

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Discourse Analysis of The Guardian and Dawn Editorials: Framing the Language of the Palestine-Israel Conflict

Muhammad Moosa Naeem ^a

Abstract: This research examines how the UK's prestigious newspaper Guardian and Pakistan's prestigious English newspaper Dawn employs language and discourse in their editorials dated October 8 to November 8, 2023, framing the severe Israel-Palestine conflict. This research examines that each editorial of each newspaper explains, creates meaning, perspective and presented the intense Hamas attack of 7 October 2023. Qualitative Analysis was used to analyze all the editorials. The Study mainly analyzed language patterns, metaphors and main themes of the content of the editorials. Editorials in Dawn often use highly charged, emotive language to describe Israeli actions as genocidal and Palestinians as victims. Dawn uses highly emotional words in the language of their editorials to represent Israeli's as a Genocidal force and Palestinians as Victims while on the other hand The Guardian uses calm and simpler language while addressing the same incident. This approach tries to be balanced and fair, but Dawn emphasizes Palestinian injustices and historical colonialism, reflecting its readership and offering a perspective that highlights power imbalances in the conflict. The Comparison in this study shows how certain factors like political views and editorial style frames the situation through the use of language and how it affects the public perception about certain conflict, its reasons, and possible outcomes. The article concludes by emphasizing the significant influence of the media in framing a narrative of conflict and the inherent problems in reporting highly asymmetric conflict. The findings also clearly show each newspaper frames the conflict differently through selective keywords and imagery.

Keywords: Palestine-Israel Conflict, Hamas, Discourse Analysis, Media Framing, Lexical Choices

Introduction

The Israeli-Palestine conflict is a long and complex geopolitical competition of the modern era, but it is also one in which media discourse plays a central role in global public understanding. It finds its origins in the late nineteenth century with the Zionist movement, which accelerates after the establishment of Israel in 1948, which Palestinians call the Nakba, or catastrophe, which led to the displacement of approximately 750,000 Palestinians, (IZAK, 2024). Further wars in 1967 and 1973 resulted in Israeli occupation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem and established a set of conditions that continue to this day, characterized by military control, settlement expansion, and restricted Palestinian movement. Since Hamas took power in 2007, Gaza has been under an Israeli-Egyptian blockade, something humanitarian organizations have framed as an "open-air prison" marked by extreme limits on goods, movement, and reconstruction.

Media language plays an active role in shaping the way that the public perceives international conflict, through vocabulary and rhetorical choices (Taofeek, November 2025). News organizations not only report the event but construct interpretive frameworks through lexical choices (Arnav Arora, 2025). The escalation of the Palestine-Israel conflict following the events of October 7, 2023, set off a media controversy across the world. And this puts leading newspapers of record like The Guardian and Dawn in the position of playing an important role in framing the aftermath for their readers. A wide range massive attacks by Hamas was launched on Israelis that result in the death of approximately 1,200 Israeli's. This attack is also known to be

^a MS Scholar, Riphah Institute of Media Sciences, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

one of history's the most brutal anti-Semitic attack since the holocaust. This resulted in a massive retaliatory military action by Israeli Military on Gaza strip. Due to the large scale Retaliatory Israeli Military action reported over 10,000 Palestinians were killed.

Editorials are used to show the clear opinion of the newspaper organization unlike the normal news which should be unbiased, neutral and Factual. The words chosen in the editorial clearly states what the writer beliefs and aims to explain about some certain issue or situation. The chosen time period as the sample size falls right in the middle of the time when the conflict between the Israel and Palestine was at very critical stage and the number of deaths were really high. The editorials taken up for analysis from Dawn are "Palestine at War" (8 October), "Gaza Besieged" (11 October), and "Children's Graveyard" (6 November). While comparing the use of language with the Guardian, shows a clear difference in choice of words used by both newspapers.

This research looks at how The Guardian and Dawn wrote about the same conflict by using different words and adopting different editorial writing style to shape the perception of their reader regarding the conflict.

By looking at metaphors, choice of words and writing style used in editorials, researcher aims to find how media shapes the perception of people and because certain language patterns can be clearly seen in both newspapers.

