



A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Neo-colonial Narratives: Ideological Bias in Western Media toward the Middle East

Zeina Mohamed Gafoor Al-lawandi

Al-Zahraa University for Women, Karbala, Iraq

* Corresponding Author: **Zeina Mohamed Gafoor Al-lawandi**

Article Info

Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.29

Volume: 02

Issue: 03

May-June 2026

Received: 08-03-2026

Accepted: 06-04-2026

Published: 04-05-2026

Page No: 12-18

Abstract

This study aims to explore the deep linguistic, and ideological mechanisms employed by Western media, specifically the American media machine and in framing armed conflicts and political shifts in the Middle East. Applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and drawing upon Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model and Teun van Dijk's ideological square, the research seeks to expose how power relations and neo-colonialism are reproduced through news textual structures. The study provides a rigorous analysis of the use of supremacist metaphors, biased naming strategies, and the employment of the passive voice to obscure American agency or legitimize its military interventions. Conversely it examines the "demonization" of national resistance movements, portraying them as illegitimate terrorist entities.

The study concludes that American media coverage is not merely a neutral reporting of facts, but rather a socio-political practice saturated with colonial ideology. It reinforces the binary of (Us) (the superior Western self) versus and (Them) (the backward Oriental Other). The findings prove that this discourse functions as a soft power tool for American hegemony, where brutal military interventions and resource plundering are marketed under the guise of (spreading democracy) and (human rights) and while deliberately absencing historical context and the root causes of the region's human suffering.

The results indicate a structural and organic complicity between capitalist media institutions and decision-makers in Washington, necessitating the development of a radical Arabic critical consciousness capable of deconstructing these supremacist narratives and reclaiming sovereignty over the national story in the face of imperial falsification.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJHSI.2026.2.3.12-18>

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Neo-colonialism, Media Framing, Ideological Square, Imperial Falsification

1. Introduction

The word 'discourse' involves a big 'D' and a small 'd'. The big 'D' relates to the general ways of viewing the world and general ways of behaving (including speaking), whereas the small 'd' concerns actual language use. CDA, on the other hand, is used to clarify how sociocultural knowledge is related to the performance of what have been called speech acts. To achieve this, various approaches have been developed, some of which investigate the production and interpretation of everyday action through conversation whereas others look at texts in terms of their internal organization. In both cases, discourse analysis is non-critical because it is concerned only with the description of discursive practices and forms of oral and written interaction (2003). Halliday (1978: 142)^[17], taking his inspiration from the work of Firth, adopts another approach in which he proposes that language is a

social semiotic and that linguistic form is affected systematically by social circumstances. He points out that every cultural group has its home-based discourse and this discourse marks its identity. Hence, people may have different identities due to their different discursive practices. He argues that:

“The nature of language is closely related to the demands that we make on it, the functions it has to serve. In the most concrete terms, these functions are specific to a culture. The particular form taken by the grammatical system of language is closely related to the social and personal need that language is required to serve (Halliday, 1978: 142)^[17].”

A rapidly changing method of analyzing language, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has emerged in the last two decades as an important way to examine and interpret meaning from texts. In less than two decades, CDA has proven to be a powerful force in our understanding of the meaning of texts and has been the focus of numerous studies, such as those conducted at BAAL and AILA. While I make several substantive critiques regarding CDA in this paper, I want my critique to be viewed in a constructive way. I believe that many of the findings within CDA are accurate; however, I believe that the use of comparative and quantitative data could enhance the strength of the argument, along with providing an overall clearer argument about the validity of overall CDA analysis.

