



Arab Media Reponses to The Iran-Israel Conflict: Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis Approach

Hamdan Kasturo*

¹ Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
hamdan@ugm.ac.id

Abstract This analysis examines Arab media discourse surrounding the Iran-Israel conflict, applying Fairclough's three-dimensional model. The focus of this research is Iran's operation of the "True Promise," which is commonly understood from three different perspectives: pro, anti, and neutral. Related to the three levels of analysis in the Fairclough's approach, namely description, interpretation, and explanation, the analysis was also explored from these three perspectives. The information is collected from three representatives of Arab online media, al-Mayadeen for pro-Iran, al-Sharq al-Awsat for anti-Iran, and al-Jazeera as neutral media. Based on the conducted analysis, it is concluded that in the level of description, pro-Iranian media portrayed the Iran operation as a justified response to Israeli aggression by highlighting Iran's military capabilities. Anti-Iranian media criticize Iran's actions and emphasize the potential for regional instability. Neutral media provide more balanced coverage by analyzing the potential consequences. In the level of interpretation, all of the Arab media encourage the Arab people to be independent. But pro-Iranian media call for cooperation with Iran to defend from Israeli aggression. Anti-Iranian media emphasize that the Arab people themselves are more than enough to destroy Israel. Neutral media provide promoted balanced coverage with ceasefire and dialogue as the main way. In the level of explanation, the lack of Arab people for war with Israel is the main topic in solving the conflict with Israel for the pro-Iranian media. Anti-Iranian media emphasize the pro-Iranian Arab as a traitor. Neutral media promote the international role to defend the Arab people.

Keywords: True Promise, Al-Mayadeen, Al-Sharq al-Awsat, Al-Jazeera, CDA

1 Introduction

The Iran-Israel conflict has become a focal point of regional and global attention, with media discourse playing a crucial role in shaping public perceptions and policy debates. By analyzing the language, power dynamics, and sociocultural context of Arab media discourse, this study uncovers the complex representations of the conflict and the underlying ideological positions of various media outlets. The study provides insight into how Arab media frame the conflict, reflecting broader regional interests, sectarian divisions, and geopolitical alignments. The analysis highlights the complex relationship between language, power, and society in Arab media discourse, high-

lighting the media's role in shaping social realities and power relations in the region [23]).

Historically, Iran-Israel relations are complex and have undergone significant changes over the years. Prior to 1979, Iran and Israel enjoyed relatively good relations, with Iran being one of the first countries in the Middle East to recognize Israel. The two countries cooperated on various levels, including economically and militarily [6]. The 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran marked a significant turning point. Iran's new government, led by Ayatollah Khomeini, was strongly anti-Israel and anti-Western. Iran's attitude toward Israel shifted from acceptance to hostility. During the 1980s and 1990s, Iran's rhetoric against Israel intensified, with leaders like Khomeini and later Khamenei calling for Israel's destruction. Iran also began supporting anti-Israel militant groups like Hezbollah in Lebanon [7]. The 2000s saw a new trend, as Iran's nuclear program became a major point of contention with Israel, which viewed Iran's nuclear ambitions as an existential threat. Israel has since become vocal in its opposition to Iran's nuclear program and has taken steps to sabotage it [9]. In recent years, the conflict between Iran and Israel has escalated, with the two countries engaged in a series of proxy wars and cyberattacks. Iran's support for militant groups in the region, such as Hezbollah and Hamas, has been a major point of contention with Israel. The most recent military operations were Operation Lion by Israel and Operation True Promise by Iran [46].

Iran's most prominent military action against Israel was Operation "True Promise," known in Arabic as al-Wa'd as-Sadiq, a massive missile attack against Israel that took place on April 13–14, 2024. The operation was a retaliatory attack aimed at Israeli military installations, specifically targeting two Israeli Air Force bases in the Negev and an Intelligence Corps facility on Mount Hermon. The attack was in response to the assassination of General Mohammad Reza Zahedei, commander of the Revolutionary Guard Corps' Quds Force in Syria and Lebanon, who was killed along with six of his top aides in a building adjacent to the Iranian embassy in Damascus on April 1, 2024. Iran launched more than 300 ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and suicide drones at Israel. Israel, with the help of the US and other allies, successfully defended against the attack, intercepting most of the incoming missiles and drones. Only a few missiles hit a single target in Israel, the Nevatim Air Force Base. The operation demonstrated the complexity and intensity of the conflict between Iran and Israel, highlighting the capabilities and limitations of both countries' military technology. The successful defense of Israel and its allies sent a message to Iran and other potential adversaries about the strength of their military alliance [21].

Among Arabs, confidence in Iran's Operation "True Promise" varies widely across the Arab world, reflected in at least three perspectives: pro-Iran, anti-Iran, and neutral. Some Arab groups and states, such as Hezbollah in Lebanon and some factions in Syria, may view Iran's operation as a justified response to Israeli aggression. They may view Iran's actions as a demonstration of resistance to Israel and a defense of regional interests. Conversely, many Arabs, particularly in Sunni-majority countries like Saudi Arabia and Egypt, may be skeptical or even opposed to Iran's motives. They may view Iran's operation as a Shia-led initiative aimed at expanding Iranian influence in the region. Other Arabs may have mixed feelings, recognizing the need

for deterrence against Israeli actions while also questioning the wisdom of escalating the conflict. They may be concerned about the humanitarian consequences and potential regional instability. Some key factors that influence Arab perceptions include historical context, sectarian affiliation, and national interests [18].

2 Literature Review

The hostility between Iran and Israel has been going on for a long time in many aspects. [42] stated that Iran has never recognized Israel's existence from the outset, so it is not surprising that the two countries are engaged in hostility. [36] added that the hostility between Iran and Israel is ideological and therefore lacks concrete manifestations. Because the two countries lack a border dispute, the issue is a conflict of interests within the Arab community. Both sides seek to infiltrate Arab public opinion to gain support. [2] noted a shift in Iran's war strategy in confronting Israel. The ever-evolving electronic environment has created a new reality and dimension of warfare, in the form of cyberwarfare, rather than traditional warfare. [19] stated that Iran and Israel have engaged in proxy wars, cyberattacks, and other forms of aggression. However, the possibility of non-military warfare between the two sides continues given their geographical distance. [10] added that, given the geographic context of the Iran-Israel conflict, air power has become the vanguard of the shadow war between the two. [43] highlighted Iran's efforts to expand its warfighting capabilities through a combination of proxies and an extensive missile program, and later a drone program.

