

Ideological Discourse in Global Press Coverage of 2023 Gaza War

Prof. Dr. Hussein Ismail Haddad¹

¹Department of Journalism, College of Media and Mass Communication, University of Thi-Qar, Iraq

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026	This study investigates the ideological discourse embedding the global press coverage of the 2023 Gaza war, focusing critically on the systemic framing mechanisms employed by Western elite media and drawing comparative insights from contemporary Arab media research. Operating within the epistemological boundaries of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the paper examines how geopolitical alignments and institutional hegemonies shape journalistic narratives. Methodologically, the study adopts a synthesized dual-analytical approach, merging Teun van Dijk's Ideological Square with Theo van Leeuwen's Social Actors Representation framework. The Western research population comprises the English-language editions of Le Monde and The Guardian, analyzed through a purposive sample of text-heavy news articles published during the critical escalation phases. To counter-balance the analytical paradigm, findings are systematically contextualized with empirical Arab academic scholarship, including studies on media frameworks, agenda-setting, social responsibility, and value determinism. The structural dissection demonstrates how Western media reinforce asymmetrical power relationships by criminalizing subaltern actors and obscuring state accountability, whereas regional Arab scholarship exposes a profound axio-political struggle against Western media hegemony, structurally prioritizing humanitarian solidarity, casualties and relief over military alignments. This research contributes significantly to the broader scholarship on conflict reporting, ideological polarization, and critical media literacy.
Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis Ideological Square Media Bias Le Monde The Guardian 2023 Gaza War	

1. Introduction

The ongoing conflict in Palestine, culminating in the critical escalation of the 2023 Gaza war, cannot be analyzed as an isolated, contemporary rupture detached from its historical anchors. Within the paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), texts and news narratives must be scrutinized as reflections of long-standing colonial and empirical practices. The linguistic framing of the 2023 Gaza war within global media bodies is intrinsically tied to a century-long trajectory of dispossession, military occupation, and shifting geopolitical alliances. This war marks a new, intensified phase where institutional global bodies fail to implement international humanitarian laws, and where elite newsrooms face deep scrutinization regarding their professional objectivity. Mainstream Western journalism historically operates under socio-cognitive frameworks that prioritize state-sanctioned narratives and align with specific geopolitical axes. Consequently, the journalistic output during this conflict serves as an active space for ideological production. Understanding the historical continuity of narrative asymmetric construction is a vital prerequisite to deconstructing the covert linguistic maneuvers and semantic mechanisms utilized by global newspapers like The Guardian and Le Monde. Concurrently, exploring how these dominant architectures interface with regional Arab journalistic frameworks—which prioritize humanitarian reporting, values, and social responsibility—provides an empirical baseline for analyzing current transnational media asymmetries.

1.1 Ideology and Media Discourse

The ontological relationship between ideology, institutional hegemony, and linguistic production forms the core of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Far from being detached, neutral transcribers of objective reality, elite media institutions function as powerful ideological apparatuses that actively participate in the production, reproduction, and naturalization of dominant power dynamics (Fairclough, 1992, 2018; Foucault, 1980). Within contemporary socio-cognitive frameworks, ideology is defined not merely as a set of isolated political beliefs, but as the foundational social representations that regulate the collective social practices, attitudes, and discourses of specific ingroups (Hall, 1997; Van Dijk, 2024). During geopolitical crises and international conflicts, such as the 2023 Gaza war, elite newsrooms utilize specialized linguistic architectures to manage public perception, manufacture political consent, and delineate boundaries of human empathy (Chouliaraki, 2006; Herman & Chomsky, 2022; Entman, 2004). Media discourse during warfare does not merely describe events; it constructs a highly managed political reality that systematically aligns with broader institutional interests and state foreign policies through framing and agenda-setting processes (Robinson, 2002; Tuchman, 1978). As modern scholarship highlights, elite liberal newspapers in the Western hemisphere navigate conflict reporting by projecting an aura of journalistic objectivity while structurally validating asymmetrical state actions and marginalizing subaltern, non-Western perspectives (Al-Kassimi, 2023; Boyd-Barrett, 2024; Said, 1997). By operationalizing Teun van Dijk's socio-cognitive model alongside Theo van Leeuwen's socio-semantic approach, researchers can deconstruct the subtle mechanisms through which