Research Question

This study addresses the following question:

1. How do The Guardian and Dawn use language and discourse in editorials after October 7, 2023?

Objectives

This research aims to find:

1. To analyze the word choices used by The Guardian and Dawn in their editorials from 8 October to 8 November 2023.
2. To examine how each newspaper represents the people involved in the conflict.
3. To find out what the language patterns, metaphors, and frames the editors used to explain the conflict.
4. To compare the ideological, cultural, and political contexts reflected in each newspaper's editorial discourse.
5. To evaluate how discourse in editorials shapes public understanding of the conflict.

Literature Review

Discourse analysis serves to examine how language creates social reality (Reyngaard, 2025). Researchers argue that discourse shapes meanings by framing the representation of events, identities, and ideologies within texts (Fairclough, 2013). (Teun A, 1998). According to (David Machin, 2025) discourse analysis is fitting for any research into how language is a carrier of ideological standpoints. Unlike critical discourse analysis, general discourse analysis does not overtly condemn unequal power relations; instead, it focuses on patterns and meanings.

Framing theory accounts for the interpretive function of the media (Entman, 1993), arguing that frames shape priorities through which audiences allocate their attention. In discourse analysis of political communication, newspapers have been shown to construct narratives of conflict (FOWLER, 1991). Empirical work has regularly shown that newspapers use framing devices to achieve moral categorizations (Reese, 2001). These frames often represent specific ideological standpoints.

Research shows that media framing has considerable impacts on the meaning of conflict. Frames define problems, ascribe responsibility, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies. In conflict reporting, frames are often used to simplify complex political processes.

Studies in Journalism Studies and Media, War & Conflict repeatedly find that newspapers frame international conflicts nationally or ideologically (Carruthers, 2011). Conflicts are framed from humanitarian and security-oriented perspectives in Western media very frequently (Chouliaraki, 2006).

Several studies show that Western media usually adopt pro-Israel framing while underrepresenting Palestinian suffering (Falah, 2023). Factors include headlines, lexical choices, and sourcing patterns that feed into characterizations of Israel as defensive and Palestinians as aggressors.

In contrast, media in Muslim-majority contexts frame Israel as the aggressor and Palestinians as resisting occupation (Marya Sarwar, 2025). Emotive metaphors and historical analogies to describe Palestinian victimhood are common in the editorials and opinion pages of Arab and South Asian newspapers.

In fact, research specifically targeting the editorial genre shows that editorial discourses are more overtly ideological than routine news reporting. Editorials are characterized by a higher degree of evaluative language, greater use of metaphor, and explicit imperatives (J.R. Martin, 2005).

(George Lakoff, 1979) George) Argue that metaphorical language shapes the conceptualization of conflict. Metaphors like “slaughter,” “occupation,” and “resistance” are full of ideological meaning. Studies on the Palestine–Israel conflict show a frequent reliance upon disaster, genocide, and oppression metaphors.

Methodology

In our hyper-connected era, major world events are intrinsically connected with texts and media framing that shapes public discourse (Altheide, 2016). Media episodically or thematically prescribes societal norms and perspectives on issues that range from political campaigns to military interventions through a process of highlighting certain narratives and negating others (RUTH WODAK, 2016). Therefore, studying language and analyzing how words and texts play their part in creating and shaping societies.

Discourse Analysis is employed in this study to examine how the editorials used language patterns and frames the conflict. Discourse analysis is basically used to study texts to see how people use language, figures of speech, and strategies to convince others. This approach looks at how words affect the perception of people about some event and even how they see people in it.

The sample size for this study is editorials published in Dawn between 8 October 2023 and 8 November 2023. Nine editorials were collected from between those dates: 8 October, 11 October, 14 October, 15 October, 19 October, 20 October, 23 October, 29 October, 31 October, 3 November, and 8 November 2023. This time period was taken very carefully as it is the perfect time period which shows that how the editorial language changes with the gradual escalation of the conflict, increasing death toll and how international communities reacts to it.