The armed conflict between the two countries then escalated. [30] demonstrated the escalation of the Iran-Israel conflict by citing Israel's assassination of Ismail Haniyeh, the former Palestinian Prime Minister, during his visit to Tehran in August 2024. Arab states generally condemned the assassination but did not focus on Iran as the site of the incident. [5] points out that the cyberwarfare between Iran and Israel poses a significant threat to regional stability as both compete for hegemonic power. Military operations by Israel and Iran represent a new chapter in their hostilities, likely to continue. This is because, in reality, the results each side hoped for through their military operations have not been achieved.

Meanwhile, efforts to defuse the dispute between the two countries have often reached a dead end. [29] observed that in managing the Israel-Iran rivalry, policies must be implemented that seek to avoid direct military conflict between the two countries. [45] demonstrated that Iran-Israel peace scenarios require developing measures related to the limits of tolerance in conflict or even a demilitarized zone. [41] emphasized the need for international dialogue, negotiation, and mediation to resolve conflicts and maintain regional stability in the context of the Iran-Israel conflict. [17] concludes that mutual distrust between the two sides complicates any efforts to reach a long-term solution. [11] further suggests that the Iran-Israel conflict will impact the Middle East, at least creating new problems in the form of disrupting normalization of relations with Israel, strengthening the military of Arab states against Israeli threats, and a new struggle for hegemony if Iran weakens.

The coverage of the Iran-Israel conflict in the international mass media is also an interesting part. [3] showed that the reporting on Al-Jazeera and BBC News was influenced by editorial bias and their respective geopolitical contexts. In [38]'s study, it was shown that Arab media tend to view the Iran-Israel conflict as part of the Palestinian struggle and criticize Israeli policies. Meanwhile, [39] observed that Western media tended to frame Iran as a malevolent actor or an irrational threat to global stability, while systematically downplaying or ignoring Israel's violations of international law. A similar bias is described by [37, 25], in the case of the Palestine-Israel conflict, stating that it is visible in the international media in America and the UK. The depiction of Israel as the victim and Palestine as the perpetrator of violence in Western media is confirmed by [27, 33].

3 Theoretical Framework

Mass media discourse is interesting because the nature of the power relations within it is often biased, and it is necessary to discern the hidden involvement of power. In media discourse, there is a sharp distinction between producers and consumers because media products are commodities. Furthermore, media discourse is designed for a mass audience, and it is impossible for producers to know who their consumers are, let alone adapt to them. Because all discourse producers must produce with multiple interpreters in mind, media producers address ideal subjects, whether viewers, listeners, or readers. Media discourse has established subject positions for ideal subjects, and actual viewers, listeners, or readers must negotiate their relationships with these ideal subjects. Producers exercise power over consumers by monopolizing production rights, thus determining products, representations, and even subject positions [13].

Discourse that dominates one institution, thus constraining others, will eventually be considered natural and legitimate because it is simply a way of behaving. This condition is referred to as the naturalization of discourse, which then proceeds in accordance with the "balance of power" in social struggles. Naturalization is the primary path to common sense, dependent on the power of the social groups whose ideologies and types of discourse are being questioned. Explanations from dominant groups should be seen as rationalizations that need to be explained. Along with the emergence of naturalization, rationalizations emerge that serve to legitimize it [13].

There is a new, radical view of Fairclough's CDA model. This view emphasizes the power behind discourse, not just the power within discourse. It also emphasizes ideology, not just persuasion and manipulation. It views discourse as a stake in social struggles and a site of social struggle, and views social struggles as including class struggles. This view establishes the goal of CDA as raising people's awareness of how language contributes to the domination of some by others, as a step towards social emancipation [13].

Ideology is a representation of aspects of the real world that is open to normative critique but also necessary for maintaining existing social and power relations and their practical forms. Discourse is ideological when it includes such representations,

and activities, practices, and genres are ideological to the extent that they embody, enact, and operationalize such discourse. Ideology is a central issue in Fairclough's CDA, with a focus on ideology as an assumption considered 'common sense' [13].

There are three dimensions to critical discourse: description, interpretation, and explanation. Description is the stage concerned with the formal properties of the text. In the case of description, analysis is generally considered a matter of identifying and 'labeling' the formal features of a text in terms of the categories of a descriptive framework. Interpretation concerns the relationship between the text and the production process and serves as a resource in the interpretation process. This stage relates to the condition of someone producing a 'text' by transcribing utterances, but the existence of different ways of interpreting will influence how someone transcribes it. The explanation stage concerns the relationship between interaction and social context, the social determination of the production and interpretation processes, and their social impact. In this case, speech occurs in a relationship between interaction and more durable social structures that shape and are shaped by social events [13].

The interpretation process at the text level is evident in the surface of the utterance, its meaning, local coherence, and the structure of the text. Interpretation begins with the selection of easily recognized words, phrases, or sentences based on their meaning. These choices are realized in a new, coherent and structural text. Regarding contextual interpretation, situational and intertextual contexts are discussed. In textual interpretation, the situation determines the type of discourse and the interpretive procedures used. In an intertextual context, the discourse used is based on the assumption that the previous set of discourses is fixed, meaning that they are part of a common experience that can be touched upon, disagreed with, and so on. Every interpretation, whether textual or contextual, involves elements of the interpreter that function as interpretive procedures [13].

The purpose of the explanation stage is to illustrate discourse as part of a social process with the productive effects that discourse can cumulatively have on the social structures that sustain and transform it. This process occurs reciprocally, as social structures shape patterns of thought, and discourse then changes these patterns of thought, which in turn changes the structure. The social structure that comes into focus is the power relations, the focus of social practices on social struggles. This stage involves a specific perspective on mindsets as ideologies. Assumptions about culture, social relations, and social identities embedded in mindsets are viewed ideologically [13].

The researcher's position in the interpretation and explanation stages requires further examination. Researchers can gain access to the processes of discourse production and interpretation through their capacity to engage personally in the discourse processes they are investigating. Researchers must utilize their own interpretive mindsets to explain how participants utilize their mindsets. The researcher's position in the explanation stage is more easily distinguished from that of participants because the "resources" researchers use here are derived from social theory. However, self-awareness is equally important if one wants to avoid importing untheorized assumptions about society or acting as if explanations can be independent of or neutral to theory. Participants do have their own rationalizations for discourse practices in terms

of assumptions about society, but such rationalizations cannot be taken for granted. Critical researchers aim to bridge the gap between analyst and participant through the development of rational understandings and theories of society at large [13].

