

Framing the Palestinian Cause: Ideological Choices in Translation and Their Influence on Global Opinion

التّلاعب الأيديولوجي في التّرجمة: أثره على تشكيل الرأي العام العالمي حول القضية الفلسطينية

KHEDAR Mounir*

الرقم التعريفي للمقال: 10.33705/1111-018.002.017

Date d'acceptation: 13.09.2025

Date de soumission: 26.11.2025

Date de publication: décembre 2025

Abstract:

This article offers a critical analysis of the translation strategies employed in Western media discourse when translating terms related to the Palestinian cause. It focuses on the use of omission, deletion, and substitution as mechanisms for reshaping the political narrative of the conflict in a way that aligns with Zionist ideology. The analysis highlights how key terms such as "Nakba," "Al-Aqsa Mosque," and "Palestinian resistance" are replaced with expressions that legitimize the occupation and obscure its colonial nature. The article concludes that translation in this context serves as an ideological tool that shapes global consciousness and global opinion, calling for a critical approach to media translation as a key player in symbolic and political conflict.

Keywords: Strategy, Ideology, Discourse, Western media, Global opinion.

Résumé :

Cet article analyse de manière critique les stratégies de traduction utilisées dans les médias occidentaux concernant la cause palestinienne. Il met en lumière l'usage de procédés comme l'omission, la suppression et la substitution pour reformuler le récit du conflit en faveur d'une vision sioniste. Des termes clés comme «Nakba» ou « résistance palestinienne » sont remplacés par des expressions qui minimisent ou légitiment l'occupation. L'article conclut que la traduction, dans ce contexte, devient un outil idéologique influençant l'opinion publique, et appelle à une lecture critique de la traduction dans les médias.

* Laboratoire de traduction et de multilinguisme, Institut de traduction Université de Mohamed BOUDIAF, M'sila, Algérie.

Email: mounir.kheddar@univ-msila.dz (Auteur correspondant).

Mots-clés : Stratégie ; Idéologie ; Discours ; Médias occidentaux ; Opinion publique mondiale.

الملخص:

يتناول هذا المقال تحليلًا نقديةً للاستراتيجيات الترجمية المستخدمة في الخطاب الإعلامي الغربي عند ترجمة المصطلحات المرتبطة بالقضية الفلسطينية، مرتكزاً على آليات الحذف، والإغفال، والاستبدال في تشكيل السردية السياسية للصراع بما يخدم الأيديولوجيا الصهيونية. وينظر التحليل كيف تُستبدل المصطلحات المركزية مثل "النكبة"، و"المسجد الأقصى"، و"المقاومة الفلسطينية" بتعابير تُضفي شرعية على الاحتلال وتُخفي طابعه الاستعماري. ويخلص المقال إلى أن الترجمة في هذا السياق تُعد أدلةً أيدلوجيةً تُسهم في تشكيل الوعي العالمي وتوجيه الرأي العام، مما يستدعي مقاربة نقدية للترجمة الإعلامية باعتبارها فاعلًا في الصراع الرمزي والسياسي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستراتيجية؛ الأيديولوجية؛ الخطاب؛ الإعلام الغربي؛ الرأي العام العالمي.

1. Introduction: Many people are often unaware that the terms they use carry intellectual and cultural dimensions, reflecting political and religious positions. In numerous cases, certain terms spread rapidly because they are adopted by the media or by influential political and cultural figures. As a result, people use them unconsciously, either due to their accessibility or because they fail to recognize their political and ideological implications—even when such terms convey inaccurate or misleading connotations.

This uncritical adoption of terminology highlights the profound influence of the media. By manipulating language and reframing events, the media has the capacity to promote peace or, conversely, to fuel hostility and conflict. In particular, electronic and visual platforms enable journalists to shape global opinion and redirect international attention, sometimes toward hatred and violence against specific groups.

As (Baidoun, 2014 p. 25) observes, the ethical responsibility of the media in covering conflicts is immense, since the language it employs has the power either to nourish peace or to incite violence.

A clear example of this dynamic can be seen in media coverage of the Palestinian cause. Both Arab and international outlets frequently use terms that are not only inaccurate but also biased.