The analysis of language used in editorial focused on multiple factors such as the choice of words, which adjectives were used to describe people and events, the choices of verbs showing who is responsible for the conflict and lastly the metaphors used to explain the conflict. A close examination was done to see how the two newspapers Dawn and The Guardian portray the same event to the people differently. By carefully examining all the editorials, It helped to identify the recurring language patterns and same ways of presenting the ideas across them. The patterns that were found was grouped into major categories like how violence was shown, how important people were portrayed, how international laws were referred, how humanitarian ideas were appealed, and suggestions to solve the conflict.

This study focused on how both the newspapers differently described the same event and same people. When writing about the Israeli military attacks on Gaza, both the newspapers had very different approach towards describing the event. The same was true in the reporting of Palestinian deaths or hardship. Comparative analysis involved the line-by-line comparison between parallel sets of leading editorials for both newspapers in order to highlight specific linguistic differences.

Analysis of metaphorical language sought to uncover the organizing frameworks through which each publication conceptualized the conflict. Metaphors organize knowledge by mapping abstract political concepts onto more concrete domains. Identifying metaphors that recur throughout a publication will uncover the conceptual framework that guides that publication's approach to the conflict. The editorials employed either mechanistic or technical metaphors, positioning the conflict as a system that needs to be managed, or organic or moral metaphors, framing the conflict as a struggle between justice versus oppression.

The analysis of rhetorical strategies included the identification of argumentative patterns and persuasive techniques adopted in the editorials. Some of the editorials established a balanced approach where they looked at multiple different opinions before giving their own opinion regarding the conflict. Other editorials based their ideas on moral reasoning like they first described what is right and what is wrong and then they gave their own opinion. The analysis assessed how these ways of speaking and writing affect the audience's perception, to see things in a certain way.

By referring to Historical contextualization means for the explanation of the conflict, how publications connect the current ongoing conflict with the historical events. For example, some editorials described October 7 attack as a surprise or shocking attack that needs to be immediately retaliated with full force without going through historical references. Other editorials explain the October 7 massacre by going through historical background of the occupational land of Palestine, Settlement expansion, Sufferings faced by the Palestinian people right from the beginning. These different ways of how history was presented to the people, influenced how audience understand why the conflict started. Comparing this with the analysis of editorials from The Guardian would show whether the similarities or differences found are because of general differences between the two newspapers or due to their conflicting point of view on the event.

Analysis

Vocabulary Choices and Lexical Representation

An investigation of word choices used by editorials in Dawn and The Guardian highlights clear differences on how they describe the same event and people. In describing the operations of the Israeli military in Gaza, The Guardian often chooses neutral words like bombardment, airstrikes, military operations, and incursions while reporting on the Israeli Military actions in Gaza. These phrases directly describe military action without connecting it with moral judgement. Conversely, Dawn's editorial used more emotive and strong words, while writing about the same Israeli Military actions as slaughter, bloodbath, massacre, barbarism, and butchery.

The selection of different words to address the same event by each publication explains the overall dynamics of the conflict. The Guardian usually adopts a very neutral approach in selection of words by calling the events as the hostilities, the war, and military operations while Dawn tends to use strong words like genocide, ethnic cleansing, extermination, and campaign of terror to explain Israeli military actions so much so that Dawn also compared the Israeli military actions with the Holocaust establishing that Israeli's are trying to impose their "final solution" on the Palestinian People.

Likewise, different type of words was used to communicate about Palestinian deaths. The Guardian seems hesitant to use emotionally loaded words while reporting about the Palestinian people and treated them as normal civilians. To maintain a distance from the news source, and show that information is not fully confirmed, The Guardian reported death toll as "According to Gaza health authorities", "or disputed by

Israel". Whereas Dawn shows no hesitancy in using emotionally loaded words to show Palestinian suffering as a fact. On October 8 editorial Dawn emphasized over the Palestinian suffering with sentences like "over 200 Palestinians have been killed by Israeli forces and settlers" and describes Gazans as "slaughtered," "butchered," and "murdered."