4 Findings and Discussions

Arab media coverage of Iran's Operation True Promise, a missile attack on Israel, largely reflected the host country's government's relationship with Israel. Countries with strained or no relations with Israel were more likely to frame the operation as a justified response to Israeli actions, in line with Iran's narrative. They also likely portrayed the operation as a strategic success, highlighting Israel's vulnerability. Countries with improved or normalized relations with Israel, such as Saudi Arabia and the UAE, may have adopted a more cautious tone, focusing on potential escalation and regional stability concerns, reflecting their countries' diplomatic efforts. Countries with complex or diverse relations with Israel, such as Qatar, may have provided balanced coverage, including Israel's response and international reaction, taking into account Qatar's diplomatic relations with Israel and Iran [14].

Several key factors influencing Arab media coverage include government relations with Israel, regional alliances, and editorial stance. Countries with strained or no relations tended to favor Palestinian or Iranian narratives, while countries with normalized relations might have focused on regional stability. Media often reflect the geopolitical interests and alliances of their host countries. Each media outlet may have a unique perspective shaped by its ownership, editorial direction, or target audience. Actual coverage can vary depending on the media outlet, editorial stance, and geopolitical context [24].

Arab media coverage of the Iran-Israel conflict reflects diverse perspectives, with some outlets criticizing or protesting their governments' positions. Al-Mayadeen questioned Israel's narrative of independence in carrying out the attacks, suggesting US involvement. Al Jazeera Arabic has framed Israel's actions as those of the West's "crazy friend," capable of acting where others would not. Public protests have erupted in various Arab countries, including Jordan, Egypt, and the Gulf states, against their governments' responses to the conflict. Protesters in Jordan have demanded a severance of ties with Israel, while those in Egypt have criticized President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi's handling of the situation. The regimes have responded with repression, arrests, and control of the protests. For example, Jordanian security forces have used excessive force, arresting over 1,500 protesters, while the Egyptian government has organized pro-regime Palestinian protests to influence public opinion. Some media outlets, such as Al-Araby Al-Jadeed, described the Israeli operation as a "deliberate and limited attack" aimed at re-establishing deterrence, while others, like Al Arabiya, emphasized regional preparedness and political signaling [30].

Many Arab governments are known to exercise control over the media, suppressing coverage that conflicts with their interests. This can manifest itself in various ways, such as censorship, media ownership, and regulatory control. Governments can

ensor media content deemed critical or threatening to their interests. Governments or pro-government individuals can own or control media outlets, influence narratives, and suppress dissenting voices. Governments can use regulatory bodies to restrict media freedom, impose fines, or revoke licenses for non-compliant outlets. - Intimidation and repression: Journalists and media outlets can face intimidation, harassment, or even imprisonment for covering topics deemed sensitive by the government. These practices can limit the Arab media's ability to provide independent and unbiased coverage, particularly on sensitive topics such as politics, security, and foreign policy. However, the level of government control can vary across countries and media outlets [31].

In the context of the Iran-Israel conflict, Arab governments can control media narratives to influence public opinion by promoting certain narratives or silencing alternative views. Governments can also control media coverage to protect their national interests, security, or diplomatic relations, as well as to maintain stability and prevent unrest or protests. Overall, the relationship between Arab governments and the media is complex, with varying degrees of control and censorship [33].

Governments in the Arab world, as elsewhere, often take positions based on a combination of national interests, regional dynamics, and international pressure. While it is difficult to generalize about all Arab governments, a nuanced perspective is on national interests, regional dynamics, international pressure, and agency. Governments prioritize their countries' security, economic, and strategic interests, which can lead them to form alliances, sign agreements, or take particular stances on regional issues. Regional rivalries, historical conflicts, and sectarian tensions influence Arab governments and shape their positions on issues such as the Iran-Israel conflict. Global powers, such as the US, can exert influence through diplomatic, economic, or military means, and Arab governments can adjust their positions in response to international pressure, considering factors such as economic aid, security guarantees, or diplomatic support. Arab governments have varying degrees of autonomy and agency in shaping their positions. Some governments may be more vulnerable to external pressure, while others may assert their independence and pursue their own interests [35].

Many Arab governments are cautious about becoming involved in this conflict, prioritizing avoiding war, protecting national interests, and managing relations with Iran. Arab states have urged restraint and de-escalation, recognizing that war would have devastating consequences for the region. Governments are focused on maintaining stability, promoting economic development, and addressing internal challenges. Some Arab states, such as Saudi Arabia, have re-established diplomatic relations with Iran, demonstrating a desire to manage tensions and avoid conflict. Ultimately, the Arab governments' response to the attacks will depend on each country's interests, relations with Iran and Israel, and priorities for regional stability [40]).

4.1 Pro-Iran

The three perspectives on the Iran-Israel conflict mentioned above are also reflected in Arab media coverage of Iran's Operation "True Promise," with varying tones and emphasis depending on the country's relationship with Iran. Pro-Iran media outlets,

such as Al-Mayadeen (Lebanon), are more likely to portray the operation as a justified response to Israeli aggression, highlighting Iran's military capabilities and resistance to Israel. Their narratives highlight the precision and complexity of Iran's missile attacks, portraying them as a successful demonstration of military power.

Al-Mayadeen is a Lebanese satellite television channel known for its pro-Iran and anti-Israel stance. Founded in 2012 in Lebanon, the channel is considered sympathetic to Hezbollah's views and has provided a platform for Iranian and Hezbollah officials to disseminate their messages. The channel's founding is seen as a response to the growing demand for alternative perspectives on regional issues, particularly in the context of the Arab Spring. Al-Mayadeen is not directly affiliated with any government, but is known for its pro-Iranian stance, often aligning its coverage with Iran's foreign policy objectives. The channel has extensively covered Iranian-backed militias in the region, such as Hezbollah and the Houthis, highlighting their role in countering Israeli actions. The channel's coverage of government policies tends to focus on encouraging resistance to Israeli actions and highlighting the importance of Iran's support for regional stability, from the perspective of Iran and its allies.

Pro-Iran discourse in Arab media often uses specialized vocabulary to frame Iranian actions positively, using key terms such as resistance, military action, patriotism, and anti-Israel sentiment. These key terms are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Specialized terminologies used by Arab media

| Resistance | Military Action | Patriotism | Anti-Israel Sentiment |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------|---|
| Muqāwama (Resistance) | Sawārīkh (Missiles) | Waṭan (Homeland) | Al-İhtilāl (Occupation) |
| Sumūd (Resilience) | Darbah (Strike) | Sharaf (Honor) | Al-Kiyān Al-Şuhyūnī (Zionist Entity/Israel) |
| Tahrīr (Liberation) | ʿAmaliyyah ʿaskariyyah (Military Operation) | Karāmah (Dignity) | Al-Muqāwamah Al-Filasṭīniyyah (Palestinian Resistance) |

Source: [1, 3, 22]

These terms are frequently used in Arab media to portray Iran's actions as justified and heroic. These expressions imply that Iran's attacks on Israel are a form of resistance against external aggression that violates its sovereignty. In carrying out this resistance, the Iranian nation is portrayed as militarily prepared. Furthermore, Iran's military readiness is demonstrated by its ability to carry out intense but targeted attacks. Thus, pro-Iran media construct a narrative that portrays Iran's operations as a legitimate and effective response to Israeli actions, while simultaneously highlighting Iran's military prowess and its commitment to regional resistance.