Such terminology is deliberately employed to influence Arab and global consciousness—aligning, on one side, with normalization agendas and, on the other, serving the interests of the Zionist entity. In this context, media producers and correspondents play a role that goes far beyond reporting facts. They actively manipulate news discourse to serve the political and ideological interests of their agencies. Thus, every news organization operates within the boundaries of its own agenda, ensuring that the discourse it employs supports particular objectives dictated by the prevailing political environment.

Therefore, politics exerts a direct impact on media coverage of the Palestinian issue, particularly during times of heightened tension. The media thus becomes a powerful political weapon, shaping public perceptions and framing events in ways that serve strategic goals.

This process underscores Reah's (Reah, 2002. p. 53) argument that language is most powerful when its role in shaping the world is implicit rather than explicit. While audiences may resist an openly imposed ideology, they are far less capable of recognizing or rejecting ideological manipulation when it is subtly embedded within the discourse. Consequently, media language does not simply report reality—it constructs it, influencing how events are understood and remembered.

2-Translation as a form of Rewriting: (Brook, 2012) posits that translation occupies a pivotal, albeit frequently overlooked, role in the production and dissemination of international news. Given that news functions as a marketable commodity exchanged across a spectrum of producers and audiences, translation emerges as a decisive factor in determining its global reach and impact. Despite this critical function, the processes underlying translation in news production have received comparatively limited scholarly attention within both Media Studies and Translation Studies.

Within this analytical framework, translation can be conceptualized as a form of rewriting rather than a mere linguistic transfer of words and meanings. It is an intentional act carried out under multiple constraints, guided by specific objectives. Each translation is inherently shaped by prevailing power structures, which influence what is selected for translation, the rationale behind its translation, and the manner in which it is rendered. Consequently, the translator's choices are

invariably mediated by the target audience's perceptions of the source culture, reflecting broader dynamics in which the "Self" interprets and represents the "Other."

Translation, therefore, should not be understood as an isolated or purely linguistic process. It is embedded within intercultural exchanges and deeply intertwined with ideological forces, operating as a socially situated practice within complex socio-political contexts where power relations, censorship, and ideological imperatives continuously intersect. Just as authorship is informed by ideological and contextual pressures, translation conceived as rewriting similarly embodies and enacts ideological mechanisms.

Accordingly, translation should be conceptualized not merely as the mechanical transfer of words, but as an interactive cultural process imbued with both ethical and ideological dimensions. Translators, shaped by their personal beliefs, social backgrounds, and political affiliations, often employ a range of strategies—including addition, omission, stylistic modification, tonal adjustment, euphemism, pejoration, manipulation, and adaptation. Utilized either independently or in combination, these strategies constitute a deliberate form of discourse mediation, serving ideological objectives that may reflect the translator's own perspective or those of other agents involved in the communicative context.

Ideology, in this context, encompasses a wide range of social norms and patterns of thought. For example, translators may omit expressions deemed offensive or socially unacceptable, a practice often described as "ideological omission." Similarly, they may rephrase culturally sensitive references in order to avoid offending target readers. Such choices demonstrate how ideology directly shapes translation as a practice of rewriting and, at times, manipulation" (2003) (عناني، 2003) (Our translation).

Building on this perspective, Lefevere and Bassnett highlighted the determining factors that shape the reception of literary texts, namely ideology, institutions, and textual processing. They argued that those in positions of power influence the rewriting of literature and control its circulation, often with ideological motives. Sometimes rewriting aligns with dominant ideologies in the target culture, while at other times it resists them. Their research further demonstrates that

political, editorial, ideological, and even poetic considerations play a decisive role in the strategies adopted by translators.

3-Translation and Discourse: Hatim (Hatim, 1997, p. 206) argues that discourse, as the voice of institutions, functions as a vehicle for expressing positions and as the framework within which the cultural codes of a given society are established.

As he observes discourse functions «As the mouthpiece of institutions, discourse becomes the vehicle of attitudinal expression, and the framework within which terms of reference pertaining to a given cultural code are established. Structurally, discoursal considerations determine the way texts concatenate (often in sequence, sometimes embedded within each other».

This aims to demonstrate that discourse is deeply rooted in cultural components such as history, social structure, values, beliefs, religion, and language—the latter both expressing and shaping the other cultural elements. Thus, discourse encompasses the collective positions toward the world, events, other cultures, and other peoples, as well as the processes through which these positions are constructed. (van Dijk, 1998)Emphasizes that discourse forms «the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group. This means that ideologies allow people, as group members, to organize the multitude of social beliefs about what is the case, good or bad, right or wrong, for them, and to act accordingly».