media discourse establishes systemic biases (Machin, & Mayr, 2012; Wodak & Meyer, 2015). Van Dijk's theory emphasizes how texts create binary ideological polarizations, reinforcing the socio-political dominance of the ingroup ('Us') while criminalizing or passive-voicing the outgroup ('Them') (Van Dijk, 2022). Concurrently, Van Leeuwen's framework reveals how linguistic grammar structurally allocates or denies agency to human actors, thereby deflecting or assigning moral and legal accountability within conflict zones (Van Leeuwen, 2023). Consequently, a rigorous textual dissection of *Le Monde* and *The Guardian* provides a crucial lens into how elite European media structurally manage, frame, and ideologically police the discursive boundaries of global conflict coverage.

1.2 Framing of armed conflict in international journalism

Framing of armed conflict in international journalism involves systematic choices about form, style, and evaluative language that organize how events, actors, and responsibilities are presented to audiences. Historical work on journalistic forms and styles argues that news is analyzed across disciplines including history, sociology, language studies, and political science, with particular attention to the narrative versus analytical character of reporting (Wintour, 2024). Such analyses underline that texts can only be fully understood when situated in the contexts that frame them, which is crucial for examining how conflicts are constructed as unique events or generalized problems. Empirical studies of newspaper content show that coders systematically record who is involved, what happens, when and where events occur, and how and why they are explained, alongside ratings of story length, emphasis, and tone. These procedures enable researchers to capture whether reporting on topics such as crime, accidents, or politics is event centered or analytical, and to describe shifts in the relative negativity or positivity of coverage over time (Goxe, 2024; Hall, 1997; Herman & Chomsky, 2022). Critical discourse approaches specify how such formal and stylistic choices become vehicles for ideological work in reporting war and violence. CDA is defined as a type of discourse analytical research that studies how social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts. It is explicitly concerned with social problems, with power relations understood as discursive, and with the idea that discourse both continues society and culture and performs ideological work in historical settings (Al-Awawdeh & Andaloussi, 2025; Al-Kassimi, 2023; Joudi & Sahel, 2025). Within this tradition, armed conflict is not treated as a neutral object of description but as a site where discursive practices embody particular formations of class, culture, gender, and power. CDA thus investigates how manipulation, dishonesty, and opaque asymmetrical relations are expressed, signalled, and legitimized in the linguistic organization of news texts (Al-Kassimi, 2023; Joudi & Sahel, 2025). Specific models have been developed to capture the framing of conflict participants. Van Dijk's analytical framework distinguishes macro and micro levels of analysis. At the macro level, attention is given to power relations between groups and institutions, control of text and discourse, access, and dominance. The micro level focuses on language, discourse, verbal interaction, and social practices among social actors within a group. Building on this, van Dijk's ideological square identifies four discursive strategies: positive self representation, negative other representation, self identity description, and norms and values description. Positive self representation emphasizes the in group's good characteristics, while negative other representation foregrounds the out group's bad or evil traits. Self identity description constructs a positive identity for a threatened group, and norms and values description stresses equality and justice and highlights violations of norms by others. These categories operationalize how news discourse polarizes conflict actors into "Us" and "Them" and encodes ideological alignments within apparently factual reports. The framing of armed conflict is further shaped through a set of discursive moves that mediate ideologies in media coverage of the Gaza war. Topics and headlines provide ideological gists that can favor one party, tropicalizing positive information about one side and negative information about the other. Lexicalization involves the selection of words with specific connotations to produce negative representations of the out group and positive representations of the in group. Polarization attributes negative properties to the out group and positive attributes to the in group, often supported by evidentiality, where authors mobilize particular kinds of facts to persuade audiences, and by number games, where statistics are used to bolster the credibility of ideological positions. Vagueness introduces ambiguity and uncertainty into meaning, which can obscure responsibility or soften the representation of controversial actions. Quantitative analysis of Gaza war coverage demonstrates how highly emotive terms such as "slaughter", "massacre", and "horrific" are disproportionately applied to some victims rather than others, illustrating how lexical choices participate in an unequal framing of suffering in armed conflict (Al-Awawdeh & Andaloussi, 2025). Alternative critical orientations emphasize that discourses of armed conflict can also be framed constructively. Positive discourse analysis proposes a critique of the critique in CDA by replacing a predominant focus on dominance, hegemony, control, and power abuse with visions of solidarity and integration. PDA examines modes of production through which social power can be jointly shared and through which discourses and sites are renovated to enact a better world, focusing on positive social values, evaluative language, and narratives that promote alignment and harmony. In this view, analysis concentrates on discourses that one wishes to endorse rather than only those one intends to criticize, including communicative practices designed to counter oppressive social structures and energize social change (Athamnia, 2024; Joudi & Sahel, 2025). For studies of international journalism on the Gaza war, these frameworks together provide tools for examining how armed conflict is framed through polarized representation of actors, selective lexicalization, and the potential opening of more solidaristic, peace oriented discourses.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Elite Media and Geopolitical Alignment

