

DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION AND NARRATIVE BUILDING: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL MEDIA REPORTS ABOUT CEASEFIRE IN GAZA

Dr. Nazia Anwar

Lecturer, University of Gujrat

nazia.anwar@uog.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17628158>

Keywords

Discursive construction, narrative building, CDA, International media, ceasefire, Gaza

Article History

Received: 12 August 2025

Accepted: 24 September 2025

Published: 07 October 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Dr. Nazia Anwar

Abstract

The discourse in media is very important in creating world sensitivities towards conflict and peace. The Gaza ceasefire of 2025 attracted the most extensive media attention, in which words served as the basis of political, humanitarian and ideological discourses. This study is a critical analysis of the way the international media framed and told the story of the recent Gaza ceasefire. It dwells upon the discursive strategies of representation of the event and the major actors in the event civilians, Hamas and Israel. Data has been collected from Al Jazeera, CNN, The New York Times, Le Monde and Times of Israel using from January to November 2025. The data was analyzed by using critical discourse analysis (CDA) and thematic analysis. The study has discussed 60 articles that comprised headings, introductory paragraphs and social media articles. Findings indicated conflicting presentation on media sources: the Western ones focused on diplomacy and stability, whereas the Middle Eastern and regional media predicted the humanitarian misery and unequal relations of power. The research finds that media discourses on the Gaza ceasefire are ideologically framed which exposes inequalities in the world in their conception of the concept of peace.

1. Introduction

During war periods, the media is critical in creating discourses that influence the masses in the way they think of war, peace and ceasefires. The recent 2025 Gaza truce agreement between Israel and Hamas has again illustrated how the international media facilitates global perceptions of the Israeli Palestinian conflict by using language and discourse. Although, the ceasefires are traditionally understood to be periods of calm and rest, the media coverage tends to contextualize the notions of ceasefires within ideological, political or moral ornaments that go way beyond mere reporting (Entman, 2004). The choice of words used by the journalists and editors to describe this truce, pause, deal or breakthrough has a discursive value, as it entrenches the narrative of legitimacy, victory or victimhood into a language system. Then, the media discourse is

not simply a description of the ceasefire, it actually forms its meaning in the world imagination.

The question of how media discourse is related to power is an old topic of interest in critical communication studies. Media texts are not ideologically neutral as Fairclough (1995) and van Dijk (2008) tend to argue, they are mirrors of power relations and social inequality of the dominant. International news reporting about Gaza situation has been working in a geopolitical system that favors specific actors and excludes others (Philo & Berry, 2011). Historically, western media has been accused of publishing narratives that justify the actions of Israel state, Arab and alternative media have reported on the conflict stating that it was a colonial occupation and resistance (Barkho, 2010; Elmasry, 2017). These contrasting frames

indicate the discursive contest of the moral and political sense of the ceasefire.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an influential theory and methodology to deconstruct these constructions. CDA aims at identifying the way in which discourse helps to sustain power and ideology in linguistic and semiotic forms (Fairclough, 2010; Wodak, 2001). The approach to the study includes evaluation of media texts by means of this prism, so that it can be seen how the international media represents conflicting accounts of peace, violence, victimhood and diplomacy. These discursive formations have not only impacts on perception of the audience but also on more comprehensive policy discussions and even aspect of humanitarian interventions towards the worst situation around the world.

The international media discourse now spans across boards in the digital age which comprises of the print, broadcast and social media. The headlines, lead paragraphs and posts at such mega-media as CNN, The New York Times, Le Monde, Al Jazeera and Times of Israel can be discussed as the discursive battlefields where the meaning of peace and conflict is compromised. The linguistic framing of the ceasefire may either create it as a vulnerable humanitarian resumption or a tactical triumph by one of the sides (Galtung & Ruge, 1965; Zelizer, 2010). They are not simply semantic representations but have ideological implications which are consistent with certain political interests or cultural values (Chouliaraki, 2006).

Studies have reported that the media reporting on Gaza had always been differentiated based on institutional and national affiliations. As an example, Western sources usually stress the insecurity issue of Israel and regional sources like Al Jazeera preempt the humanitarian crisis in Gaza (Franks, 2010; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). These distinctions highlight the way world discourses have been disjointed and influenced by larger political orientations. The discursive struggle over language i.e. what is considered a pause and a peace, is relegated into a mirror image of unequal power relations in the processes of global information flows (van Dijk, 1998).