Viewed from a translational perspective, institutional discourses that reflect particular socio-cultural positions impose constraints on translators, especially when their own stances differ from dominant norms in the target culture.

These constraints extend to systems of text selection, translation strategies, the representation of the “Other,” and the reception and consumption of foreign works. Translation as discourse therefore requires higher levels of analysis that often precede the act of translating itself. In this sense, discourse may be regarded as encompassing culture, which represents the body of knowledge that members of a community must acquire in order to act, interact, and interpret texts in specific ways.

In the context of the Palestinian cause, the Zionist entity has worked systematically to consolidate its narrative and reinforce its political discourse by employing propagandistic

strategies aimed at justifying its practices as an occupying power while protecting itself from international criticism. One of the most prominent techniques is “name-calling,” which relies on negatively connoted terms to describe opponents. This strategy seeks to attach a negative image to the targeted party, thereby arousing hostility and rejection while leaving little room for objective evaluation.

Israeli activist and writer Miko Peled explains that «Israel is using its powerful lobby in the US and Western Europe. Israel is pressuring Western politicians and mainstream media to tell the story that Israel wants to tell and indeed, during that time the story was being told that Israel was acting in self-defense» (Qaddoura, 2017).

This recurring discourse of “self-defense,” systematically invoked during episodes of military aggression, stands in sharp contrast to the extensively documented realities of violations and atrocities, including the killing of thousands of unarmed civilians. Such ideological framing unavoidably extends its influence to the field of translation.

In this context, terms such as “occupation” are often replaced by more neutral or mitigated expressions like “dispute” or “conflict,” while “resistance” is occasionally rendered as “terrorism.” Similarly, “massacre” may be translated as “clashes,” and “settlement” as “urban expansion.” These lexical transformations do not merely alter linguistic form; they fundamentally reshape the semantic and ideological dimensions of the discourse. Consequently, translation becomes an instrument through which the dominant narrative is reinforced, contributing to the normalization of the Israeli perspective and the marginalization of the Palestinian one.

Motasem Dalloul, a journalist and translator affiliated with Middle East Monitor , substantiates this argument by noting that «the global mass media were mostly owned or manipulated by Zionist Jews or had pro-Israeli editors. Then, they used social media and bloggers as Netanyahu encouraged social media users to take part in the war, pledging to pay for their university fees» (Qaddoura, 2017)

In addition to these manipulative strategies, Israeli discourse frequently employs positively connoted terms such as “freedom,” “equality,” “democracy,” and “civilization.” While these

expressions carry universal ethical appeal, they are often instrumentalized within propaganda frameworks to construct a favorable self-image and to legitimize policies that diverge markedly from the lived realities on the ground. The rhetorical use of such terminology functions to elicit empathy and international endorsement, thereby demonstrating how discourse—when mediated through translation—operates as a potent ideological instrument shaping global perception.

4-Ideological Orientation in Translation: The concept of ideology has traditionally been associated with politics, where it often carries negative connotations. Within the framework of Marxist thought, ideology is viewed as a form of distortion or misrepresentation of reality.

(Gardiner, 1992) Explains, ideology is «a form of cognitive distortion, a false or illusory representation of the real».

However, ideology is not limited to this pejorative sense. It can also be defined more broadly as a cumulative system of values that influences and directs human behavior—whether individual or collective—until it evolves into a doctrine or quasi-doctrine that governs patterns of thought and social interaction. In this way, ideologies function as powerful systems capable of shaping collective perceptions by promoting specific models of attitudes and experiences. Since translation is itself a complex human activity, it inevitably becomes a site of negotiation between different ideologies and actors.

Within the field of Translation Studies, ideology is commonly understood as the set of implicit assumptions, beliefs, and value systems collectively shared by members of a society at a particular historical moment. These underlying frameworks influence translators' interpretive stance toward texts—whether consciously or subconsciously—and are manifested in the lexical, syntactic, and discursive choices they make throughout the translation process.

(Farghal, 2008 p. 1) Refers to such influences as “ideological moves, superimposing certain directionality on the text in order to approximate it to, or even have it meet, their own or some other agent's goal.” In other words, translation is not merely an act of linguistic transfer but also a reorientation of discourse shaped by ideological purposes.