The choice of words used by both the publications to describe Hamas also shows major differences. October 7 attack was narrated by guardian with a comparatively neutral words than the other publication. Guardian chose words like "attack" and "assault". Guardian used words like "militant," "gunmen", "attackers" while highlighting the death toll that was linked with the Hamas. Dawn also covers the same event but with a very different approach, it describes the event as a history of long standing occupation, expanding Jew settlements and Oppression on Palestinian people. The 8 October editorial termed it as a retaliatory act of the long standing history of Oppression, unjust fullness, atrocities happening on the people of Gaza. They report it as not a surprise attack but a retaliatory attack. The word siege was employed by both the publications but with a very different meaning for each publication. The Guardian uses the words "siege" in a very limited manner, attributing to closed Gazan border, restricted movement of people and goods while on the other hand Dawn uses the word "siege" as a metaphor and historical manner attributing it to holocaust and presenting Gaza as "open air concentration camps". Comparing Gaza's situation as an "open air concentration camp" links it with the history of concentration camps and genocide. These strongly emotive words clearly increase the moral blame on Israel. The highly emotive choice of words clearly signifies the Palestinian people as oppressed people facing a highly powerful force.

Metaphors and Imagery

The Analysis of the metaphorical language used in editorials shows that how different types of conceptual metaphors are employed to understand the conflict. The Guardian majorly approaches towards mechanistic, and process based metaphors which are used to frame conflict as a physical system and are difficult to control and manage. Phrases like "Spiraling out of control" shows conflict as a powerful system that can get more critical over time, and it can be controlled by International actors restraint and through coordination. This framework considers international diplomacy and legal constraint as a very useful and powerful tool that can be used to reduce the future escalation of the conflict.

On the other hand, Strong and simple emotive metaphors were employed by the Dawn to highlight the physical pain and suffering caused by violence. Describing Israeli bombardments with strong emotive words such as "bloodbath" evokes the imagery of death, blood, and injuries in mind, which feels more emotionally connecting than the dry military or medical language. Using Metaphors to describe Gaza as "on the brink of collapse" and "children's graveyard" creates images of death, killing of innocent children, chaos and destruction in mind. October 29 editorial's title "Gazan Apocalypse" employs religious language to establish or to depict the conflict as a major catastrophe not just a mere political issue.

The Guardian emphasizes on shared responsibility and working together when talking about the International response through the choice of Metaphors. "Burden-sharing," "Working together," and "Collective responsibility" shows that International actors should work together to stop the conflict from intensifying. This framing presents the International community as neutral, and which can ask both sides to show restraint.

However, Dawn presents the conflict as a struggle for justice and rightful entitlement. By employing words like "Freedom", "Dignity" and "Liberation" showcases the Palestinian struggle as a struggle for a right and just cause and shows that it's not just a war for the land occupation. The Guardian mainly focuses on human suffering and human tragedy. Language of "victims," "suffering," and "tragedy" depicts the conflict as a situation where human suffering results from circumstances rather than intentional actions, thereby separating violence from deliberate human agency and framing it as a tragic consequence of conflict

escalation. On the other hand, Dawn emphasizes on words like "butchery," "barbarism," and "slaughter," to depict Israeli Military actions as a deliberate move to perpetrate in violence.

Historical Context and Framing

The Guardian and Dawn treat the same conflict very differently through understanding the history behind the conflict.

The Guardian refers to the 7 October incident as a surprising and shocking incident. It employs words like "shock" and "surprise" and presents the attack as an unexpected break from the past. Naming it "the shock and horror," By presenting this attack as unprecedented and without any provocation, the guardian termed it as "shock and horror". This makes the attack looks without any particular reason and to be looked upon as a clear act of terrorism while not considering the long historical political issues.

When The Guardian talks about history, it only talks about the recent Economic issues of Gaza rather than explaining it in context with the details of long term colonialism or the decades of occupation. It only explains the issues faced by the economy of Gaza but does not explain that how occupation caused the Gazan economy to weaken. This gives a "shallow historical awareness," wherein history is a background concept, but the main focus remains on how to manage the current crisis. The result is to view the conflict as primarily caused by recent events and security issues rather than by profound, ongoing injustices.