Although, past researchers have examined media reporting of the Israeli Palestinian conflict, little research has been done on how international media discursively construct the meaning of a ceasefire, as a political and humanitarian phenomenon, in the modern context. A lot of the literature available pertains to the war reporting, propaganda or peace journalism (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005; Hackett, 2007), although less has been given to the discursive scheming that goes into narrating the instances of temporary peace. Moreover, comparative works which examine media in various cultural and geopolitical settings, i.e. Western, Arab and Israeli ones, are rather limited. The present study fills this gap through an analysis of how the major 5 international media outlets frame the 2025 Gaza ceasefire information by using linguistic and ideological frames.

The study sheds light on the development of the growing field of critical media studies and discourse analysis by helping to understand the role of linguistic practices in forming the consciousness of the masses when handling a conflict. With its emphasis on Gaza ceasefire in 2025, the study provides information about language, ideology and power in global journalism in a timely manner. It adds to our knowledge of the discursive production of peace within media discourses and how such discursive products are based on more general geopolitical inequalities. In addition, it offers a comparative viewpoint that cuts across Western and non-Western media to ways of fostering critical media literacy and awareness among scholars, policymakers, and the general populace.

1.1 Research Questions:

1. How does international media describe the ceasefire in Gaza (temporary, pause, breakthrough, victory)?
2. What discursive strategies have been used by international Media to represent different groups (civilians, Hamas, Israel) in the context of ceasefire in Gaza?

1.2 Research Objectives:

- To know how international media describes the recent ceasefire in Gaza (temporary, pause, breakthrough, victory).
- To know the discursive strategies used by international Media to represent different groups (civilians, Hamas, Israel) in the context of recent ceasefire in Gaza.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Media Framing of War and Peace

The media framing theory is the foundation of many studies on the effect of the international media in reporting conflicts, ceasefire and peace processes. Framing entails selective display of events, actors and situations which affect the perception of the audience (Entman, 1993). Indicatively, Rahman and Aoni (2025) have investigated the coverage of the Russian-Ukraine war and discovered that peace-related frames were much less frequent in comparison with war-related ones. Similarly, Kaur and Arora (2025) have used both computational and qualitative techniques on a collection of Israel-Palestine coverage and demonstrated that war-frames are prevalent with the peace-frames at the periphery. These results indicate that despite the existence of ceasefires or intervals, media can focus on continuity of conflict instead of the lasting peace.

In the context of the Gaza situation in particular, Khan (2023) has discovered that international media houses exercise a dual role in that they not only mirror the discourse about the Gaza issue but also govern it, by focusing on certain narratives (e.g. security, terrorism, humanitarian suffering) over others. A further examination of ceasefire reporting shows that lexical preferences such as pause, temporary truce or historic deal have diverse semantic burdens such placing ceasefire as either weak or substantial political accomplishment.

2.2 Conflict Reporting and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

In media studies CDA allows us to examine the intersection of language, ideology and power in news discourse (Fairclough, 1995; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). The work by Van Dijk (1998) brings forth the ideological square (us vs them) and the contribution of discourse to ideological

reproduction. To give an example, Almufata (2024) uses the model of van Dijk to the international media on the Gaza war and reveals that there is systematic positive-self/negative-other representation in which Israel is portrayed in positive terms and Palestinians in negative terms or on the negative axis through the use of lexical words and topic organization. Likewise, Kareem and Najm (2024) have reviewed the Western media coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict and recorded the biases in the coverage in the form of lexical and syntactic selections which build asymmetric representations of the sides.

These works demonstrate the non-neutrality of media discourse which creates realities and corresponds to larger ideological or political standpoints. In general, passive voice (civilians were killed) has a lesser direct agency and responsibility (van Leeuwen, 2008). Within your example of ceasefire reporting, CDA plays a crucial role in investigating the ways in which the media describe the event (e.g. breakthrough vs pause), the ways in which actors are framed (victims vs aggressors) and how the discursive strategies naturalize specific interpretations.