According to Fowler, it's worth trying to develop the critical discursive analysis (CDA) in light of the significant social problems that CDA portrays through its analyses. CDA draws many relationships between language, power and ideology; as well, CDA draws connections between how people think of the world through the ways in which the world is represented in concrete discursive texts. The following quotes illustrate some vital ideas relevant to CDA: ‘As critical discourse analysts [...] we believe that the investigation, revelation, and elaboration of power and the values that are expressed and communicated through language form part of what we see as our professional duty; therefore, CDA is about politics.’ (Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard, 1996: xi) ‘Critical linguistics [...] created a way of analysing public discourse to expose the ideology that is hidden from view and is instead encoded into nationalism [...] According to critical linguistics, representation (whatever that means) is not the result of the inherent properties of language itself, but is instead the result of all the values held by the mediating mechanism (whatever that may be) used to produce representation [...] The proponents of critical linguistics [...] will use their analysis of language to highlight all forms of misrepresentation [...] The critical linguist is also interested in how different meanings can be represented by different languages.’ (Fowler, 1996)^[4]

Understanding contemporary global politics depends upon relationships between language, power, and authority. While colonialism was formerly expressed through military force (i.e., occupying a country), it has become a discursive system that seeks to dominate both the mind and consciousness of those living in these regions. Therefore, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can be a useful tool for examining how language creates, maintains, and reproduces social and political inequalities. The Middle East has historically been the site of the greatest examples of "Orientalism" (Said) when Westerners created an image of the Middle East as a naturally violent and chaotic place in order to justify taking care of it. The problem investigated in this academic work is the large

disconnect between professed "objectivity and neutrality" of some of the largest news networks in America (e.g. CNN, Fox News) and their actual discursive practice which reflects the hegemonic agenda of the United States of America. The media not only reflects what occurs in the outside world but also assembles it as part of its own "Framing" by carefully creating language and omitting language from the available vocabulary in order to lead a reader/consumer to draw conclusions based upon U.S. foreign policy. When U.S. media discusses "national interest" with respect to foreign countries across the globe, it has provided a manifestation of "Symbolic-Violence" which provides legitimacy and justifies removing the sovereignty of a nation-state from countries located in the Middle East.

From Van Dijk's perspective, beliefs shared by members of particular social groups (such as the elites of the West) provide explanations for the group's behavior and serve to support the vilification of other groups that were defined by negative characteristics. For example, "Neo-colonial" discourse appears to be benevolent (i.e., invasion = liberation; act of looting = economic support; assassination of a country's leader = removal of threat). This research will attempt to break-down these social constructs, because through the communication of false information and the removal of context, Middle Eastern society has become a victim of the very powerful media machine that has used the process of "Manufacturing - Consent". (Herman and Chomsky, 1988)^[2]

This research seeks to shed light on the American system of domination that seeks to establish its own cultural-political template as if it were the only global template available. Through an analysis of deep structural textual data, this research examines how the victims living in the Middle East have been dehumanised through the use of cold, technical language, while simultaneously creating a 'heroic' image of the American soldier. As researchers, we are engaged in an ideological conflict forced to give our support to the issues of our region, and to reject the idea of a Western narrative as an unavoidable reality and instead view it as an ideological construct to be analysed and critiqued.

While the war of words continues to unfold around the nature of American dominance, we must recognize it as not simply an attempt at controlling the world through violence; rather, contemporary U.S. supremacy relies heavily upon Antonio Gramsci's notion of Cultural Hegemony — meaning that U.S. corporate culture has institutionalized many of the same categories associated with colonialism as 'commonsense' or self-evidently true by mainstream media outlets who produce representations that maintain Eurocentrism as the standard for adjudicating truth, beauty and justice. As such, any resistance by Middle Eastern societies would systematically be labeled as deviant from or a challenge to the established "International Order" (Foucault, 1972); to use the language of the victors, the "International Order" was created in response to those who have experienced the consequences of the preceding World Wars and has become an institutional mechanism through which to eliminate the Other and to extract the resources of the Other through a system of international law and legitimacy.