Contrastingly, Dawn situates the October 7 attack within a far longer process of occupation, settlement expansion, and Palestinian displacement. The editorials on October 8 referred to the assault as a response to months of violence and humiliation. On October 29, the editorials added that for decades, Palestinians have been killed, humiliated, and subjected to land dispossession. In this light, October 7 would appear to be a comprehensible eruption of pent-up anger, rather than mindless terror.

The Nakba of 1948 figures clearly in the editorials in Dawn but not in those of The Guardian. The editorials of October 11 in the paper describe how the Palestinian people have either lived in exile, wandered in other places to seek shelter, or suffered as prisoners in their own homeland, and unequivocally say that the Nakba must end. In invoking the Nakba, Dawn constructs the Israeli state as having begun from Palestinian dispossession, rather than simply a normal national project. More often than not, this points to the continued occupation and settlement expansion as leading factors, not just as sidebar side notes, but treated as the normal background. In the editorials in the October 14 edition, Israel ordered more than a million people in northern Gaza to leave in a continued pattern of forced moves. Through such language, displacement and occupation appear continuous, forming the Palestinian experience into a sustained, systemic issue.

Rhetorical Strategies and Argumentative Structures

The Guardian and Dawn employ radically different rhetorical strategies and argumentative structures in constructing their editorial positions regarding the conflict. The Guardian uses an expression called "balanced argumentation," which states that editorials firstly acknowledge the valid arguments presented by both the parties and before approaching with its own opinion. For instance, October 15 editorial express that "Israel has a right to self-defense" but with certain conditions i.e. protection of civilian life and prevention of excessive use of force through Military action to not cause unnecessary harm.

This balanced approach presents The Guardian as it is not supporting any party instead it is only providing support for humanitarian principles. By repeatedly discussing International humanitarian law, The Geneva Conventions, and the UN it highlights that these rules and laws are important to follow. By relating its opinion with these laws, The Guardian establishes that it doesn't favors any country but only supports humanitarian rights and universal laws. This is how The Guardian tries to establish itself as a fair and neutral voice rather than supporter of any side.

Conversely, Dawn presents itself with a very different approach known as “Moral Foundationalism” which is based on simple moral ideas, fairness and oppression. October 8 editorial clearly states that Israeli occupation should and Palestinians must get justice. So, this basic idea establishes itself as the foundation for the other arguments. Rather than using Legal rules Dawn refers to the historical events of colonialism, occupation and resistance. That’s how Dawn portrays itself as a mouthpiece for the oppressed pursuing for justice, not taking a neutral stance on the issue.

The Guardian mostly employs language which focuses on procedures like referring to International Mediation, Global cooperation and solving issue through talks. It repeatedly emphasizes on UN involvement, International Engagement and Diplomatic talks as the solution for the mediation in conflict. Through this careful positioning of language, it is expressed that the conflict can only be solved by International Institutions like United Nations.

Although on the other hand, Dawn employs such expressions which focuses on basic changes in Judicial systems. Dawn emphasized that the occupation must be ended, Settlements must be demolished and refugees must get their land back with full ownership rights This way of presenting the conflict shows that only managing the conflict with set of rules or laws won’t be making much difference but it should be looked as deep rooted history of injustice which needs to be cured through structural changes in the justice system. Another particular strategy that Dawn employs is that it exposes and highlights the hypocrisy of the Western countries related to free speech and humanitarian rights. October 15 editorials states that although western governments declare themselves as the voice for free speech but at the same time, suppresses Pro-Palestinian speeches and protests.

Moral Evaluations

Dawn approaches it with directly moral condemnation. It uses words to discuss Israeli actions as “war crimes” and “crimes against humanity.” It criticizes Western government by calling them hypocrites. Dawn uses strongly emotive words to highlight the emotion of innocence using words like “slaughtered children,” “dead families,” and “helpless civilians.”

Dawn presents Palestinians as pure and innocent while it shows Israeli’s as Morally wrong and corrupt. This thinking and framing are aligned with the principles of Global south media where biasedness is shown on the basis of solidarity and identity.