2.3 Labelling and Lexical Framing of Peace Processes

The media studies focus on the labelling of peace processes or ceasefires is receiving less direct attention but is emerging. A truce is a term with weak connotations than an agreement or a historic deal. Research like that by Sehar and Anwar (2025) indicates that media utilization of pause frame or lull frame focuses on the temporality and strengthens cycles of conflict. In situations such as Gaza, Le Bzour and Abu Anzeh (2018) discuss the consequences of the U.S. recognition of the status of Jerusalem and the manner in which western media reported the issue of Israel-Palestine conflict and found that the lexical framing effect on the perception of legitimacy, victimhood and agency.

According to this literature, the discursive meaning of ceasefire is partly provided by its description. The term historic breakthrough gives agency, success and permanence; temporariness and uncertainty are inherent in pause in fighting. Therefore, media discourse

on a ceasefire does not solely constitute events but rather it is also about how the event is construed.

2.4 Actors Representation: Civilians, Militants and States

One of the major issues when it comes to conflict media is the representations of various actors. Civilians are usually shown as innocent objects, militants as violent strangers and states among those who act legitimately (Philo & Beattie, 2008). In Gaza/Israel case, Almustafa (2024) is able to find that Palestinians are often presented through the prism of terror/violence or victimhood and Israel is presented through the prism of acting within the norms of international law and defending. In their comparison of Al-Jazeera and The New York Times, Rehman and Mamoon (2025) have observe that the former focuses more on humanitarian misery and historical injustice whereas the latter focuses on the issue of security and geopolitics.

Linguistically speaking, the idea of actor representation, developed by van Leeuwen (2008), demonstrates that the nominalisation, the lack of agents or foregrounding of particular voices enforces the power relations. Based on this, in ceasefire coverage, the direct quotation of civilians, the naming of militants, or the active or passive description of the actions of the states all have a bearing in the exegesis of who said what and why by the audience.

2.5 Media, Peace Journalism and Conflict Cycles

It has been argued by the field of peace journalism (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005) that there should be media practices that anticipate resolution, background and agency of peace instead of mere escalation of conflict. Rahman and Aoni (2025) demonstrate that the presence of peace-frames is lower than the occurrence of war-frames in major outlets. Fareed et al. (2025) has reviewed the editorials of the Indian and Pakistani newspapers and demonstrated how editorial discourse may be biased to either the orientation of peace or polarising stories.

Nevertheless, despite the increasing literature there are still a number of gaps in the literature

related to the media portrayals. To begin with, despite the fact that much research is being conducted on the issue of conflict framing and representation, little attention has been given to the specific issue of ceasefire discourse and the manner in which the event is named, reported and portrayed in the international press. Second, comparative cross outlet studies (Western vs non-Western) have not been conducted in the particular field of ceasefires. Third, the interaction of social media posts (headlines + lead paragraphs + social media captions) in the construction of the narrative of ceasefires is not well-investigated. New computational methods and corpus techniques (e.g. Bailey & Heiligman, 2025) start to trace changes in narratives across time with the help of textual networks on a massive scale.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study has adopted a qualitative research design based on critical discourse analysis (CDA) to explore the discursive construction and narrative of the recent ceasefire in Gaza by the international media. The CDA framework is especially appropriate in this investigation because it enables one to explore extensively the way language reproduces and represents power relations in the society (Fairclough, 1995; Wodak, 2001). Instead of attempting to establish some generalizations numerically, the study lays more stress on the interpretive analysis of texts in terms of meaning-making, representation and ideology. Therefore, the qualitative method allows one to have a subtle insight as to how discursive measures and linguistic decisions are involved in forming the general perception of the ceasefire.

The study is based on the three-dimensional model of CDA developed by Fairclough that incorporates (1) the analysis of texts in language, (2) discourse practice, or the way texts are produced and consumed, and (3) social cultural practice, or how texts are related to the broader social and political contexts (Fairclough, 2010). This model offers a broad prism through which media language can be understood as a whole as not just text but also as an action of social activity which is deeply

embedded in ideological and institutional structures of power.