Al-Mayadeen often navigates a complex web of identities and affiliations, with multiple perspectives including shared Shia identity, anti-Western sentiment, Arab nationalism, historical ties, and narratives of resistance. Many pro-Iran Arab media

outlets are based in countries with significant Shia populations, such as Lebanon, Iraq, or Bahrain. This can help them capitalize on existing anti-Western or anti-Israel sentiment in the Arab world while arguing that Iran's influence can help Arab states assert their independence and national sovereignty. The cultural and historical ties between Arab and Persian civilizations are highlighted by emphasizing shared heritage and cooperation between the nations. By framing Iran as a key player in the regional resistance against Israel and Western powers, pro-Iranian Arab media outlets seek to appeal to Arab audiences who sympathize with the Palestinian cause or oppose Western intervention in the region. By adopting this position, pro-Iranian Arab outlets can build credibility and trust with their viewers or readers, shape public opinion, and promote Iranian interests.

Al Mayadeen's position as a pan-Arab news channel reflects its commitment to Arab issues and its alignment with the perspectives of Iran and Hezbollah on regional issues. The channel emphasizes its commitment to nationalist, pan-Arab, and humanitarian issues within a framework of professional journalistic objectivity. Al Mayadeen asserts its Arab identity by focusing on issues of Arab priority, particularly the Palestinian issue, and framing it as a primary concern for Arab viewers. The channel also promotes resistance movements across the Arab world as a struggle against Western or Israeli domination. Al Mayadeen has a network of reporters across the Arab world, providing extensive coverage of regional events and issues.

There are several notable examples of Al-Mayadeen's discourse. Ghassan bin Jiddo, the channel's director, has spoken of his "friendship" with Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah, highlighting the channel's close ties to the organization. Al-Mayadeen has referred to Syrian rebels as "terrorists" and the Syrian government's actions against them as a "cleansing" when reporting on the Syrian civil war. The channel has also promoted the Palestinian cause as its primary narrative, often portraying Israel as an occupying force and emphasizing the need for resistance against it.

Al-Mayadeen's anti-Israel stance is consistent with its broader narrative of supporting resistance movements and criticizing Israeli and US policies in the region. Al-Mayadeen positions itself as a pan-Arab news channel, promoting Arab interests and perspectives. However, Al-Mayadeen's alignment with Iran and Hezbollah has led some to question its objectivity. Critics argue that the channel's coverage reflects Iranian and Hezbollah interests, potentially influencing its pan-Arab narrative. Al-Mayadeen appears to support Iranian intervention in the Arab world, framing it as a positive force. Key points about Al-Mayadeen's perspective include Iran's military preparedness and its support for resistance movements. The channel's coverage often emphasizes Iran's readiness to respond to any escalation, highlighting its military capabilities and potential changes to its nuclear policy in response to perceived existential threats. Al-Mayadeen's narrative tends to favor resistance movements, including Hezbollah and Hamas, which are considered key players in regional dynamics. Al-Mayadeen's positions closely align with official Iranian positions, and its coverage reflects Iran's interests and perspectives.

4.2 Anti-Iran

Al-Sharq al-Awsat is a London-based pan-Arab international newspaper known for its moderate and liberal stance. Founded in 1978 by Saudi businessman Hisham Hafiz and his brother, Mohamed Ali Hafiz, the newspaper has become a leading voice in the Arab world, covering a wide range of topics from politics and economics to culture and society. The newspaper is not directly affiliated with any government, but has historically been considered pro-Saudi, reflecting the kingdom's interests and perspectives on regional issues. Al-Sharq al-Awsat's coverage of government policies tends to focus on promoting Arab interests and values, while also criticizing authoritarianism and advocating for greater political and social freedoms. The newspaper's coverage often reflects Saudi interests and perspectives, although it also provides a platform for a diverse range of Arab voices and opinions.

In contrast to pro-Iran media, Al-Sharq Al-Awsat (Saudi Arabia) criticized Iran's actions, emphasizing the potential for escalation and regional instability, and also considered Iran's actions reckless and provocative. This narrative often emphasized the role of diplomacy and international cooperation in crisis mitigation. Specific phrases used criticized Iran's actions with several key aspects, such as crisis terminology, Iran's intentions, regional security, and critical analysis. These phrases are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Specialized terminologies used by Al-Sharq Al-Awsat

| Crisis | Intentions | Regional Security | Critics |
|--|------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Taş'īd (Escalation) | Niyyah (Intention) | Istiqrār (Stability) | Istifzāz (Provocation) |
| Makhāṭir (Risks) | Maṣāliḥ (Interests) | Tahdīd (Threat) | 'Udwān (Aggression) |
| Za'z'at Al-Istiqrār (Destabilization) | Ajandah (Agenda) | Amn Al-Mintīqah (Regional Security) | Tadakhkhul (Interference) |

Source: [1, 8, 22]

The above terms are frequently used by Al-Sharq Al-Awsat to express concern about Iran's actions and their impact on regional stability. Concerns are conveyed by emphasizing the potential risks and consequences of Iran's reckless actions. Iran's motives are questioned, as its actions are driven solely by self-interest, not a genuine desire for peace or stability. Phrases highlighting potential threats to regional security emphasize the need for caution and international diplomacy to find a peaceful solution. Phrases criticizing Iran's military strategy suggest that Iran's actions are ill-considered and likely to backfire. By using these terms, anti-Iran media outlets construct a narrative that portrays Operation True Promise as misguided and potentially disastrous, while emphasizing the need for regional stability and international cooperation.