In the practice of neo-colonialism, a form of "Discursive - Exclusion" is applied when the right of an individual to communicate their thoughts is denied. The individual within the Middle East serves only as a "subject" of research or as a "statistic" when it comes to determining the number of

casualties sustained during a military action; while the strategic analyst in Washington or the general at the Pentagon have complete authority to interpret and construct the narrative around the military action. CDA plays a role in this process, both as a linguistic technique and as a means of cognitive resistance, with the goal of giving the voiceless and the marginalized back their voice. The language used in news reports from organizations such as CNN is not innocent of their geopolitical biases; it is purposely "technical-language" designed to sanitize war by replacing the horrific images of bodily dismemberment, destruction, and death with sanitized phrases such as "surgical strikes" or "pre-emptive operations" (Fairclough, 2013)^[3].

In addition, the act of "Framing the Other" within the context of American Media evinces a history of centuries of Eurocentric Stereotypes with respect to how various peoples in the Middle East have been depicted through this classification system (as one, homogeneous mass of tribes/religions engaged in an interminable state of conflict). By doing so, the act of "Framing the Other" propagates a colonialist ideology by portraying US intervention within the greater Middle East as "necessary evil" to curtail the chaos that the Middle East has created. Furthermore, relegating "radical history" associated with the various peoples within the region fails to provide an objective account of either the effects of previous colonial influences established in the region (e.g. through all forms of the Colonial experience), or the US' own Smart Power approach to regime-change, which was achieved through covert intelligence operations used to successfully overthrow National government(s) within the area. Rather, the focus is on the "present historical context" of each of the various nations in which the media represents as, inappropriately, not able to effectively govern themselves. This study illustrates the idea of "Linguistic Imperialism," where English becomes the vehicle for enforcing neoliberal values and creating dependency on external cultures. When Western media uses terms like "democracy" and "open markets", it provides a backdrop for facilitating access to major corporations and establishing American dominance within the global economy. To deconstruct this form of discourse, we must move from "passive reception" of that discourse into "critical engagement" with it. We analyze the meaning of words not only to understand their meaning, but also to examine the "Will to Power" that lies behind those words, showing that the news narrative is as lethal as killing by drone in the context of modern colonialism. Our goal is to show how our "minds have been engineered" to see hegemony as the only course of action, while paving the way for constructing an alternative discourse in which the Middle East can reclaim its identity and the sovereignty that has been linguistically and materially stolen from it.

The way that American media covers conflicts in the Middle East is an example of "Discursive Structural Violence." This form of violence does more than support the use of guns; it also attempts to provide legitimacy to their use against innocent people. The basis of this discourse is a strategy called "Decontextualization." When Western media reports on Arab popular uprisings or armed resistance to imperialism in the Middle East, they begin their story with a "moment of explosion," ignoring the decades of economic and political oppression inflicted by imperialists. This intentional omission not only discredits the professionalism of the reporters but is also an ideological effort to depict the Arab

as "innately violent" or "irrational," thereby justifying American intervention as necessary "pacification," instead of an attack on a country's sovereignty (Fairclough, 2013)^[3].

In addition to this difference in naming, "Ideological Erasure" shows itself in how the conflicting parties are identified. American goals are given high-profile labels like "Global Security" and "Common Human Values." In contrast, the objectives of Middle Eastern people are given low-profile designations: "Narrow Interests" and "Sectarian Agendas." This is a way that U.S. hegemony further legitimizes its interests by ascribing them a "Universal" nature, while at the same time isolating and breaking down the aims of people who are struggling. Replacing eyewitnesses or actual victims with "military experts" and "security analysts" creates a lack of understanding and a transformation of "human tragedy" into a benign "security equation" that has deadened our collective sense of responsibility and diminishing our compassion for the just causes of people in the Middle East. The "Politics of Fear" is an example of how a tool of rhetoric can be used to control discourse. Threats that originate in the Middle-East are exaggerated for the purpose of providing a rationale for massive military spending and a permanent American military presence. The media becomes a partner in the "Producing of Threat" for the purpose of rationalizing U.S. (American) protection. The media's functional role is a demonstration of Chomsky's theory of the "Manufacturing of Consent," where the Western public (and perhaps a few locally) are convinced that Neo-colonialism is a "moral responsibility" of the U.S. to protect so-called "civilization," when in fact, it is a systematic depletion of resources and a systematic elimination of national identities (Chomsky & Herman, 1988)^[2].