3.2 Data Collection

Data to be used in this study was gathered from (January 1- November 1, 2025) which included the media coverage of the Gaza ceasefire in this year. Purposive sampling approach was adopted so as to make the selection of international media outlets that will be representative of various geopolitical, cultural and ideological orientations to be balanced and diverse enough. The outlets that have been chosen are Al Jazeera, The New York Times, Le Monde, Times of Israel and CNN. The reason why these organizations were selected is that they are the most influential organizations in the world and tend to take opposing discursive positions- ranged between the Western liberal view and the Middle Eastern and European views. The study concentrates on three media texts:

- Headlines- to examine immediate framing and lexical emphasis.
- First paragraphs - to get narrative structure and tone-setting.
- Social media comments (on official verified accounts of the chosen sources) - to study abridged, real-time discursive presentations and interactions with the international communities.

The total number of texts was 60 (12 texts per outlet) with the guarantee of both traditional and digital discourse samples. All the texts were collected at the public archives or official social media sources to keep the transparency and authenticity. All of the texts were placed into a digital corpus and tagged with source, date and type to make it easier to analyze them systematically.

3.4 Analytical Framework

CDA has been used as the framework in analyzing the data, which included the principles of Fairclough (1995), van Dijk (1998) and van Leeuwen (2008). This analysis was carried out in three steps:

- **Textual Analysis:**

This step was aimed at the determination of the linguistic patterns such as the selection of

lexicon, transitivity, modality, and evaluative language. It was focused on repetitive words like truce, pause, attack, and defense to see how certain expressions added to the creation of the meaning and power relations (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

- **Discursive Practice Analysis:**

The analysis is based on a discursive examination of the practice. Manufacturing and selling of texts were analyzed keeping in view institutional, political and cultural backgrounds of each media house. This step examined the discursive decisions and focus on narratives as influenced by editorial norms and geopolitical affiliations, which was part of the discourse-historical approach employed by Wodak (2001).

- **Social Practice Analysis:**

The last step placed the discussion in the larger social-political context of international relations, ideological power and world views of the Gaza conflict. The review has utilized the Foucault's (1980) idea of discourse as a power tool by examining the role of media discourses in the construction of legitimacy, morality and blame. Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used to label the emerging patterns to improve the level of analytical rigor. Inductively, thematic searching was in the form of fragility of ceasefire, diplomatic success, humanitarian framing, and moral responsibility, which were found after a series of reading and coding. This integration of CDA and thematic analysis allowed linguistic accuracy and depth of concept in explaining how media discourses influence group knowledge of the ceasefire.

3.5 Reliability, Validity and Ethical Considerations

Despite the fact that qualitative research is not based on statistical validity, the credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research were ensured due to the methodological transparency and reflexivity. Triangulation of the data was done through comparing the coverage among the various media systems to achieve a balance in the interpretation. The researcher kept a reflexive journal in order to

record interpretive choices and reduce individual bias. All the materials discussed were in the open access and no personal information was gathered which will not lead to a breach of ethical principles in research. The review was also critically aware of positionality about its analysis, and that the interpretation of discourse is bound to be influenced by socio-political and cultural views (van Dijk, 2008). Therefore, the purpose of the study was not to assert that it was neutral but to uncover the functions of meaning and ideology in the texts of the media. The main weakness of this research is the extent of the sample used (five large international outlets) which, although varied, cannot be considered to be representative of the world media. Also, the research used English and translated texts which might not reflect the entire expressiveness of original-language words. However, the constraints are counterattacked by the purposive selection and richness of CDA, which provides a valuable and important perspective on the global discursive construction of the Gaza ceasefire.

4. Data Analysis

Theme 1: Weakness and Tentativeness of the Ceasefire

One common motif of Al Jazeera, CNN and to some extent Le Monde was the description of the ceasefire as weak, unstable and interim. The choice of words: fragile truce, temporary pause, brief calm, lull in fighting did not build the ceasefire as a stop in the hostilities but rather as a pause before they were likely to resume. Even the heading of the article like *A Fragile Pause Holds amid Rising Tensions* (CNN) or *Temporary Calm in Gaza Faces New Threats* (Al Jazeera) utilised words in a lexical way that emphasized instability. These linguistic structures put the ceasefire as temporary and conditional, contingent on whether the warring parties complied or third states mediated. Discursively, this theme takes the form of a precautionary narrative approach to uncertainty management and newsworthiness by highlighting the impermanence of peace. Such media outlets have normalized the suffering by concentrating on the notion of helplessness and a cycle of inevitability in the

conflict between Israel and Gaza by turning violence into a repetitive, near-naturalized phenomenon. Therefore, this theme is, related to the concept of ideological polarization introduced by van Dijk that the conflict is normalized as a norm and peace as an exception.