Recent studies examining Western media reporting on Middle Eastern conflicts consistently highlight patterns of asymmetrical framing. Prior research on Anglo-American media discourse indicates a historical tendency to align journalistic narratives with state foreign policies, frequently employing strategic lexical choices that criminalize resistance movements while rationalizing state-sanctioned militarism (Al-Kassimi, 2023). Scholars utilizing Van Dijk's Ideological Square have observed that elite newspapers routinely deploy positive self-presentation to minimize the moral culpability of geopolitical allies, while systematically amplifying the negative attributes of geopolitical adversaries to construct a clear moral dichotomy (Boyd-Barrett, 2024). This geopolitical alignment has been critically scrutinized within Middle Eastern scholarship, particularly through the lens of Western media failures

regarding ethical standards. Empirical assessments indicate that major Western news networks often abandon professional detachment during crises in the Global South. For instance, Athamnia (2024) conducted a field study among academic experts and concluded that international news channels systematically violated the foundational tenets of Social Responsibility Theory during the initial phases of the 2023 conflict, actively operating as spaces for biased reporting, unverified rumors, and state propaganda. Furthermore, the underlying ideological friction is conceptualized under Value Determinism Theory. As Joudi and Sahel (2025) note in their study of transnational news coverage, there exists a profound axio-political struggle between the indigenous narrative of national liberation and the dominant frameworks of Western corporate journalism, which often deploy communicative and human-interest values selectively to legitimize dominant state interests while stripping subaltern populations of political agency.

2.2 Linguistic Asymmetry and Role Allocation

Furthermore, empirical investigations adopting Theo van Leeuwen's framework of Social Actors reveal deep-seated biases in role allocation during humanitarian crises. Literature shows that victims in non-Western conflicts are frequently subjected to linguistic 'passivation' or outright 'exclusion', depriving them of human agency and historical context (Kallio & MacRury, 2025). Conversely, Western political figures are routinely 'activated' and 'functionalized' as rational, authorized agents of order and stability. In contrast to these trends of structural passivation in Western coverage, regional Arab media scholarship illustrates that Middle Eastern platforms adopt fundamentally different framing priorities. In an extensive framing analysis of elite Arab press outlets, Jabor (2024) discovered that humanitarian themes, structural displacement, and calls for an immediate truce captured the primary editorial focus (13.6%), with a targeted focus on visual humanization, such as documenting the funerals of martyrs (9.9%). This is reinforced by contemporary agenda-setting research across regional networks. Al-Awawdeh and Andaloussi (2025) analyzed the journalistic outputs of official Arab news agencies and demonstrated that humanitarian relief initiatives and systemic civilian crises anchored the core media agenda, accounting for 12.5% of overall reporting, followed closely by the documentation of infrastructural damage (11.2%) and unlawful displacement (9.8%). These studies reveal that while Western journalism frequently utilizes grammatical suppression to shield powerful state actors, Arab journalism actively institutionalizes a discourse of solidarity and systemic documentation.