Building on this perspective, scholars in postcolonial translation studies such as Lawrence Venuti and Antoine Berman argue that translators operate within broader socio-cultural and

institutional constraints. Translators may receive implicit or explicit instructions from clients, project managers, or publishers—guidelines that inevitably frame and limit their agency throughout the translation process. Similarly, Lefevere (1992) emphasizes that the translator's ideology and cultural background play a decisive role in shaping translation strategies. For Lefevere, ideology is often imposed by authority, society, or institutions, compelling translators to negotiate a compromise between the dominant ideology of the target culture and their own individual stance.

In this respect, Lefevere (cited in 246 صفة، عناني، 2003) underscores the primacy of ideology over purely linguistic considerations: "we can demonstrate that whenever linguistic considerations at any level of the translation process come into conflict with ideological or poetic considerations, the latter will always prevail." This observation reinforces the idea that translation decisions are often governed less by linguistic fidelity than by ideological alignment or aesthetic priorities, thereby situating translation within a network of power relations rather than mere linguistic equivalence.

Therefore, ideology in translation should not be regarded as a peripheral or secondary concern but as a central determinant shaping the entire translational act—from the selection of source texts and translation strategies to the reception and interpretation of the target texts. It functions simultaneously as a constraining and guiding framework, underscoring the fact that translation is never a neutral activity but one inherently embedded within specific ideological and socio-political contexts.

5- The Translator's Ideological Intervention and Its Impact on the Reconstruction of Meaning : In the context of escalating conflicts and disputes on the international scene, translation has increasingly come to embody the link between language and power. It reveals the extent of influence exercised by political parties and institutions, who employ language strategically to shape public opinion and garner support through the intentional interpretation of texts and political discourse. Such influence is only possible through the conscious and deliberate use of language in translation.

As Chilton emphasizes, political activity is inseparable from language, which constitutes its essential foundation: «What is clear is that political activity does not exist without the use of language. It is true, as noted earlier, that other behaviours are involved and, in particular, physical coercion. But the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language.» (Chilton, 2004 p. 6)

From this perspective, translation becomes a crucial instrument in amplifying the influence of language, particularly because English—the dominant language of international relations and global politics—occupies a privileged status in the field of translation.

Consistent with this perspective, Baker (Baker M. , 2006) argues that translation imposes on translators and interpreters an active role in environments marked by conflict and violence. In such sensitive contexts, translators are not simply transferring meaning; they are actively shaping political discourse and reframing its messages according to prevailing ideological frameworks. Similarly, (Schäffner, et al., 2010 p. 8) highlight the translator's power to "influence and control content in multiple ways," shaping the audience's response through deliberate choices of vocabulary and strategy. This manipulation is particularly evident in the media, where the press acts as both a disseminator of information and a tool for influencing political decisions and steering public opinion.

They explain that: «recontextualisation always involves transformation, determined by goals, values and interests» (Schäffner, et al., 2010 p. 8). Similarly, recontextualization, when applied to translation, operates under the same dynamics, whereby texts are reshaped according to the goals, values, and interests guiding the translational process. All processes, starting from a decision to report on affairs and events in another country (not only political affairs, but any topic) up to the production of a final text are determined by institutional policies and ideologies. Mass media enable communication across languages and cultures, but in doing so, they can privilege specific information at the expense of other information, and they can also hinder and prohibit information from being circulated.

In this sense, ideological intervention in translation transcends the notion of simple domestication, which merely adapts a text to the linguistic and cultural norms of the target audience. Rather, it involves a deeper process of reconfiguring the conceptual and intellectual

structure of the source text in accordance with the ideological orientation of the translator or the commissioning institution. Consequently, the translator ceases to function as a neutral intermediary and instead assumes the role of an active interpreter, reconstructing meaning and discourse to serve particular ideological or institutional ends.

Such intervention frequently leads to substantial modifications in the semantic architecture of the source text. In journalistic contexts, for instance, translators may add, omit, or rephrase elements of the discourse in order to adapt the message to the expectations or sensitivities of a particular audience. Although this process often remains imperceptible to the general readership, it exerts a powerful influence on how events are perceived and on the interpretive stances subsequently adopted by both the public and political actors.