Al-Sharq al-Awsat positions itself as a pan-Arab newspaper that promotes Arab interests and goals within an Arab identity. While maintaining a critical stance against Iranian influence in the region, Al-Sharq affirms Arab unity and sovereignty, and promotes regional stability through diverse perspectives. Al-Sharq al-Awsat frequently criticizes Iran's actions and influence in the region, framing them as a threat to Arab stability and security. It emphasizes the importance of Arab unity in facing regional challenges, advocating for the sovereignty of Arab states. It emphasizes the need for regional stability and cooperation and frequently highlights the importance of diplomatic efforts in mitigating crises by addressing regional issues from diverse Arab voices and perspectives. It frequently highlights the importance of the Arab-Israeli peace process, while also advocating for a negotiated resolution of the conflict.

Al-Sharq al-Awsat, a leading Arabic-language daily newspaper, uses a variety of discourses to express its positions on regional issues, such as the Pan-Arab perspective, regional stability, and diverse perspectives. However, its most prominent expression is Saudi influence. The newspaper has covered peace initiatives and diplomatic efforts in the region, highlighting opportunities for peace and stability. It also analyzes regional changes and their implications for the Middle East, including the impact of the Arab uprisings and shifting regional power dynamics.

While Al-Sharq al-Awsat's editorial stance may reflect Saudi Arabia's perspective, its reporting does not always demonstrate a strong pro-Israel stance. Instead, Al-Sharq al-Awsat appears to prioritize regional stability and criticize actions that could exacerbate tensions. Al-Sharq al-Awsat's discourse does not explicitly express an anti-Iranian or pro-Israeli stance. Key points about Al-Sharq al-Awsat's stance include criticism of Iranian expansionism and calls for escalation. Columnist Tariq Al-Homayed argues that Iran's actions, including its support for Hamas, have contributed to regional chaos and instability. The newspaper's coverage often emphasizes the need for restraint and diplomacy in regional conflicts.

Al-Sharq al-Awsat's stances on Israel and Iran differ markedly. Israel is viewed with a pragmatic approach to regional dynamics. While Al-Sharq al-Awsat's editorial stance may not directly support Israel's existence, its reporting demonstrates an openness to diplomatic solutions and a pragmatic approach to regional relations. This perspective is likely influenced by its relationship with Saudi Arabia and its focus on regional stability. Iran, on the other hand, is viewed as a significant threat to the Arab world, citing concerns about its nuclear ambitions, military threats, regional instability, and Gulf security. The newspaper's former editor, Abd Al-Rahman Al-Rashed, expressed concern that Iran's nuclear program poses a threat to regional stability, particularly to neighboring countries such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and others. He argued that Iran's nuclear ambitions are more likely directed at its neighbors than Israel, given the vast disparity in military capabilities.

Al-Sharq al-Awsat's coverage highlights Iran's actions deemed destabilizing, including its support for militias and proxy groups across the Middle East. Columnist Tariq Al-Homayed criticized Iran's behavior, citing cyberattacks, drug trafficking, and threats to maritime navigation as evidence of its unreliability. The newspaper advocated a firm stance against Iran, with Al-Homayed suggesting that the West must have a "Plan B" to confront Tehran, including a credible military threat to prevent it

from developing nuclear weapons. He believed this approach would be effective, as Iran understands the language of force. Al-Sharq al-Awsat also discussed Iran's implied threats against Gulf states, including Bahrain, which Iran claims as its territory. This rhetoric has raised concerns among Arab states, especially given Iran's historical claims to parts of the Gulf. Overall, Al-Sharq al-Awsat's perspective on Iran's threat to the Arab world emphasized the need for caution, diplomacy, and a strong deterrent to prevent further escalation.

Al-Sharq al-Awsat portrayed Iran as a significant threat to the Arab world, especially to Gulf states that cooperate with the US. While Al-Sharq al-Awsat's perspective on the Iranian threat may not be representative of the entire Arab world, it reflects the concerns of some Arab states, particularly in the Gulf region. The newspaper advocates a strong response to Iran, including military threats and diplomatic pressure. The West must have a "Plan B" for confronting Iran, including credible military threats to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons. Al-Sharq al-Awsat supports the imposition of additional sanctions on Iran, focusing on its drone and missile industries.

4.3 Neutral

Al-Jazeera is Qatar's state-owned Arabic-language international news channel. It has been a leading voice in the Middle East media landscape since its launch in 1996 by an Emirati decree by the then-Emir of Qatar, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al Thani. The channel was established as an independent news organization, despite being owned by the Qatari government. Its coverage often reflects Qatari foreign policy interests and perspectives, although it also provides a platform for diverse voices and opinions. The channel's reporting on government policies tends to focus on promoting democracy, human rights, and freedom of expression, while also criticizing authoritarianism and extremism. Al-Jazeera is known for providing coverage that sometimes aligns with Qatar's diplomatic efforts and interests in the region. Al-Jazeera's coverage often criticizes authoritarianism and extremism while promoting democracy and human rights, although its coverage can be influenced by Qatari foreign policy interests.

A neutral or analytical media outlet, such as Al-Jazeera (Qatar), provides more balanced coverage by analyzing the implications and potential consequences of such operations for the region. This narrative explores the technical aspects of the missile attacks, such as the types of missiles used (Ghader, Imad, and Khaibar Shekan) and the effectiveness of Israel's defense system. Al-Jazeera's analytical discourse frequently uses specific expressions to provide balanced coverage, with several key terms on analysis, contextualization, critical thinking, and relations (regional and international). Table 3 lists these expressions in detail.

Table 3. Specialized terminologies used by Al-Jazeera

| Analysis | Contextualization | Critics | Relations |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Taḥlīl (Analysis) | Siyāq (Context) | Naqd (Critique) | Diblūmāsiyyah (Diplomacy) |
| Taqyīm (Evaluation) | Khilfiyyah (Background) | Taḥqīq (Investigation) | ‘Alāqāt Dawliyyah (International Relations) |
| Tadā‘iyāt (Implications) | Ab‘ād (Dimensions) | Manzūr (Perspective) | Tawatturāt Iqlīmiyyah (Regional Tensions) |

Source: [1,22,46]

These terms are frequently used in Al-Jazeera's analytical reporting to provide in-depth analysis and nuanced understanding of complex issues. Based on these expressions, Al-Jazeera tends to use more balanced and objective language, focusing on factual reporting and analysis. They prioritize nuanced factual accuracy and avoid emotional language. Analytical language is used to provide context and insight. Neutral media outlets may cite a variety of sources, including officials, experts, and analysts, to provide a balanced view of the issue.