Whereas The Guardian approaches with more balanced moral judgement. it denotes the Hamas's attack as "terroristic," "indefensible". Whereas states Israeli actions as "collective punishment" and states that this could result in the breach of International laws. The Guardian criticizes the brutality on civilians by any country. In Contrast, Dawn’s moral judgement seems to be biased and conflicting.

Legality and ethics are emphasized way more than identity in The Guardian’s ethical evaluation. This contrast clearly shows the difference between both of the publications Journalistic and Ideological practices.

Calls to Action

Dawn’s call to action stresses on Muslim unity, showing resistance and giving punishment to Israel on an International level. This approach supports Pakistan’s political culture and also aligns with the long standing historical solidarity of Pakistan with Palestine.

The Guardian's provides solutions which includes diplomatic approach, ceasefire, legal accountability, and political negotiations. This shows a way of thinking which is often seen in Western editorials that encourages cooperation by liberal international community (Thussu, 2019).

Proposed Solution and Vision for Resolution

The Guardian and Dawn approaches with very contrasting ideas to solve the conflict. Both have very different meaning for what justice means, what can be done, and which political results are appropriate to solve this

issue. The Guardian voice for "managed coexistence" plan. It perceives two state solution as a foundational framework for peace. By mentioning again and again the "two-state solution" highlights this idea as essential and appropriate for gaining long lasting peace. October 21 editorial states that Biden has once again shown support for the Two state solution for Israel-Palestine conflict. Stated it as the only solution to bring peace and justice.

The Guardian emphasizes more on the process and developing institutions instead of focusing on accountability or past injustices. It voices for mediation by International community, UN involvement, and country to country cooperation, and it considers current International Institutions are accurate instruments to handle. It discusses ideas like "multinational forces" or "Arab peacekeeping forces," and believes that after the conflict ends, International actors should govern the state. It gave more significance to stability and smooth transition rather than calling people to account for their past wrong doings or on creating wide justice measures.

In contrast, Dawn talks about "transformative justice" which means that only dividing land isn't the solution but real and immense change in political power is needed describes what you could call "transformative justice." It argues that real change in political power is needed, not just land division. Dawn argues on 8 October editorial that Israeli occupation must end and Palestinians must get justice. This suggests that now the issue has gone beyond land division, It states that major changes in power system must be done. It adds: "one where the Palestinians have a viable state that is secure and financially self-sufficient, where those ethnically cleansed over the decades by the Zionists have the right to return to the land of their forefathers, and where illegal settlements are permanently dismantled."

Another key difference observed in ideological framing is the concept of Palestinian's "right of return." The term "right of return" means that those Palestinians who lost their land or became homeless in 1948 or after should have the right to return to their lost lands. It is a major transformation than merely creating two states because it gives an idea to rethink about the basic structure of the state of Israel. Dawn presents this as a non-negotiable precept and reflects divergent ideas about what constitutes justice, as compared to the plan put forth by The Guardian. Accordingly, DAWN advocates steps for the present, with immediate concrete actions, rather than for a future institutional framework. October 19 editorials clearly state that Muslim countries should create economic pressure on Israel. For example, "the oil weapon" which was used after 1973 was discussed as a solution. These propositions show that Israel can be forced to change its behavior by creating economic pressure and politically isolating it. The choice of words moves forward from developing institutions to developing strong pressure on Israel so that the state of Israel considers Palestinian demands. Boycotting Israel made products and cutting all diplomatic ties from Israel was also proposed as acceptable approach.

Discussion

From 8 October to 8 November 2023, Comparison of both the publication shows that each publication employs very distinctive language patterns from other to narrate the Israel-Palestine events. This stark difference doesn't originate on the basis of facts instead it originates on the basis of strong beliefs, professional traditions, and political thinking. Both publications examined same events: the October 7 attack, Israeli bombings in Gaza, casualty numbers, and international statements, but gave the events different meanings through their word choices.