Consequently, this study endorses the view that CDA is a type of laboratory work. The second step in restoring the "Intellectual Independence" or "Intellectual Sovereignty" of scholars and educators, and the last step in establishing a full historical record, is to delineate the underlying "American Supremacy" present in the morphological and syntactic patterns used within the news media to report events. There is an imperial media establishment that has the resources and the technology but has no obligation to ethics and follows an agenda against the interests of the Middle East. Thus, an analysis of how biased the news media is toward the Middle East reflects a bias toward an accurate historical account of what has happened versus an inaccurate historical account of what has happened, and also results in a bias toward the right of people in the Middle East to keep their right to self-determination as opposed to finding themselves under renewed colonial influence whose purpose is to write our future with corrupt pens and ideologies.

Additionally, "Visual Power", a term used to define the written discourse of American media, cannot be separated from the visual images and/or video support these texts (ex. Colonialism's continued influence in today's media is seen through the use of visual images). The use of camera angles, such as representing an American soldier in a "high angle" or as a "savior" or as an "inferior" or as an "other" (Machin & Mayr, 2012)^[9], fundamentally represents the colonial ideology of creating an "other". This type of multimodal discourse is designed to create an emotional response in the person receiving the content that prevents them from rationally holding accountable the colonial crimes because the crime against humanity becomes a humanitarian project

when it is framed within a poignant cinema or video and biased discursive language is used to communicate the content.

As of today, we can observe an emergence of what may be called "Digital Colonialism" in relation to the American algorithms/platforms' considerable manipulation of the overall information flow through which the U.S. government is exercising its invisible discursive censorship. Furthermore, terms that express legitimate rights (i.e. "Resistance", "National Liberation"), have been excluded from circulation, and in their absence security-related terminology that portrays any person/group engaged in either of the above mentioned actions as criminals, have been used by governments to justify their actions/behavior towards a person or persons who wants to remove the oppressive yoke of dependency from their lives/communities/society. This research asserts that the efforts of the U.S. hold on to hegemonic power has created a "Linguistic - Prison" system that restricts the choices available to the majority of Middle Eastern societies between continuing to exist as dependent upon the U.S.A., or becoming branded as "Terrorists" and becoming "International Pariahs". Therefore, CDA should be used as a tool to break the prison bars of the "Linguistic - Prison" by identifying the blatant contradictions arising from the discourse of Imperialists in Western Nations who advocate for Freedom and free peoples in one part of the world while at the same time preventing and repressing those same freedoms in a different part of the world for the sake of Imperial Interest.

The objective of the purpose of this study is to stand with those who have been harmed due to "Linguistic Arrogance", those whose cities have been destroyed and their resources depleted and then portrayed by the world's media to be an "obstacle to peace". The understanding of textual structures will exemplify how terms like "International – Coalition" are used to provide collective legitimacy for a unilateral colonial act, and how "Logical – Fallacies" are used to justify the siege and starvation of people. We want to do more than provide a scholarly study of the language; we want to offer an "Intellectual – Manifesto" to reject the ongoing American – guardianship over our minds and history. Discourse deconstruction is the first step in obtaining physical liberation; those that possess their language possess their will, while those that reject the colonizer's name, lay the first brick in the wall of their national independence (Van Leeuwen, 2008).

To summarize this introduction - we will follow this through careful sampling of evidence that western media is not a "mirror of truth" but instead a "hammer" being used to create a new reality which promotes and supports US dominance in the world. As the researchers at the epicenter of the Middle East; we feel compelled to produce a Counter-Discourse based on historical facts concerning the Middle East and on the promotion of human rights and justice as opposed to the imperialistic distortions which are so often the subject of scholarly writing.