As, (Schäffner, et al., 2010 p. 8) observe, this phenomenon forms part of the broader “power of language” exercised by the media, which functions as a central mediator between institutions and the public. They therefore call upon scholars to investigate the role and influence of journalist-translators in order to gain a deeper understanding of the interplay between translation, ideology, and socio-cultural context—particularly in relation to questions of fidelity and representational accuracy.

Accordingly, translation should not be conceived merely as a process of linguistic transfer; rather, it constitutes an active practice of manipulation and meaning construction. From this standpoint, two distinct modes of intervention can be identified. The first involves deliberate ideological manipulation designed to advance specific agendas or perspectives, while the second entails more subtle adjustments intended to enhance readability and coherence without fundamentally altering the intended message of the source text.

Whenever translation operates under ideological pressure, however, critical theoretical questions inevitably emerge concerning the relationship between the source text and its translated version, as well as the extent to which translators' ideological positions shape the interpretive outcomes of their work.

In this regard, (Farghal M. , 1993) offers a useful conceptual distinction between intrinsic managing and extrinsic managing. Intrinsic managing refers to the inevitable adjustments required to reconcile structural or cultural mismatches between source and target languages—whether phonological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, or textual. Such modifications are necessary to ensure intelligibility and naturalness in the target language. Extrinsic managing, on the other hand, denotes conscious ideological intervention, whereby the translator deliberately imposes personal, institutional, or political orientations upon the target text, thus reshaping meaning in line with particular ideological or propagandistic objectives.

He states that: «we will distinguish between two types of managing: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic managing. Intrinsic managing, on the one hand, relates to the alterations effected in the Target Language (TL) text due to the mismatches existing between the TL and the Source Language (SL). These mismatches range from the most micro to the most macro-levels; they involve phonic, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, textual, and cultural mismatches. The managing of these mismatches is a prerequisite in the process of translating, for them leaving unmanaged would bring about unintelligible translations, hence a breakdown in communication. Extrinsic managing, on the other hand, relates to the translator's ideological superimposition on the TL text aiming to the TL text's message toward meeting his own goals. This premeditated intervention in the TL text may manifest itself in the syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and culture of the translations.» (Farghal, 1993 p. 258)

6-Methodology and Research Limitations: This research adopts a qualitative analytical approach based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Translation Studies frameworks. It examines how ideological manipulation operates in the translation of media discourse related to the Palestinian cause. The analysis focuses on lexical and terminological shifts occurring in the translation of Arabic terms into English, particularly in international and Arab media coverage.

It relies on a descriptive and interpretative method, aiming to uncover how translators' choices and institutional pressures reshape meaning and reproduce ideological orientations. Selected examples are drawn from real journalistic and political contexts to illustrate the mechanisms of manipulation at the lexical and discourse levels.

By combining insights from scholars such as van Dijk (1998), Lefevere (1992), and Baker (2006), the research situates translation within a socio-political framework where language functions as a tool of power. This approach allows a contextualized understanding of how ideological forces operate through translation, influencing both representation and reception.

7. Materials and Procedure: To carry out this analysis, a corpus of media terms related to the Palestinian cause has been collected from both Arabic and English sources. The selected materials include news reports, headlines, and political commentaries published in leading international and Arab media outlets such as MEMRI (Middle Eastern Media Research Institution), Al Jazeera, TRT Global reports. These terms were chosen for their recurrent coverage of key political events involving Palestine, notably those addressing resistance, occupation, and peace negotiations.

For analytical purposes, the study focuses on a representative sample of terms drawn from various journalistic contexts. Each excerpt consists of an original Arabic segment and its corresponding English translation, enabling a comparative investigation of the ideological shifts at the lexical and discourse levels.

The comparative findings highlight areas of convergence and divergence between the source texts (ST) and target texts (TT), illustrating the translator's role in reproducing—or resisting—the ideological orientation of the source discourse.

7-1- Lexical-Level Ideological Manipulation: A Critical Analysis: Ideological intervention is most visibly manifested at the lexical level, where translators' selection of specific terms reflects ideological orientations that diverge from those implied by alternative expressions. Such lexical choices are rarely neutral; they are often conditioned by social and political allegiances, personal convictions, and cultural frameworks. In journalistic discourse—where neutrality and factual accuracy are ostensibly expected—translation thus becomes a particularly fertile ground for ideological manipulation, as the rendering of key terms frequently determines how events are framed and interpreted.