Theme 2: Political Legitimacy and Diplomatic Triumph

Conversely, The New York Times and The Times of Israel were consistent in using the discourse of diplomatic success. Their heads and the first paragraphs frequently foreshadowed mediation, negotiation and international diplomacy with the words of breakthrough, agreement, deal brokered or historic accord. To give an example, The New York Times referred to the ceasefire by stating that it was a breakthrough achieved after U.S. and Egyptian mediation, whereas The Times of Israel referred to it as a major diplomatic success which guaranteed safety of Israeli citizens.

This framing creates the ceasefire as an end result of reasonable negotiation and international coordination, thus authorizing the political representatives who monitored the process. The agentive verbs (brokered, secured, achieved) put the place of agency on the state and diplomatic institutions, instead of the conflicting parties themselves. With this tactic, the media portrays diplomacy as the driving force of peace, and the fighters emerge as passive consumers of the willful politics.

Thematically, this story is able to create a diplomatic success story that can assure people the existence of global governance systems. It is also implicitly glorifying western and Israeli action which associates peace with their move. The implication is to turn a humanitarian crisis into a showcase of political rationality and world order—a good illustration of what Fairclough describes as the technocratization of discourse i.e. the representation of political processes as problem solving activities and not as moral and ethical crises.

Theme 3: Humanitarianism and Civilian Victimization

The third theme that is dominant in Al Jazeera, CNN and Le Monde is the humanitarianization of the ceasefire by presenting the plight of civilians. Such headlines as Families Return to Rubble as Ceasefire Briefly Relieve the human cost but not diplomatic gain is foregrounded. It was these outlets that reproduced the experiences of individual testimonies, emotive imagery, and quantification of the casualties, building civilians as the main referents of meaning of the narrative of ceasefire. This humanitarian rhetoric works in two ways that are complementary to each other, humanization and quantification. Humanization is manifested in the use of recognizable victims and emotional narrative and quantification is expressed in statistics as, *over 200 killed, thousands displaced*. However, according to CDA, numbers can tell and tell not at the same time: they establish a sense of legitimacy to humanitarian concern and are, at the same time, in danger of de-personalizing the suffering. This theme is part of an effort to put moral discourse back to the center of human outcomes, where the political discourse of elites is being challenged. It puts the ceasefire in a different perspective as a political process but rather a humanitarian momentary suspension. Through this, it brings some moral judgment to the media discourse and makes compassion, relief and vulnerability more predominant emotional registers.

Theme 4: Objection of Agency and Moral Responsibility

There is a key cross-cutting theme that deals with the dissemination of agency and responsibility between Hamas, Israel, and other actors. Hamas could have been pretty much identified with terms such as militant group, rocket attacks, armed faction, etc. which helped Hamas to strengthen its representation as the aggressor. Israel, in its turn, was often related to the state legitimacy and security discourse, which was explained by such words as retaliation, defense operation, or response. In The Times of Israel and The New York Times, Israel was a regular actor who is just defending

citizens and Hamas was a regular actor who is threatening peace or initiating it. However, in other cases, Al Jazeera repackaged agency, by focusing on Israeli airstrikes or a humanitarian effect of the blockade, rebalancing moral responsibility. CNN and Le Monde were more neutral but nonetheless used passive forms of constructions, such as the ones below:

civilian areas were hit, or rockets were launched and by doing so, specific perpetrators of violence were hidden.

This division of agency displays the idea of agency representation as suggested by van Leeuwen- grammatical options such as passivization or nominalization mask or stress responsibility. The general trend shows disharmony: whereas state actors tend to be rationalized, non-state actors are characterized by violence and civilians are placed in the position of a silent victim. The result of the discursive process is a pyramid of legitimacy posed in the form of language.