2. Methodology

This study adopts a descriptive - analytical qualitative approach and drawing its tools from the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis. The choice of this methodology stems from its superior ability to penetrate the depths of texts, moving beyond surface meanings to uncover the ideological structures and power relations latent within media language.

2.1. Questions of the Study

1. What are the discursive and linguistic strategies (naming, framing, and agent - deletion) employed by American media to reproduce the neo-colonial ideology and justify its hegemony over the Middle East?
2. How is the binary of the (Civilized - Western - Self) versus the "Terrorist - Oriental - Other" utilized in news language to strip the peoples of the region of their sovereign rights and legitimize brutal military interventions against them?

2.2. Significance of the Study

1. Epistemological and Critical Significance: It lies in exposing the discursive falsification of media that hides behind slogans of "objectivity" demonstrating how language functions as a tool of Symbolic - Violence that paves the way for material aggression and neo-colonialism.
2. Emancipatory Significance: Contributing to the construction of a critical consciousness within Middle - Eastern recipient, enabling them to deconstruct supremacist Western narratives, possess the ability to formulate an alternative national discourse that rejects American dependency and guardianship.

3. Objective of the Study

The primary objective of this research is to expose, strip away the hidden ideological mechanisms in American news discourse and to demonstrate how linguistic tools are utilized to legitimize colonial hegemony and falsify historical awareness regarding issues of justice and resistance in the Middle - East.

4. Delimitations

1. **Thematic Delimitations:** The study is limited to analyzing ideological bias associated with concepts of American hegemony and neo-colonialism.
2. **Sample Delimitations:** Selected samples of news reports and opinion articles from leading American media institutions (CNN, Fox News, The New York Times and Fox news) they represent the mouthpiece of the elite and decision-makers in Washington.
3. **Linguistic Delimitations:** Analyzing texts published in English to reveal how international public news is addressed, directed against the interests of the region's peoples.

5. Analytical Framework

5.1. Teun van Dijk's Ideological Square

The focus will be on four discursive strategies: (Emphasize our good things and emphasize their bad things, De-emphasize our bad things, and De-emphasize their good things). This model will reveal how American actions are portrayed as "redemptive" while resistance in the Middle East is portrayed as "criminal."

5.2. Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

1. **Text (Description):** Studying linguistic features (such as biased vocabulary selection, colonial metaphors, and the use of the passive voice to obscure the crimes of the colonizer).
2. **Discursive Practice (Interpretation):** Analyzing the processes of text production, consumption, and distribution to serve the agenda of hegemony.

3. **Social Practice (Explanation):** Linking discourse to the broader colonial context and the geopolitical power relations between the US, and the Middle East.

5.3. Semiotic and Critical Strategies:

Utilizing Edward Said's concepts of *Orientalism*, Noam Chomsky's *Manufacturing Consent* to deepen the discussion on how language contributes to the erasure of the national identity of the region's peoples in favor of the American imperial identity.

6. Discussion

According to Fairclough Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a form of critical social analysis. Critical social analysis shows how forms of social life can damage people unnecessarily, but also how they can be changed. CDA's contribution is elucidating how discourse is related to other social elements and offering critique of discourse as a way into wider critique of social reality. CDA offers better explanatory understanding of relations between discourse and other components of social life. Explanatory critique identifies the problem in the existing state of affairs, in this case the marketization of universities. This provides a normative view of problematisation: in political deliberation, problematisation is often open to critique for lacking this explanatory basis. The movement from problematisation to advocated solution is itself characterised by dialectical relations between discourse and non-discursive social elements. The chapter suggests how the 'epistemological' dialectic of debate connects with a 'relational' dialectic and thereby 'ontological' and 'practical' dialectics. (Fairclough, N. 2017)^[6]