Within this context, translators employ strategies such as deletion, omission, addition, and substitution, each serving as a potential site of ideological intervention. These strategies, shaped by

broader cultural and political affiliations, are especially prominent in translations related to the Palestinian question. Through the distortion or replacement of terms, translators may subtly reconfigure meaning, influence public perception, and attenuate global awareness of the Palestinian struggle.

Significantly, these interventions extend beyond mere reinterpretation: they actively contribute to the entrenchment of alternative terminology within the global lexicon—and, increasingly, within Arabic discourse itself. In this way, translation functions not only as a medium of linguistic transfer but also as an instrument in advancing wider political objectives, including the normalization of relations between Arab states and Israel.

The following examples illustrate how such ideological manipulation operates in translations from Arabic into English within the Palestinian context.

The Arabic term “معتقلات” (mu’taqalat), referring to politically charged detention centers, is often rendered as “**prisons**,” thereby neutralizing its connotations of arbitrariness and illegitimacy.

Similarly, the phrase “نكسة حزيران” (June Naksa), which frames the 1967 war as a temporary “setback,” is translated as “**defeat**,” erasing the cultural nuance of resilience and imposing a harsher interpretation.

References to “جرحى وشهداء” (wounded and martyrs) are also replaced by “**casualties**,” a neutral term that downplays the religious and political resonance of martyrs. In each case, translation choices reshape the original narrative, aligning it with dominant Western or Israeli perspectives while diminishing the political and cultural meanings intended in Arabic (see (Hamdan, Naser, & Hamdan, 2021).

A clear case of ideological intervention is the substitution of “**الضفة الغربية**” “Occupied West Bank” with the biblical term “**Judea and Samaria**.” As TRT Global reports, this lexical shift reframes the territory as part of Jewish heritage, erasing the legal notion of occupation under international law.

«Lawmakers in Israel and the US have simultaneously introduced bills in the top law-making bodies in the two countries to replace the name ‘West Bank’ with biblical terms ‘Judea and Samaria’» (Alam, 2025)

Such choices, as Baker (2006) argues, suppress some narratives while legitimizing others, illustrating how language becomes a tool of political power.

Similar patterns appear in the translation of other politically charged terms. Military expressions such as “**occupation**” are sometimes replaced by alternatives like “**defense**,” a shift that portrays the Israeli army as protective rather than as a force of control.

Terms central to Palestinian collective memory, such as “**al-Nakba**”, are avoided in some Western media, replaced with “**Israel Independence Day**” or “**Establishment of the State of Israel**.” These choices redirect attention toward narratives of statehood and independence while sidelining displacement and loss.

Comparable shifts are observed in religious and geographical terminology. “**Al-Aqsa Mosque**” is sometimes rendered as “**Temple Mount**” or “**Har HaBayit**”, reflecting Jewish historical claims. In the political sphere, the phrase “Palestinian cause” is frequently translated as “**Israeli-Palestinian conflict**,” presenting the issue as a bilateral dispute rather than a matter of occupation. Similarly, “**Palestinian resistance**” is often translated in ways that emphasize **terrorism** rather than liberation, aligning discourse with security-oriented narratives.

Other lexical substitutions further illustrate these tendencies. The Arabic expression “**the Zionist entity**”, which carries negative connotations in Arab discourse, is routinely rendered as “**the State of Israel**.” Likewise, individuals described in Arabic as “**settlers**” are often referred to in English as “**residents**” or “**inhabitants**,” choices that soften the legal and political weight of settlement activity.

8. Results: The evidence presented underscores that translation within the Palestinian context cannot be regarded as a neutral or merely linguistic endeavour. Rather, it operates as a highly situated discursive practice, wherein lexical and terminological choices actively participate in the construction, reinforcement, and legitimization of specific ideological frameworks. Translators, through deliberate or unconscious selection and modification of key terms, contribute to the normalization of dominant narratives that depoliticize the Palestinian struggle, reframing it within discourses of “**security**,” “**peace**,” or “**coexistence**.”