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, interpretive, and deeply textual methodology rooted in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), merging Teun van Dijk's Ideological Square (Macro-strategies: Emphasize Positive of Self, Emphasize Negative of Other, De-emphasize Negative of Self, De-emphasize Positive of Other) with Theo van Leeuwen's Social Actors Representation (Micro-linguistic dimensions: Inclusion vs. Exclusion, Activation vs. Passivation, Identification vs. Functionalization). The research population is strictly defined as the digital archives of the English-language edition of *Le Monde* and the British daily *The Guardian* (UK edition). A purposive sampling method consisting of ten (10) highly relevant, text-heavy news articles and editorials (5 from *Le Monde* and 5 from *The Guardian*) published during the early critical escalation phases of the 2023 conflict.

3.1 Research Problem

The global press coverage of the 2023 Gaza war serves as a critical site for the manifestation of institutional power, geopolitical alignment, and ideological warfare. While mainstream Western media organizations project a facade of professional objectivity and neutral journalism, their textual outputs often function as ideological apparatuses that construct highly polarized and non-neutral accounts of international conflicts. The research problem lies in the systemic framing bias and discursive mechanisms deployed by elite Western news outlets to marginalize particular historical realities while normalizing specific political hegemonies. Specifically, there is an academic necessity to critically unmask how linguistic structures are operationalized to generate institutional consensus, influence public perception, and validate asymmetrical state violence. This study addresses this gap by deconstructing the subtle, covert, and naturalized linguistic strategies embedded in the coverage of *Le Monde* and *The Guardian*, exploring how these publications navigate the delicate balance between ethical reporting and ideological accountability, while contextualizing these patterns against findings from contemporary Arab media scholarship.

3.2 Research Questions

- RQ1: How is ideological polarization structurally reproduced in the textual coverage of the 2023 Gaza war by *Le Monde* and *The Guardian* through the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation?
- RQ2: What specific discursive roles and socio-political agency are allocated to the respective actors involved in the conflict according to Theo van Leeuwen's Social Actors framework?
- RQ3: To what extent do the discursive strategies of these two elite newspapers diverge or converge in framing the geopolitical and humanitarian dimensions of the war when compared to regional media paradigms?

4. Findings

4.1 Detailed Analytical Matrix for *The Guardian*

Article ID	Article ID	Authentic Textual Extract	Authentic Textual Extract	Macro-Strategy (Van Dijk) Macro-strategy(Van Dijk)	Micro-Linguistic Choice Micro-linguistic Choice	Ideological Deconstruction Ideological Deconstruction
TG-01: Geopolitical Framing		"While the US flounders in a conflict it did not		• De-emphasize Negative of Ingroup: Mitigating state	• Activation / Metaphorical Obscurity: The US is activated but	Minimizes global accountability; Western superpower