Theme 5: Opposing Narratives and Ideological Congruity

The last general theme is narrative competition and ideological congruence between outlets. Although the factual event involving the Gaza ceasefire was the same and it was reported by all media, they gave the same an ideological interpretation. The diplomatic success story reflects the interests of Western geopolitics and the ceasefire is a result of the responsible statecraft. Weakness and humanitarian distress stories, in their turn, doubt the sustainability and fairness of peace attained in unequal power relations.

The discourse of Al Jazeera focuses on Palestinian suffering and doubts the intentions of mediators, which is an anti-narrative to Western mainstream frames. Le Monde is torn between humanitarian compassion and diplomatic commentary, its European compromise between moral and institutional pragmatism. The voice of the U.S. government regarding diplomacy is frequently reproduced by CNN and The New York Times, as it depicts Washington as the main mediator, and the ceasefire as a national triumph that guaranteed the interests of Israeli security.

In this way, the thematic pattern shows that the news discourse is not an unbiased reporting but a field of ideological rivalry. Every outlet builds a coherent narrative, which appeals to the political culture of its audience. To Foucault, the media are discourse producers and they influence the way knowledge about the conflict is transmitted, confirmed and internalized. These outlets generate different versions of the meaning of the ceasefire by prioritizing one aspect over the others: diplomacy, fragility or humanity.

4.1 Synthesis of Themes

The five themes synthesized expose two meta-discourses. The former is the discourse of the Normalization of Conflict where constant stress on fragility and temporariness make violence a regular movement. The second one is the Discourse of the Legitimation of Power in which the diplomatic and security frames entrench the power of states and mediators at the expense of the subalterns. The discourses work according to linguistic strategies of labeling, delegation of agency, and the lexical choice. The moral evaluation is prefigured by the humanitarian discourse, which is disruptive in some way, but in many cases does not shift structural interpretation to the emotional one. Thus, the ceasefire is a multifaceted convergence of the hope, instability, and legitimacy created by international media. Humanitarian empathy and political rationality interplay result in a complex story which humanizes and depoliticizes the conflict at the same time. The discourse swings between the social reality representation and reproduction of hegemonic relations of power, as Fairclough puts it.

The thematic analysis reveals that the international media reporting on the peace between Gaza and Israel in 2025 does more than simply announce the news but it actually constructs the meaning of peace, an act of conflict and morality. Al Jazeera, CNN and Le Monde anticipate human cost and frailty to build an ethical and negative news. The New York Times and The Times of Israel roll out a story of diplomatic success and political legitimacy, seeing the ceasefire as a show of good statecraft. In all the outlets, the civilians

occupy the moral-focus but seldom-agentive role; the Hamas is the ever-attacking aggressor; the Israel is the political giant with strategic rationality.

These patterns reinforce the main thesis of Critical Discourse Analysis, which holds that language is a social practice. International media not only narrate events through their thematic constructions but they also replicate ideological standpoints on responsibility, legitimacy and power in the Israel Palestine conflict. Thus, the ceasefire becomes a mythical place where rival histories of vulnerability, victory and humanity collide making it as much about the politics of the media in the world as it is about the world.

4.2 Findings and Discussion

The media discourse analysis about Gaza ceasefire 2025 has showed that a number of inter-related topics depicted the roles of the language in creating political knowledge and positioning ideologies. Fragility of the ceasefire, diplomatic triumph, humanitarian framing, agency and moral responsibility, and ideological alignment are the five key themes that demonstrate the complexity of global news stories and their involvement in the creation of social meaning.

Another pattern observed was that the ceasefire was seldom brought forward as a final conflict resolution. Rather, it was being reported through different outlets like Al Jazeera and CNN in a way that made it look fragile or temporary and stressed on the uncertainty and the possibility of another outbreak of violence. The use of words like brief pause, fragile calm, and the use of temporary truce served a discursive role in order to naturalize the cyclic nature of violence in Gaza. This is in line with the idea of ideological polarization by van Dijk (1998) that conflict has become normalized by means of recurring linguistic framing, which formerly struggles to establish peace as an exception and instability as a rule. This kind of language recreates a sense of the expectation of a repetition and places the ceasefire as not a success, but a tentative humanitarian pause.