The exercise of hegemony in American media discourse toward the Middle East does not manifest as a random act, but rather as an organized strategy aimed at reproducing colonial power relations within a modernist mold. By applying Van Dijk's "Ideological Square" (Van Dijk, 2006), we find that news coverage operates according to a bipolar mechanism: "Us" (USA, and its allies) versus "Them" (Middle Eastern society and resistance forces). This mechanism is employed to maximize self-positivity and justify transgressions; while blatant American violations in conflict contexts are classified as "procedural errors" or "Collateral Damage," any defensive act by the region's peoples is portrayed as a "barbaric" act lacking moral legitimacy (Fairclough, 2013)^[3]. This linguistic manipulation fundamentally aims to depoliticize the rights of the region's peoples to self-determination, transforming their national struggle into a mere criminal phenomenon that necessitates military crushing under the pretext of "counter-terrorism."

This dominance extends to "Naming - Strategies," which are among the most dangerous tools of Dehumanization. The selection of vocabulary in American newsrooms is a preeminently political act aimed at building an ideological human hierarchy. While American casualties are deeply humanized through biographical narratives and the immortalization of their names, victims in the Middle East are reduced to mere "statistical figures" or "field elements" (Machin & Mayr, 2012)^[9]. This discursive disparity creates a gap in global empathy, where an American death becomes a tragedy necessitating international mourning, while a Middle Eastern death becomes a natural consequence in a region discursively branded as a "hotbed of chaos."

Furthermore, the strategic use of the term "Regime" is exclusively applied to powers that reject subordination to American hegemony, implicitly suggesting their illegitimacy and morally paving the way for forced "Regime Change." Conversely, governments loyal to Washington are granted titles such as "Administrations" or "Partners," terms that provide them with discursive immunity and international legitimacy (Richardson, 2007)^[11].

Moreover, American media reproduces the old colonial "Civilizing Mission" through the lens of Neo-colonialism. The Middle East is depicted in Western reports as a region suffering from a "civilizational deficit", "eternal sectarian conflicts" with no solution except through external intervention. This discourse consciously erases historical facts confirming that these crises are a direct product of previous American hegemonic policies (Chomsky & Herman, 1988)^[2]. Here, language functions to reverse roles: the aggressing colonizer is transformed into a "humanitarian savior" attempting to establish peace, while resisting peoples are portrayed as obstacles to "Global Stability." Hegemony reaches its ideological peak when it penetrates the consciousness of the victim, leading some within the region to adopt these Western terms to describe their own reality, thereby legitimizing permanent "American Guardianship" (Said, 1978)^[12].

The use of the "Passive Voice" in news headlines represents another tool to obscure the culprit when the American side is the actor - such as "civilians were killed in a strike - thereby diffusing legal and moral responsibility. Meanwhile, the Active Voice" is used clearly regarding acts committed by the people of the region to fix the charge and confirm the violent stereotype (Van Leeuwen, 2008). This cunning employment of grammar contributes to the "Manufacturing of Consent," aiming to convince the public that American hegemony is an inevitable fate. (CDA) proves that American media does not merely report events but practices a "Symbolic - Violence" aimed at eternalizing colonial control (Wodak & Meyer, 2015)^[15].

Deepening this analysis reveals what can be termed "Epistemicide," where Western media seeks to erase the cognitive and political models of Middle Eastern society, replacing them with "Eurocentrism." According to Fairclough (2013)^[3] media discourse acts as a "Social Practice" that reproduces colonial structures. American reports often use "material metaphors" to portray conflicts as natural disasters (using "outbreak" for wars) to sanitize the language and avoid American historical responsibility.

