independence, and decisiveness—often characterized by a lack of prolonged deliberation. Meanwhile, at the group level, another crucial factor is the president’s immediate circle. Due to Trump’s limited political experience at the onset of his presidency, he relied heavily on close associates to fill key positions in his administration. The presence of these individuals significantly influenced his policy perspectives and decision-making processes.

Although both Barack Obama and Donald Trump shared the overarching goal of maintaining U.S. engagement in the Middle East—particularly in relation to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—their approaches diverged significantly. Trump adopted a more aggressive strategy, oriented toward unilateralism and confrontation, in line with his “America First” doctrine and his background as a businessman. This led him to explicitly favor Israel in policy matters. In contrast, President Barack Obama tended to apply a more normative and persuasive approach, shaped by his legal education and life experiences within a family that upheld values of tolerance and diversity. These differences in leadership style and policy approach demonstrate that a change in leadership in a global power such as the United States can profoundly impact the country’s direction and stance in long-standing international conflicts, such as the Israeli-Palestinian dispute.
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