On the contrary, The New York Times and The Times of Israel have portrayed the ceasefire with the theme of diplomatic success and

political legitimacy. There was also the use of evaluative verbs like brokered secured and achieved which placed the agency in state and international mediators, especially the United States and Egypt. This construction of discourse is manifested according to Fairclough (2010), as the technocratization of political discourse, through which the intricate moral dilemmas are restructured in the form of managerial or procedural success. The success of the negotiation often being linked to the ceasefire implicitly validated the participants on the ground and averted the issue of the humanitarian cost of the war. Therefore, the discourse strengthened the Western diplomatic agency and state-centered views of peace.

Al Jazeera, CNN, and Le Monde, in the mean time, were characterized by a different thematic orientation with the focus on humanitarian issue and civilian casualty. They often covered single stories, images and emotionally charged terms like, families rejoin rubble, children pulled out of rubble. Such humanitarian discourses follow the notion of Wodak (2001), discourse-historical approach, which asserts discourse to social and moral backgrounds. These outlets primed the human suffering, which placed the civil population as the major ethical actors in the ceasefire. Nonetheless, such framing was also ambivalent enough since, on the one hand, it made victims more human, but on the other hand, this approach depoliticized the situation because it excluded structural accounts of power inequality, turning conflict into a humanitarian crisis instead of a political one (Chouliaraki, 2013). An important cross-cutting observation is concerned with agency and moral responsibility. In the outlets, the Hamas was always discussed in militarized terms and was frequently referred to as a militant group, an armed group, or a terror organization. However, Israel was more often attached to the narratives of security or defense and they used such phrases as retaliatory strikes, or defense operations. These asymmetries in language reflect what van Leeuwen (2008) terms the representation of social actors in which grammatical decisions highlight or conceal agency. Depersonalizing responsibility through passive constructions like civilian areas were

struck and moral accountability through active constructions like American forces initiated fire. Therefore, the disposition of agency in words is indicative of stronger ideological orientations that justify some actions and incriminate others.

The competing narratives and ideological alignment is the fifth theme that states that global media is not merely a reporting entity but is a meaning-making one. The discourse of each outlet reflects the geopolitical and cultural positioning of the outlet. Western media, including The New York Times or CNN, repeated the official diplomatic position to a great extent, which created an image of a mediator and a control force on the international level. The Times of Israel made the story national security-victory based. By contrast, Le Monde and Al Jazeera provided more critical/humanitarian approaches that problematized the power relations in the conflict in terms of their moral value. These disparities are representative of Foucault (1980) theory that discourse is a product and a means of power, which propagates knowledge that advances specific worldview.

Comprehensively, the results indicate that international media exist as discursive actors that determine the ideological frames of peace and conflict. The ceasefire was not only the objective reality but a locus of a narrative struggle with opposing linguistic strategies building an alternative reality. The relationship between diplomatic legitimacy and humanitarian issue brings out a two-sidedness of discourse; the first is that which affirms world politics and the second, which unveils human plight in the world politics. According to Fairclough (1995), media discourse replicates hegemony naturalizing the relations of power so that some interpretations seem natural. Peace in this situation is not a justice process but a well-managed commodity of diplomacy.

To sum up, the thematic conclusions imply that the international media ceasefire discourse of Gaza is significantly influenced by ideological standpoints, language preferences and institutional background. The fragility narrative naturalizes the instability, the diplomatic narrative rationalizes the state

power and the humanitarian narrative moralizes suffering without always questioning the structural inequality. Combined these discourses depict the fact that the language of the news media is not neutral; this is a social practice that fashions the very realities that it claims to explain.

5. Conclusion

The study has aimed to analyze the ways in which international media constructed and told the recent ceasefire in Gaza based on the critical discourse analysis (CDA). The study has examined the intersection of language, representation and ideology in the formation of the understanding of the event by the audience, using materials prepared by Al Jazeera, The New York Times, Le Monde, Times of Israel, and CNN. This evidence showed that the ceasefire is not a merely political phenomenon but a socially produced discourse, which is mediated by selective language and themes, which is indicative of underlying ideological and geopolitical orientations.