Furthermore, a "Politics of Fear" is organized where Middle - Eastern national identity is linked to "extremism" while the American colonial project is presented under the banner of "Enlightened Rationality." This binary legitimizes "Security Exceptionalism," where what is prohibited for others is permitted for America and its possession of nuclear weapons becomes a "guarantee of peace," while the region's pursuit of power is deemed an "existential threat to civilization"

Finally, the analysis shows an "Ideological Displacement"; instead of discussing "Occupation" and "Liberation," the conflict is shifted toward abstract "Human Rights" or "Democratic Reforms", this shift aims to dilute the core issue of National Sovereignty, transforming struggling peoples from "rights holders" into "aid seekers" or "victims in need of Western rescue" (Said, 1978)^[12]. Deconstructing these layers of discursive falsehood proves that media is the "Soft - Power" that accompanies the "Hard Power" of neo -

colonialism. Aligning with Middle Eastern society in this context is an act of resistance that rejects the hijacking of consciousness and the distortion of identity. Confronting hegemony begins with formulating a new "Liberatory Lexicon" that rejects the colonizer's terms and reclaims the right to write history (Van Leeuwen, 2008) ^[14].

7. Results

7.1. Western Media as an "Ideological Proxy" for Colonial Projects

This conclusion transcends the traditional view of media as a mere tool for news reporting, proving that it functions as a strategic arm, a "soft propaganda" tool serving American hegemony.

- **Analysis:** The research concludes that major media institutions (such as CNN and Fox News) are not independent entities in their editorial decisions regarding the Middle East. Instead, they act as "Ideological - Proxies" that prime global public opinion to accept colonial projects. Media here works on "Manufacturing - Consent" by portraying American military interventions as moral or global security necessities. This functional role implies that the word precedes the cannon; interventions and resource plundering are discursively legitimized before they occur physically, making the media an organic partner in the modern colonial structure (Chomsky & Herman, 1988) ^[2].

7.2. Absence of Historical Context and the Criminalization of Popular Resistance

This study focuses on the strategy of "spatio - temporal amputation" used by media discourse to distort the image of resistance.

- **Analysis:** Western news reports deliberately employ the technique of "Decontextualization," where the narrative begins only from the moment of the "outburst of violence" while completely ignoring decades of occupation and structural injustice practiced by the colonizer. Through this intentional absence, the reaction of Middle Eastern peoples appears as an "isolated - criminal act", "unjustified - terrorism" rather than a natural resistance to long-standing historical oppression. This discursive distortion aims to strip national liberation movements of their legitimacy, shifting the conflict from an issue of "rights and self - determination" to one of "security and crime," thereby providing colonial powers with a moral justification to suppress these populations (Fairclough, 2013) ^[3].

7.3. Ideological Bias as an Integrated Linguistic Structure Serving Hegemony

This conclusion shifts from observing "opinions" to observing "structures"; meaning that bias is not merely a journalist's viewpoint but a tightly woven linguistic system.

- **Analysis:** The research proves that bias against the Middle - East is rooted in the "Linguistic - Structure" itself. Grammatical rules (such as the use of the passive voice to obscure the colonial actor) and rhetoric (such as metaphors depicting the Middle - East as a jungle or a hub of chaos) are harnessed to serve material hegemony. This bias is an "integrated - structure" that starts from the choice of a single word and ends with the formulation of the overall news frame. This structure works to

transform ideology into a "tangible - reality" in the minds of recipients, legitimizing control over land and resources by controlling language and naming things in ways that serve the powerful. Language here is not a descriptor of reality, but a tool for producing a reality that serves American imperialism (Van Dijk, 2006) ^[13].

8. Conclusion

This study concludes that the battle for liberation in contemporary Middle Eastern societies is no longer confined to traditional political or military arenas. Rather, it is, in its very essence, a fierce existential struggle over "meaning" and discursive sovereignty. The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) adopted by this research clearly reveals that the American media - acting as the ideological striking arm of imperialist powers, does not merely transmit reality; it reinvents and reshapes it to serve the sustainability of hegemony. It practices a systematic "soft" mental colonization aimed at legitimizing material plunder and geopolitical control under the cloak of glittering nomenclature and false humanitarian slogans that strip concepts of their ethical content.