RESEARCH ARTICLE

	foresee, emerging powers see a chance..."	responsibility by framing systemic structural funding as tactical confusion.	through passive, descriptive verbs ("flounders").	involvement is detached from active co-belligerency and naturalized as a well-meaning tactical struggle.
TG-02: Historical Analysis	"The mainstream media generally individuates in detail Israeli civilian deaths... In contrast, it most frequently describes... Palestinian civilian deaths collectively and in passive terms..."	• Emphasize Negative of Ingroup Press: Exposing the asymmetrical media practices that preserve the moral dichotomy.	• Passivation vs. Identification: Dissecting how subaltern casualties are structurally denied individual personalization.	Explicitly critiques the elite media's selective empathy, where linguistic grammar is weaponized to make one group's casualties natural phenomena while the other's are atrocities.
TG-03: Chronological Reporting	"Shocked Israelis woke... as Hamas and Islamic Jihad fired thousands of rockets... shooting and taking hostages."	• Emphasize Negative of Outgroup: Giving explicit, heavy visual and semantic space to the violence perpetrated by non-state actors.	• Activation / Functionalization: Non-state resistance movements are highly activated as destructive historical agents.	Mandates a specific, highly contextual moral baseline that isolates the confrontation from its ongoing 16-year legal and geographical blockade.
TG-04: Institutional Failures	"Israel's war in Gaza... has stoked violence across the Middle East and beyond, much of it involving Iran-backed groups..."	• De-emphasize Negative of Ingroup Allies: Presenting structural military operations as broad, systemic phenomena.	• Nominalization / Spatial Backgrounding: Turning active carpet bombing into an abstract, automated geopolitical extension ("stoked violence").	Obscures causal state responsibility for infrastructural destruction, transferring the active agent role solely onto regional adversarial proxies.

4.2 Detailed Analytical Matrix for Le Monde (English Edition)

Article ID	Article ID	Authentic Textual Extract	Authentic Textual Extract	Macro-Strategy (Van Dijk) Macro-strategy(Van Dijk)	Micro-Linguistic Choice Micro-linguistic Choice	Ideological Deconstruction Ideological Deconstruction
LM-01: Media Terminology		"...descriptions of the suffering... are juxtaposed with dispassionate justifications... the dead are reduced to numbers and bombing to 'strikes'."		• Emphasize Negative of Allies' Discourse: Deconstructing how institutional journalism actively rationalizes systemic violations.	• Nominalization / Over-Aggregation: Critiquing how active state warfare is syntactically translated into abstract nouns ("strikes").	Exposes the ideological sanitization of military violence within corporate networks, illustrating how structural language shields states from war crime classifications.
LM-02: Structural Guilt		"The Israeli military forces' war on Gaza... is the first Israeli war in which Washington is a cobelligerent... providing arms and ammunition..."		• Emphasize Negative of Ingroup / Allies: Stripping the US of its pseudo-neutral arbitrating status in Middle Eastern politics.	• Activation / Relational Identification: Directly activating the United States as an explicit "cobelligerent" in the execution of the war.	Rejects the liberal media consensus of an independent proxy war; it establishes direct joint state responsibility for the historic-scale loss of civilian lives.
LM-03: Global Justice Divide		"This court is built for Africa and for thugs like Putin, was what one senior leader told me.'... Biden called it 'outrageous'..."		• Emphasize Negative of Ingroup Institutions: Directly exposing the implicit racism, bias, and double standards governing global systems.	• Classification vs. Functionalization: Contrasting the pejorative classification of non-Western actors ("thugs") with Western-aligned shielding.	Deconstructs the neo-colonial hierarchy embedded inside international law, detailing how elite states expect legal institutions to act as sovereign tools against adversaries only.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

The empirical data extracted from *The Guardian* and *Le Monde* (English edition) provides profound insights into how linguistic structures are meticulously operationalized to manifest underlying ideological motivations. By shifting the analytical lens from macro-discursive strategies down to micro-linguistic configurations, the dual-model application unmask a systematic asymmetry in the distribution of socio-political agency and moral accountability during the 2023 Gaza war.

A critical cross-examination of the matrices reveals a pivotal ideological divergence in how both publications construct the role of Western superpowers. In TG-01, *The Guardian* relies heavily on a discourse of mitigation and strategic detachment. By utilizing the lexical choice "flounders in a conflict it did not foresee," the newspaper frames the United States' institutional involvement through an alibi of tactical confusion and passive observation. Through Van Leeuwen's framework, this is a distinct instance of Passivation wrapped in a narrative of accidental entanglement, which effectively decouples the global hegemon from its material role as a primary arms supplier. Conversely, *Le Monde* in LM-02 explicitly rejects this liberal sanitization. By choosing the rigorous legalistic and socio-economic designation of a "cobelligerent," *Le Monde* shifts the strategy to direct Activation, explicitly charting the physical infrastructure of complicity—specifically pointing out the cargo planes and vessels delivering thousands of tons of ammunition. This direct activation structurally shatters the myth of the US as an "impartial arbiter" or a passive observer, positioning it instead as an active architect of the ongoing material devastation.