The Guardian is more inclined towards "liberal internationalism." International rules, humanitarian law, and diplomatic talks are majorly focused on this case. According to this idea, both the countries rights are of equal importance however Israeli rights are already acknowledged and are considered legitimate while Palestinian rights need to be legally acknowledged first and it needs to be protected as well. By placing its arguments on general, legal and humanitarian rules which are considered to be above all the political

interests, The Guardian shows compassion towards the suffering Palestinian people are going through while maintaining its neutral stance on great political questions.

However, this is a false claim of being neutral instead it acts as holding a position. The Guardian indirectly supports the current system of Israel by concentrating on legal restrictions on Israel's actions and considering the Israeli occupation as normal. It doesn't highlight occupation as the key problem instead only argues about proportionality and civilian protection for the sake of controlling military actions. This means that occupation is wrong, but it is manageable through legal rules, not through real change in justice.

Dawn's editorials present a different approach named "postcolonial justice." It highlights historical oppression, unequal power, and highlights the rights of colonized people. Israel is presented as a colonial project which was created by seizing innocent Palestinian's property instead of presenting it as a legal nation state. Palestinian violence is shown as a power of resistance fighting against colonization rather than terming them as terrorists. It doesn't mean that Dawn encourages the bloodshed of innocent civilians on any side but after seeing this violence through the lens of occupation and dispossession that it is a never ending process of injustice.

These thoughts are seen in the language employed by both of the publications. To use highly emotive words to denote Israeli deeds as "barbarism," "slaughter," or "massacre" is a very strong moral judgment which shows that this is very wrong and it can't be defended at any cost. Conversely, It can be referred through neutral words like "bombardment" or "airstrike". By employing this kind of neutral choice of words, The Guardian gets to stay professional while presenting its opinion on what is right and what is unjust. The exact verbs chosen- "ordered," "announced," "sought" versus "slaughtered," "massacred," "butchered" this choice of words shapes the perception of readers about Israeli operations and their duties.

Both of the publications highlight different sides of the situation. The Guardian highlights issues like security issues, possible escalations, suffering of civilians and also discusses about the fatalities. This structures the conflict as a real catastrophe with security limits and International rules in place. It also shows western countries as well wishers but reserved people. Dawn on the other hand focuses on disparity in power, Israeli Military's advantage over civilian people and unjust occupation. This makes the conflict looks one sided, where a strong military is used on weak civilians.

This shows each newspapers audiences and environment. The Guardian is a part of British media, where balanced and responsible journalism is considered as utmost important. It is read by educated readers which includes Jewish and Pro Israeli people as well. The Guardian's serious and analytical writing style perfectly aligns with that atmosphere. Dawn is a Pakistani newspaper where support for Palestine is common and is based on anti-colonial feelings. Dawn presents itself as the voice of Global south which also shows solidarity with after colonization resistance. This analysis demonstrates that the editorial pages of a newspaper are a principal site for media framing of citizen conceptions about international conflict. Language can never be neutral but embodies ontological assumptions and values. Word choices, visual details, or rhetorical patterns, due to a close-up reading, indicate the particular ways in which framing occurs not through explicit argumentation but through day-to-day language. The readers of The Guardian and Dawn are invited into different conversational worlds, places where what is considered normal, rightful, and just is dramatically different between the papers.

Research Implications

The research indicates that media discourse is a function of political culture, and therefore, the construction of the Palestine-Israel conflict is informed by the ideological environment of newspapers. In detail, this means that Dawn invokes emotionally charged language to mobilize support for Palestinians, while in the case of The Guardian, legalistic and humanitarian framing is used to advance the balanced interpretation of the issue. Findings shows that metaphors, showing who is responsible, and moral judgment changes the

perception of audience that how they perceive violence, responsibility, and victimhood. This examination shows that editorial discourse shapes the expectations public have from political solutions and it also states that media framing plays a pivotal role in structuring political debates. It also highlights the significance of discourse analysis to uncover hidden ideological messages in war reporting, recommending that both the writer and reader must know how language shapes the perception. Newspapers do more than just merely reporting wars or facts, they create political meaning through the choice of lexical words, which shapes public perception.