Al-Jazeera positions itself as a pan-Arab news organization, promoting Arab interests and unity while maintaining a nuanced and analytical approach to regional issues, prioritizing coverage of Arab perspectives. The network provides in-depth analysis of regional issues, often exploring the complexities and nuances of Arab politics, society, and culture. Al-Jazeera is known for maintaining a critical yet balanced approach to regional issues, often criticizing policies and actions while providing diverse perspectives and opinions. Al-Jazeera's unique perspective is its global reach and diverse audience, which enables it to promote Arab perspectives and interests to a broad international audience. By promoting Arab perspectives and interests to a global audience, Al-Jazeera contributes to fostering greater understanding and cooperation between the Arab and international communities.

4.4 Ideology

The Iran-Israel conflict has significant ideological underpinnings, particularly from an Iranian perspective, with key aspects related to religious doctrine, regional influence, anti-Western imperialism, and Palestinian resistance. When it comes to Arab media coverage of the Iran-Israel conflict, the narrative can vary significantly depending on the country and the media outlet publishing it. Some Arab countries, such as those in the Gulf region, may view Iran's actions as a threat to regional stability, while others may sympathize with Iran's stance on Palestine. Given the complex nature of the conflict, Arab media coverage can reflect a variety of perspectives, ranging from criticizing Iranian aggression to condemning Israeli actions. The ideological aspects of this

coverage will depend on the specific context and the media outlet's stance on the conflict [44].

The ideological aspects of Arab media reporting on Iran can vary significantly depending on the country, media outlet, and specific context. Some key factors to consider when evaluating Arab media reporting on Iran include country-specific bias, media ownership, journalism, freedom, and regional dynamics. It is important to remember that these factors can interact in complex ways, and individual media outlets may exhibit varying perspectives depending on the specific context and their editorial stance [44].

The relationship between Arab media reporting on the Iranian attack and the media's capitalists is important, as funding sources can influence the narrative and tone of the coverage. Saudi-funded media outlets reported the incident in varying tones, from emphasizing Israel's defensive posture and regional stability to a more technical perspective on the attack. SL Jazeera, like Qatari-funded media outlets, portrayed Israel as a "crazy friend" of the West and highlighted the potential for escalation. This contrasted with independent pan-Arab media outlets, which questioned Israel's independence in carrying out the attack and implied US involvement. Al-Mayadeen, a Beirut-based outlet closely affiliated with the Axis of Resistance, framed the Israeli operation as a politically motivated gamble. These varying perspectives illustrate how capitalists can shape media narratives, reflecting their respective interests and agendas [47].

Economic ideology can be reflected in the discourse used by the media, particularly in terms of framing, tone, sources, and issues. Media can frame economic issues in ways that align with their ideological leanings. For example, some media outlets might emphasize the benefits of free-market policies, while others might highlight the need for government intervention. The tone and language used can also reflect economic ideology. For example, more socialist-leaning media might use language that emphasizes social welfare and government support, while more capitalist-leaning media might use language that emphasizes individual freedom and entrepreneurship. Media outlets may choose to cite sources that align with their economic ideology, which can shape the narrative and influence public opinion. In the context of Arab media coverage of the Iranian attacks, the discourse used may reflect the economic ideology of the media outlets or their shareholders. Market-oriented media might emphasize the economic implications of the attacks on regional stability and trade. State-controlled media, on the other hand, might focus on the need for government action to protect national interests and security. By analyzing the discourse used, we can gain insight into the economic ideologies and interests underlying media narratives [26].

Certain phrases used by al-Mayadeen reflect its ideological leanings. The axis of resistance refers to a network of Iranian-backed groups and militias in the Middle East, including Hezbollah in Lebanon and certain factions in Syria and Iraq. In defending the country, pro-Iranian media often frame their military actions as defensive measures to protect the country or region from external threats, particularly from the United States and Israel. They are also anti-imperialist, using rhetoric that emphasizes resistance to Western imperialism and Zionism, portraying Iran and its allies as

champions of anti-colonialism and the right to self-determination. Pro-Iranian media often highlight their support for the Palestinian cause. In some cases, pro-Iranian media may use sectarian language to mobilize Shia communities or vilify Sunni groups, depending on the context. It is worth noting that pro-Iranian Arab media often have distinct tones and styles, reflecting their ideological leanings and target audiences. These media may also use different vocabulary and expressions to appeal to different groups, such as Shia communities or Sunni audiences. These discourses and expressions are often used to shape public opinion and promote certain narratives [3].

Ideological implications are evident in al-Sharq al-Awsat's expressions, which portray Iran as a threat. Security threats are a key point, emphasizing concerns about Iran's regional ambitions and military activities. Sectarianism is also a key issue, highlighting Iran's attempts to exploit sectarian tensions. A cautious stance emphasizes interventionism, criticizing Iran's involvement in regional conflicts and perceived efforts to spread its ideology. Proxy militias refer to Iranian-backed groups in various countries, often with negative connotations. These discourses and expressions are frequently used in Arab media critical of Iran's regional policies and activities [8].

Some specific expressions used by al-Jazeera also encompass ideological aspects, with a tendency toward a middle-of-the-road stance. Conflict resolution is encouraged through diplomatic efforts or negotiations. For military issues, reports on military developments are presented impartially. Economic implications are also discussed, focusing on regional developments. Al-Jazeera aims to provide a balanced and informative narrative, avoiding sensationalism and emotional language. They focus on facts, analysis, and diverse perspectives to help readers understand complex issues [16].

4.5 Contestation

The Arab media landscape is characterized by intense contestation among various parties, including pro-Iran, anti-Iran, and neutral media outlets. This contestation reflects the complex geopolitical dynamics in the region, with various countries and groups vying for influence through media narratives. Key aspects of this contestation include their roles, approaches, forms, and socio-political dynamics. Arab media play a significant role in shaping political conflicts and agendas, with different media outlets promoting different ideologies and agendas. Understanding the media contestation in the Arab world regarding its role requires an interdisciplinary approach, combining insights from media studies, anthropology, religious studies, and political science. The contestation involves both traditional and new media forms, including social media and satellite television, which have transformed the media landscape in the Arab world. Media contestation reflects and influences socio-political dynamics in the Arab world, with various groups using the media to promote their interests and agendas [28].

The implications of this contestation among Arab media outlets are numerous, such as polarization, influence on public opinion, and regional stability. Media contestation can contribute to polarization, reinforcing existing divisions and complicating the search for common ground. Diverse media narratives can shape public opinion and

influence political attitudes in the Arab world. This contestation can have implications for regional stability, as various groups and states use the media to promote their interests and agendas. Overall, the Arab media landscape is characterized by intense contestation, reflecting the complex geopolitical dynamics in the region. Understanding this contestation requires a thorough analysis of various media narratives and their implications for regional stability and public opinion [20].