Furthermore, the micro-linguistic management of casualty representation across both outlets confirms Rashid Khalidi's poignant critique in TG-02, where he exposes that within mainstream Western reporting, "Israel does not kill: Palestinians die; Israel does not starve Palestinians, they suffer from famine" (Khalidi, 2024). This phenomenon is driven by the systematic deployment of Nominalization and Passive-Voice Grammar. When reporting on non-Western or subaltern casualties, both networks frequently transform active military assaults into automated, agentless events. For example, as deconstructed in LM-01, the active corporate warfare of carpet bombing is routinely translated into abstract nouns like "strikes" or reduced to sterile, detached "statistics". By systematically executing this strategy of Backgrounding and Suppression, the text strips the victims of individual personalization (Identification) and historicization, turning an asymmetrical humanitarian crisis into an inevitable natural phenomenon without an identifiable human perpetrator.

The implementation of Van Dijk's Ideological Square is equally pronounced in the chronological layout of the conflict's origin. In TG-03, the text establishes a rigid moral baseline by activating non-state actors through heavily charged emotional syntax: " Hamas and Islamic Jihad fired thousands of rockets... shooting and taking hostages". While these descriptions document literal events, their strategic placement at the absolute chronological forefront of the narrative serves a distinct macro-ideological function: it creates a historical rupture, presenting the escalation as an unprovoked, sudden explosion of violence. This structural choice effectively deemphasizes and suppresses the macro-context of the prior 16-year blockade and systemic territorial disposessions. By contrast, *Le Monde*'s legal analyses (as shown in LM-03) offer a critical meta-discursive deconstruction of this institutional bias. By explicitly quoting the internal admission that "this court [the ICC] is built for Africa and for thugs like Putin," *Le Monde* directly exposes the neo-colonial hierarchy and institutional double standards governing Western legal exceptionalism.

This dual-model critique aligns deeply with the conclusions drawn by Middle Eastern communication theories. When juxtaposed with the findings of Athamnia (2024), the linguistic sanitization observed in elite newspapers structurally underscores the systematic evasions of social responsibility, transforming institutional journalism into selective propaganda instruments. Concurrently, the selective erasure of historical context via narrative ruptures (TG-03) is empirically validated by Joudi and Sahel (2025) as a manifestation of hegemonically driven value structures that actively attempt to undermine subaltern realities.. By bridging Western critical linguistics with Middle Eastern media studies, it becomes structurally evident that international conflict reporting remains heavily governed by asymmetrical power matrices and neo-colonial frameworks.

In conclusion, while *The Guardian* provides a localized platform for intellectual dissent, it occasionally falls back on abstract vocabulary and nominalized structures to mitigate the structural accountability of Western state systems. *Le Monde*, through its English editions, presents a more structurally aggressive execution of Critical Discourse Analysis. It actively names the causal agents of violence, deconstructs the semantic manipulation of media terminology, and contextualizes the ongoing warfare not as an isolated modern disorder, but as a continuation of asymmetrical colonial hegemonies.

5.2 Recommendations

- Promoting Critical Media Literacy: Academic institutions should integrate synthesized CDA methodologies (combining socio-cognitive and socio-semantic frameworks) into media and communication curricula to train future scholars to identify naturalized media bias and institutional propaganda.
- Establishing Ethical Conflict Reporting Standards: Global newsrooms must re-evaluate their editorial guidelines, specifically regarding syntactic role allocation and lexical choices during asymmetrical wars, to ensure humanizing representations are equally applied to all civilian populations regardless of geopolitical alignments.
- Diversifying Information Sources: Researchers and journalists are encouraged to challenge institutional hierarchies by actively incorporating subaltern testimonies and localized legal frameworks to counteract the monocultural consensus of elite Western agencies.
- Cross-Platform Comparative Analysis: Future studies should expand this methodology to comparative analyses between traditional elite press coverage and algorithmic visual framing across decentralized social media networks (e.g., TikTok, X, Telegram).
- Global South Media Discursive Mapping: A significant scholarly contribution can be achieved by analyzing how non-Western media apparatuses counteract or reproduce Western-centric ideological square strategies.
- Longitudinal Linguistic Auditing: Executing a longitudinal discourse analysis tracking the semantic shift of specific legal designations (such as "war crimes" or "genocide") in Western elite newsrooms across different phases of Middle Eastern escalations.