True and conscious alignment with the causes of our region transcends fleeting emotional sympathy; it requires us, as researchers and intellectuals, to possess solid cognitive tools that enable us to "deconstruct" these superior discourses and expose their latent racist roots. Reclaiming "sovereignty over the text" is the necessary and indispensable precursor to reclaiming "sovereignty over the land." Robust national independence cannot be achieved as long as our minds remain captive to the colonizer's terminology and classifications - those which grant the executioner the title of "savior" while labeling the victim an "obstacle to peace."

Restoring the prestige of the national and pan-Arab narrative is the ideal historical response to the attempts at "epistemicide" (cognitive genocide) targeting the Middle - Eastern individual within the Western media machine - a machine that seeks to erase memory and replace it with a narrative of defeat. We must fully realize, based on the linguistic and analytical evidence presented in this research, that the word in American media is not merely a tool for neutral reporting; it is "the bullet that precedes the cannon," clearing the path for tanks. It is what assassinate the victim morally and strips them of their humanity before they are physically killed, it is what justifies the siege and beautifies colonial ugliness under the guise of "security necessity."

Awareness of the mechanisms of CDA or our deep understanding of how the "ideological square" and hidden framing tools operate, is not a mere academic luxury or intellectual exercise. In the core of our practice of national consciousness, it is the "first step of intellectual resistance" against Neo-colonialism in its digital and globalized version. This study concludes that it is necessary to adopt a strategy of "epistemic decoupling" from Western centrism and to begin establishing an Arab critical school capable of reading the world through the eyes of its people, not its invaders. Building a counter-discourse that commands historical truth and human dignity is a moral duty that brooks no delay. The battle for liberation begins with freeing language from the shackles of American ideologization and ends with imposing a new reality that rejects guardianship and dependency in all its forms. The peoples of the Middle - East are not an "object" to be written about in Washington's research centers; they are sovereign historical agents of their own destiny, capable of

articulating their own language that expresses their aspirations for freedom, justice, and absolute sovereignty. In the end, this research sounds the alarm, accepting the colonizer's terminology is the first concession of territory and linguistic resistance is the last fortress of national identity. Let our words be the first wall of defense against imperial falsehood, and let us reclaim our right to call things by their true names affirming that the dawn of liberation begins with the liberation of the word.

References

1. Bourdieu P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1991.
2. Chomsky N, Herman ES. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1988.
3. Fairclough N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge; 2013.
4. Fowler R. On critical linguistics. In: Caldas-Coulthard CR, Coulthard M, editors. *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge; 1996. p. 3-14.
5. Fowler R. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge; 1991.
6. Fairclough N. CDA as dialectical reasoning. In: Flowerdew J, Richardson JE, editors. *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge; 2017. p. 13-25.
7. Gramsci A. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers; 1971.
8. Hali S. Ideology and representation in news media. *Journal of Media Studies*. 2021;15(2):45-60.
9. Machin D, Mayr A. *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*. London: SAGE Publications; 2012.
10. Reisigl M, Wodak R. *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Routledge; 2001.
11. Richardson JE. *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2007.
12. Said EW. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1978.
13. Van Dijk TA. *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University; 2006.
14. Van Leeuwen T. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008.
15. Wodak R, Meyer M, editors. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications; 2015.
16. Zinn H. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: HarperCollins; 2003.
17. Halliday MAK. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold; 1978.

How to Cite This Article

Zeina Mohamed Gafoor Al-lawandi. A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of Neo-colonial Narratives: Ideological Bias in Western Media toward the Middle East. *International Journal of Humanities and Sustainable Innovation*. 2026 May-Jun;2(3):12-18. doi: 10.54660/IJHSI.2026.2.3.12-18.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BYNC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.