Determining the dominant players in the Arab world and the international context surrounding the Iran-Israel conflict is complex, with various stakeholders influencing these narratives. In the Arab world context, this also involves multiple perspectives. Pro-Iranian media, aligned with Iranian interests, emphasize resistance to Israeli aggression and highlight US support for Israel. Anti-Iranian media focus on the country's destabilizing role in the region and its support for proxy militias. Neutral media prioritize factual reporting and analysis, providing a balanced view of the conflict. Internationally, there have been global calls for restraint. International leaders, including the UN Secretary-General and European leaders, have urged restraint and de-escalation. Meanwhile, the US Congress is divided on the issue, with some lawmakers supporting Israel's actions and others advocating caution and diplomatic solutions [15].

4.6 Criticism

Criticism of Arab media's stance on Iran can be categorized based on their perspective: pro-Iran, anti-Iran, or neutral. Western countries and their media outlets often view pro-Iran media as promoting extremist ideology and supporting terrorism. Anti-Iran Arab media accuse pro-Iran media of serving Iranian interests and promoting sectarianism. Some Sunni Arab governments, such as Saudi Arabia, have criticized pro-Iran media for fueling sectarian tensions and supporting Iran's regional ambitions. Conversely, pro-Iran media and governments view anti-Iran media as promoting a biased and hostile agenda against Iran and its interests. Some Western scholars and analysts also criticize anti-Iran media for oversimplifying complex issues and perpetuating stereotypes about Iran and its people. The Iranian government and its supporters, of course, accuse anti-Iran media of spreading propaganda and lies about Iran's policies and actions. In different contexts, both pro-Iran and anti-Iran media criticize neutral media for not taking a clear stance or for perceived bias. Some analysts and scholars argue that neutral media outlets may fail to provide sufficient context or depth in their coverage of complex, unbiased media outlets by failing to promote their own agendas or perspectives [12].

Despite the mutual criticisms mentioned above, there is a common thread in Arab media coverage of Iran's attack on Israel: it was well-planned and limited in scope. Most media outlets agree that both Israel and Iran operated with a deterrent logic, aiming to avoid escalation into open warfare. There are several key perspectives on this. Pro-Iranian media outlets framed the Israeli operation as a politically motivated gamble, perhaps aimed at distracting public attention from internal issues or reaffirming deterrence against Iran and its network of allies. Furthermore, anti-Iranian media outlets viewed the attack as part of a broader Israeli strategy to assert regional leader-

ship against the Iranian bulwark, protecting not only Israel but also Gulf Arab states wary of Tehran's influence. This is the flip side of neutral media's focus on factual reporting and analysis, which highlights the complexity of the conflict and the potential for escalation [12].

Arab media attitudes toward Arab independence and cooperation with Iran vary depending on their ideological leanings. Pro-Iranian media often emphasize the benefits of cooperation with Iran, framing it as a strategic partnership that can enhance regional stability and security. Iranian attacks on Israel are seen as bringing benefits, such as weakening Israeli dominance, increasing resistance to the West, and diverting international attention from internal Arab issues. In contrast, anti-Iranian media tend to prioritize Arab independence and sovereignty, viewing Iranian influence as a threat to regional stability and security. They often criticize Iran's interventionist policies in Arab countries, arguing that Tehran's actions undermine Arab autonomy and exacerbate sectarian tensions. Neutral media, on the other hand, take a more balanced approach, recognizing the complexity of Arab-Iranian relations and the need for differentiated engagement. They prioritize Arab interests and sovereignty while recognizing the potential benefits of cooperation with Iran in specific contexts, such as regional security or economic development [12].

5 Conclusion

This analysis examines Arab media discourse surrounding the Iran-Israel conflict, applying Fairclough's three-dimensional model. The study reveals complex representations of power dynamics, ideological alignments, and regional stability concerns. Arab media outlets employ distinct linguistic strategies to frame the conflict, often reflecting their ideological leanings.

In the context of this research, the level of description is related to the language application of Arab media regarding the Iran-Israel conflict. Pro-Iranian media likely portrayed the Iran operation as a justified response to Israeli aggression, highlighting Iran's military capabilities and resistance against Israel. For anti-Iranian media, might have criticized Iran's actions, emphasizing the potential for escalation and regional instability. Such neutral media may have provided more balanced coverage, analyzing the operation's implications and potential consequences for the region.

In the level of interpretation, all of Arab media in the context of Israel-Iran conflict, assert their-self as Arab defender. They also encourage the Arab people as independent. The difference is in the method to make sure for the independence. Pro-Iranian media likely call a cooperation with Iran to defend the Arab from Israeli aggression, based on Iran's military capabilities. For anti-Iranian media, emphasize that Arab people their self is more than enough to destroy Israel. Neutral media provide promoted balanced coverage with ceasefire and dialog as main way. In the level of explanation, the lack of Arab people for war with Israel is the main topic in solving the conflict with Israel for pro-Iranian media. Anti-Iranian media, in the other hand,

emphasize pro-Iranian Arab is traitor. Neutral media promote the international role, not only Arab, for defend Arab people.

The conflict is also situated within broader socio-political contexts, including historical alliances, sectarian divisions, and geopolitical interests. Arab responses reflect a mix of strategic interests, security concerns, and diplomatic efforts to prevent further escalation. By applying Fairclough's framework, this analysis highlights the intricate relationships between language, power, and society in Arab media discourse surrounding the Iran-Israel conflict. The study demonstrates how discourse shapes and reflects social realities, identities, and power relations in the region.