The discussion revealed that media talk on Gaza ceasefire was characterized by three overall narrative orientations, which include the vulnerability of peace, the validation of diplomacy and the moralization of humanitarian plight. All of these orientations influence the way the audiences see the conflict resolution, accountability in morality and political legitimacy. As an example, the popular use of the words like temporary truce and fragile calm promoted the instability and uncertainty making the peace in Gaza temporary and conditional. This is maintained linguistic framing that propagates as van Dijk (1998) refers to ideological polarization as an endless cycle instead of a solvable political issue.

At the same time, Western media including The New York Times and CNN affirmed a story of diplomatic success, where agency was mainly vested in state actors and global brokers such as the United States or Egypt. This representation builds peace as a politicized negotiation and not social justice which is the idea of Fairclough (2010) in his technocratization of discourse. The ceasefire

was also packaged as a diplomatic victory instead of a humanitarian need and this is a subtle way of justifying the current state of affairs in the international system.

Contrastively, Al Jazeera and Le Monde have focused more on the humanitarian aspect, which puts the life of civilians and the ethical imperative of aid in the forefront. This is the discourse-historical approach as proposed by Wodak (2001) since these outlets placed suffering in a more contextualized moral and historical environment. Nonetheless, although this humanitarian discourse humanized victims, it sometimes decontextualized the power relations, as outlasting emotion over political responsibility, which as Chouliaraki (2013) asserts turns the real solidarity into passive spectatorship.

The comparative analysis has showed that the images of Hamas, Israel, and civilians were highly disproportional. Militarized and delegitimizing terms like the label of a terrorist group, or a militant organization were used to build Hamas, whereas the actions of Israel were put in security and defense discourses. The linguistic forms and terms employed in these descriptions, e.g. active/ passive constructions, came into the limelight of distributing moral responsibility. This trend is consistent with the framework of representation of social actors created by van Leeuwen (2008) and shows how structures of language reinforce ideological inequalities and legitimize the inequalities of power within the global media discourse.

In general, the study proves that international media are not merely the reporters of events as they actively construct social realities with discourse. The ceasefire was constructed as a discursive location of ideological contest between the discourse of stability, morality and power. The results facilitate the claim of Foucault (1980), that discourse is a power that dictates what one can think, say and believe regarding social phenomena. In this regard, the Gaza ceasefire press reports (among other things) is a good depiction of the role of the global media as perpetrators of ideological reproduction, supporting some worldviews and excluding others.

Future studies can extend this discussion to incorporate local Palestinian media or other

digital media in order to compare the emergence of counter-discourses beyond the mainstream narrative. Moreover, a multimodal strategy (images, videos, and headlines) might enhance the comprehension of the interaction of visual semiotics with language options to build the meaning. This study has highlighted the importance of the idea that language in international media is not neutral, it is a potent social instrument that forms the perception of conflict, peace and justice. To enhance a more balanced, inclusive and critically informed global communication, the discursive processes underlying media discourse are important to understand.

References

- Barkho, L. (2010). *News from the BBC, CNN and AlJazeera: How the three broadcasters cover the Middle East*. Hampton Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chouliaraki, L. (2006). *The spectatorship of suffering*. SAGE Publications.
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.
- Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Franks, S. (2010). *The neglect of Africa: How the media misrepresent the world*. Hurst & Co.
- Galtung, J., & Ruge, M. H. (1965). The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(1), 64–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336500200104>
- Hackett, R. A. (2007). Is peace journalism possible? Three frameworks for assessing structure and agency in news media. *Conflict & Communication Online*, 6(2), 1–17.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Elmasry, M. H. (2017). *Producing news in the Arab world: Journalism and political engagement in the Middle East*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2005). *Peace journalism*. Hawthorn Press.
- Philo, G., & Berry, M. (2011). *More bad news from Israel*. Pluto Press.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Said, E. W. (1997). *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world* (Rev. ed.). Vintage Books.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, J. B. (1995). *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media*. Stanford University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). *The discourse-historical approach*. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). SAGE Publications.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Zelizer, B. (2010). *About to die: How news images move the public*. Oxford University Press.