References

- [1] Al-Awawdeh, M., & Andaloussi, S. S. (2025). Taghtiyat mawaqi' wakalat al-anba' al-arabiyyah lil-harb ala ghazzah 2023m–2025m: Dirasah tahliliyyah muqaranah. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 123, 260–296.
- [2] Al-Kassimi, K. (2023). *Decolonizing critical discourse analysis: Ideology, hegemony, and media bias in international conflict reporting*. Academic Press.
- [3] Athamnia, A. (2024). Al-taghtiyah al-i'lamiyyah lil-qanawat al-ikhbariyyah al-gharbiyyah lil-harb ala ghazzah ba'da amaliyyat tufan al-aqsa: Dirasah maydaniyyah fi itar nazariyyat al-mas'uliyyah al-ijtima'iyyah. *Journal of Research and Scientific Studies*, 18(1), 1040–1054.
- [4] Belkaïd, A. (2024, October). The Arab states have made up their minds. *Le Monde diplomatique*.
- [5] Boyd-Barrett, O. (2024). *Media imperialism and conflict framing: Manufacturing consent in the digital age*. Routledge
- [6] Chouliaraki, L. (2006). *The spectatorship of suffering*. SAGE Publications.
- [7] Entman, R. (2004). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. University of Chicago Press.
- [8] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- [9] Fairclough, N. (2018). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- [10] Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- [11] Goxe, S. (2024, July). International law weighs in on Gaza. *Le Monde diplomatique*.
- [12] Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. SAGE Publications.
- [13] Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2022). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media* (Updated ed.). Pantheon Books.
- [14] Jabor, A. M. M. (2024). Otor taghtiyat mawaqi' al-sohof al-arabiyyah li-ahdath al-harb ala ghazzah 2023: Dirasah tahliliyyah. *Journal of Media Research and Studies*, 29(2), 243–310.
- [15] Joudi, S., & Sahel, A. (2025). Al-ab'ad al-qimiyyah fi al-taghtiyah al-i'lamiyyah lil-harb ala ghazzah li-qanat CNN bil-arabiyyah. *International Journal of Social Communication*, 12(3), 245–268.
- [16] Kallio, J., & MacRury, I. (2025). *Geopolitical alignments and elite media reporting on middle eastern conflicts*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [17] Khalidi, R. (2024, April 11). A new abyss: Gaza and the hundred years' war on Palestine. *The Guardian*.
- [18] Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. SAGE Publications.
- [19] Rimbart, P. (2023, December). Even war has rules. *Le Monde diplomatique*.
- [20] Robinson, P. (2002). *The CNN effect: The decision to intervene via the news media*. Routledge.
- [21] Sadria, M. (2024, January). The first joint US-Israeli war. *Le Monde diplomatique*.
- [22] Said, E. (1997). *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world* (Rev. ed.). Vintage Books.
- [23] Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. Free Press.
- [24] Van Dijk, T. A. (2022). *Socio-cognitive discourse studies: Deconstructing the ideological square*. Oxford University Press.
- [25] Van Dijk, T. A. (2024). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary approach*. Routledge
- [26] Van Leeuwen, T. (2023). *The representation of social actors in discourse: A socio-semantic framework* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [27] Wintour, P. (2024, April 6). The new world disorder: How the Gaza war disrupted international relations. *The Guardian*.
- [28] Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.