References

1. Al-Kayyali, 'Abdul-Wahhab. *Mausu'ah as-Siyasah. al- Mu'assasah al-'Arabiyyah lin-Nasyr wad-Dirasah* (1985)
2. Al-Maimuniy, A. bin 'Ali. *al-Jabha an-Nasytah Tada'iyat al-Muwajahah as-Sibraniyyah baina Iran wa Isra'il*. *Majallah Dirasat Al-Iraniyya*, 12 (2020)
3. Almayadeen Homepage. www.almayadeen.com. Last accessed 2026/1/2
4. Alim, S., Yusli Effendi, & Agus Wahyudi. Framing The Iran-Israel Conflict: A Comparative Analysis of Al-Jazeera and BBC News Coverage in April 2024. *Journal of Islamic Civilization*, 6(2), 166–180 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.33086/jic.v6i2.6537>
5. Amaliya, L. R. A Cyber War of Iran-Israel_A Geopolitical Rivalry. *Proceeding of the International Conference on Strategic and Global Studies 2024* (2025)
6. Anderson, E. W., & Anderson, L. D. *An Atlas of Middle Eastern Affairs*. Routledge (2010)
7. Asgharzadeh, A. *Iran and the Challenge of Diversity: Islamic Fundamentalism, Aryanist Racism, and Democratic Struggles* (2007)
8. Al-Sharq al-Awsat Homepage. www.aawsat.com. Last accessed 2026/1/2
9. Conduit, D., & Akbarzadeh, S. *New Opposition in the Middle East*. In *New Opposition in the Middle East* (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8821-6>
10. Dryden, J. *Airpower in the Middle East Iran, Israel, and the Struggle for the Skies over the Middle East*. *Æther*, 2(1) (2023)
11. Dzulhisham, H. E. *The Iran-Israel Conflict: Geopolitical Implications for The Middle East*. *RSiS Comentary*, pp.146 (2025)
12. Fahsh, B. *Al-Harb al-Isra'iliyyah al-Iraniyyah_Shara' al-Aidiyulujiiyyat al- Musallahah*. www.majalla.com (2025)
13. Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*. Routledge (2015)
14. Farhat, M. F. *Ad-Durus al-Mustafadah min al-Harb al-Isra'iliyyah- al-Iraniyyah*. www.acpas.ahram.org.eg (2025)
15. Frantzman, S. J. *By, with, and Through: How the U.S.-Led Coalition Defeated the Islamic State in Iraq Using Tactics without Coherent Strategy for Confronting Iranian Influence*. *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 21(3) (2017)
16. Garcia, A. R., Filipe, S. B., Fernandes, C., Estevão, C., & Ramos, G. *Harbu Isra'il wa Iran*. <https://www.aljazeera.net> (n.d.)
17. Ghadban, A. A. *Israeli and Iranian Deterrence Strategies and Their Implications for the Middle East (2015–2025)*. *Majallah Al-Khalij Al-'Arabiyy*, 1(53) (2025)

18. Haidar, D. *Baina al-Ghadab wa la al-Mubalah: Kaifa Tanzuru asy-Syu'ub al- 'Arabiyyah ila Iran fi Muwajahatiha ma'a Israil*. www.bbcnews.com (2025)
19. Hamed, A. F. Vulnerabilities and weaknesses points in the Iranian-(Israeli) conflict: a strategic readability include the changing of regional environment. *Tikrit Journal For Political Science*, **1**(31), 3–28 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.25130/tjfps.v1i31.36>
20. Hinnebusch, R. *The International Politics of the Middle East*. Manchester University Press (2003)
21. Huraidi, S. *Maza Kasyafat al-Muwajahah al-'Askariyyah baina Israil wa Iran*. www.futureuae.com (2025)
22. Ibnu-Manzur, A.-F. J. M. bin M.. *Lisan al- 'Arab*. Matba'ah Miriyah. (1981)
23. Javadzadeh, A. *Marxists into Muslims: The Iranian Irony*. Florida International University, Miami (2007)
24. Kahl, Colin H., E. a. *Risk and Rivalry: Iran, Israel and the Bomb*. www.cnas.com
25. Kandil, M. A. (2009). *ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in American, Arab, and British Media : Corpus-Based Critical Discourse Analysis* (2012)
26. Kamrava, M. *The Modern Middle East: A Political History since the First World War*. University of California Press (2005)
27. Kareem, A. H., & Najm, Y. M. A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Biased Role of Western Media in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. *Journal of Language Studies*. **8**(6), 200–215 (2024)
28. Karim, T. *Sara' Iran wa Israil: Qalaq Dakhiliyy wa As'ilatun haula ar-Raha'in wa Harb Gazzah*. www.dw.com (2025)
29. Kaye, D. D., Nader, A., & Roshan, P. *Israel and Iran: a Dangerous Rivalry*. National Defense Research Institute, 250–251 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203905142-4>
30. Kayyali, M. *As-Sara' al-Isra'iliyy al-Iraniyy: Tabi'atuhu, Hududuhu, Tauzifatuhu, Ihtimalatuhu*. www.palestineforum.net (2023)
31. Keskin, T. *Middle East Studies After September 11: Neo-Orientalism, American Hegemony and Academia*. Brill (2018)
32. Khattab, Y. K. *al-Wadl' ar-Rahin fi asy-Syarq al-Ausat fi Zill Tasa'ud at- Tawattur baina Iran wa Israil*. www.gre.com (2025)
33. Manor, I., Crilley, R., & Crilley, R. *Visually framing the Gaza War of 2014 Visually framing the Gaza War of 2014 : The Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs on Twitter Ilan Manor*. **11**(4), 369–391 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635218780564>
34. Mens, J. *War without Name: The Iran-Israel Relationship in Historical Perspective*. www.belfercenter.org (2024)
35. Monshipouri, M. *Middle East Politics*. In *Middle East Politics* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429060496>
36. Na'na', A. al-Q. *al-'Ilaqat al-Iraniyyah-al-Isra'iliyyah_Ab'ad min al- Aidulujiyya*. www.aqnanaa.com (2014)
37. Nahed, S. Al, & Hammond, P. *Framing War and Conflict : Introduction to the Special Issue* (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635218798992>
38. Priya, L. *Gaza Crisis and the Arabic Press : A Discourse Analysis* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1177/23477989241292150>
39. Qatrani, O. *The Iran-Israel War: A Hyper-Complex Conflict in the Lens of Global Strategic Calculations*. *Case Study Series*, 1 (2025)
40. Scott-Baumann, M. *Crisis in the Middle East: Israel and the Arab States 1945-2007*. Hodger Education (2010)

41. Seung-Hyun, K. The Israel-Iran Conflict_Historical Background and Modern. *International Journal of Advanced Culture Technology*, **12**(2), 309–317 (2024)
42. Syalabiy, 'Abdul-Hamid 'Abdul-Jalil. al-I'tiraf al-Iraniy bi Isra'il wa Mauqif al- 'Arab minhu. *Ar-Ruznamah*, 8 (2010)
43. Tarzi, A. Israel–Iran Conflict: A Change in Iran's Strategic Assesment. *MESinsight*, **15**(5) (2024).
44. Tyler, P. *A World of Trouble: The White House and the Middle East, from the Cold War to the War on Terror*. Farrar Straus Giroux (2008)
45. Veen, E. vaan, & Touval, Y. *Israel Against Iran: Regional Conflict Scenarios*. Clingendael (2024)
46. Yusuf, M. Khabaya Sara' az-Zalam baina Israii wa Iran. www.aljazeera.net (2025)
47. Zuhur, S. *Iran, Iraq, and The United States: The Triangle's Impact on Sectarianism and the Nuclear Threat*. www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil (2006)

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