Conclusion

This discourse analysis states that while describing the 2023 Israel-Palestine conflict both the publications, Dawn and Guardian have employed very different language patterns. Dawn exercised very strong and negative words in its editorials for Israel. It presented evocative descriptions of Genocide and showed moral resentment. It presents Israel as an oppressor and Palestinians as oppressed and called Muslim countries to punish Israel through building economic pressure. Conversely, The Guardian approaches with more balanced language and emphasizes on Humanitarian problems, legal rules, and suffering faced by both countries. Whereas it admits with the Israel's right to defend itself but under International rules of war. It shows the crisis as a tragedy, which influences everyone and calls for International cooperation.

This Analysis shows that the language employed in editorial showcases that how readers will perceive the conflict. Dawn shows a biasedness towards Palestine, but it is of no surprise as it is a Pakistan based newspaper, so it caters to its readers need and this shows Pakistan's stance on the issue. While on the other hand The Guardian took a balanced approach by criticizing any harm to civilians.

Previous studies suggest that such framing is typical: Western media tend to humanize Israeli views more and position Israel as acting in response to threats, whereas in Muslim contexts, Palestinian victimhood is more often stressed (Cherkaoui, 2024).

This study certainly confirms the power of language and framing in media from the point of view of discourse analysis. Terms such as "holocaust" or "open-air concentration camp" have a heavy ideological load and signal the attitude of the author. The Guardian appeals to international law and norms, which can be seen as another discourse strategy-one that tends to universalize the conflict as a matter of justice rather than pure enemy imagery.

The contribution of this paper to the existing understanding of media bias and framing in conflict journalism has been to show that even editorial opinion pieces, not just news reporting, use carefully selected language in service of particular narratives

References

- Altheide, D. L. (2016). The News Media, the Problem Frame, and the Production of Fear. *THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY*, 38(4), 647-668. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1997.tb00758.x>
- Arnav Arora, S. Y. (2025, March 26). Multi-Modal Framing Analysis of News. <https://arxiv.org/html/2503.20960v1#bib.bib7>
- Carruthers, S. L. (2011). *The Media at War*. London: RED GLOBE PRESS.
- Cherkaoui, T. (2024). Framing the Gaza Conflict: Media Bias, Violence, and the Battle of Narratives. *The Political Economy of Communication*, 11(1), 85–99.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2006). *The Spectatorship of Suffering*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- David Machin, A. M. (2025). *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: Multimodal*. Thousand Oaks : SAGE Publications, Inc. .
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies. *Critical policy studies*, 7(2), 177-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2013.798239>
- Falah, G. W. (2023). The portrayal of Palestinian and Israeli suffering and violent incidents in selected US daily newspapers. *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*, 22(1), 65-92. <https://doi.org/10.3366/hlps.2023.0305>
- FOWLER, R. (1991). *Language in the News*. New York: Routledge.
- George Lakoff. (1979). *Metaphors we live by*. California: The University of Chicago Press.
- IZAK, K. (2024). The Jewish-Palestinian conflict. *Terrorism – Studies, Analyses, Prevention*, , 292-299. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1279005>
- J.R. Martin, P. W. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation*. Palgrave.
- Marya Sarwar, D. H. (2025). Framing the israel-palestine conflict in media headlines: a comparative analysis of western and eastern perspectives using appraisal and transitivity frameworks. *Journal of applied linguistics and tesol*, 1919-1931. <https://jalt.com.pk/index.php/jalt/article/view/1194>
- Reese, S. D. (2001). Framing public life. In O. H. Stephen D. Reese, *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and our Understanding of the Social World* (pp. 7-31). Routledge.
- Reyngaard, D. M. (2025, August 15). *Discourse and Discourse Analysis: Qualitative Research Method*
- RUTH WODAK, M. M. (2016). *Methods of Discourse Studies*. Sage.
- Taofeek. (November 2025). *Effects of Conflict Terminology and Lexical Choices in Indo-Pak News Stories*.
- Teun A, V. D. (1998). *Discourse & Ideology*. *Discourse & Society*, 307-308.
- Thussu, D. K. (2019). *International Communication*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.