Such lexical interventions extend beyond semantic adjustment; they subtly manipulate the representation of power asymmetries, attenuating the perceived disparity between the occupying forces and the Palestinian population. By substituting culturally and politically charged terms with neutral or reframed equivalents—such as rendering معتقلات as “prisons” or النكبة as “Israel Independence Day”—translation shapes international understanding of the conflict, aligning it with perspectives that privilege hegemonic interests.

Consequently, the study of translation emerges as essential for critical inquiry into ideological operations in global media representations of Palestine. Translation functions as a site of contestation where competing narratives are negotiated, filtered, and strategically reframed. Analyses of these dynamics illuminate the dual role of translation as both a communicative medium and an instrument of symbolic power, revealing how language mediates and perpetuates broader political agendas.

9-Conclusion: Translation is far from a neutral process; it operates as a site of ideological negotiation where lexical and discursive choices actively shape meaning. In the context of the Palestinian cause, translators—whether consciously or under institutional influence—employ strategies that reinforce dominant narratives, obscure alternative perspectives, and influence global perceptions. Media discourse, mediated through translation, thus becomes a potent instrument of political and ideological control. Awareness of the ethical and political dimensions of translation is crucial for scholars, practitioners, and audiences, as it highlights how language constructs realities, shapes collective memory, and guides public opinion.

To support researchers and translators engaged in translating politically sensitive terms, particularly those related to the Palestinian issue or other Arab contexts, several measures are recommended:

1. Developing linguistic and cultural awareness: Translators and students should acquire deep knowledge of rendering sensitive terms accurately into English, preserving original meanings without distortion.

2. Strategies for handling sensitive expressions: Translators must cultivate the ability to manage ideologically charged expressions in ways consistent with the cultural and political expectations of target audiences, while maintaining fidelity to the source text.
3. Familiarity with media terminology: Students and novice translators should study terms commonly used in media, analysing their translations to ensure precise understanding and correct usage in varying contexts.
4. Enhancing academic curricula: Universities should integrate specialized courses on the political dimensions of terminology within translation programs, enabling students to comprehend the broader implications of terms in political and media discourse.
5. Encouraging scholarly research: Increased academic attention should be devoted to translating politically sensitive terms related to Arab issues, examining translation strategies and their impact on shaping international opinion. Mastery of political terminology is essential for countering biased translations.

A focus on ideology in translation offers significant benefits for translation students, enriching their academic development, professional competence, and future careers. Translators must also become acquainted with manipulative strategies employed in foreign translations of Arabic terms, particularly those concerning the Palestinian cause, to ensure ethical, accurate, and contextually informed translation practice.

10-References:

Books:

- 1-Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. Routledge., New York:.
- 2-Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge Taylor & Francis group London and New York.
- 3-Gardiner, M. (1992). *The Dialogics of Critique: M M Bakhtin and the*. Routledge London:.
- 4-Hatim, B. (1997). *Communication Across Cultures Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press. Great Britain
- 5-Reah, D. (2002.). *The Language of Newspapers* . Routledge. London:

6-Schäffner, C. ., & Bassnett. (2010). Political Discourse, Media and Translation. cambridge scholars publishing.Britain

7-van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach. . London: Sage.

عناني , م. (2003). نظرية الترجمة الحديثة. مكتبة، الشركة المصرية العالمية للنشر، لونجمان.

Journal articles:

1-Alam, K. (2025, 02 04). Why US, Israel want to rename occupied West Bank as 'Judea and Samaria'. TRT GLOBAL

2-Farghal, M. (1993). "Managing in Translation: A Theoretical Model. META , 38 (02).

3-Farghal, M. (2008, January). Translatorial Ideological Movesk. Retrieved 05 09, 2019, from researchgate: <https://www.researchgate.net/>

4-Qaddoura, R. M. (2017). Israel's Propaganda Strategies: Case Study Of The Protective Edge . International Journal of Development Research , 07 (12).

Dissertations:

1-Baidoun, A. (2014). The Gaza Conflict 2013 and Ideologies of Israeli and Palestinian Media: A Critical Discourse Analysis. Örebro University, Jordan).

2-Brook, J. (2012). The role of translation in the production of international print news: three case three case studies in the language direction Spanish to English . The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

3-Hamdan, ., J., Naser, R. S., & Hamdan, H. J. (2021). Arabic- English Translation in the Palestinian – Israeli ‘Conflict’: Ideology in the Wings. Amman, Jordan : The University of Jordan, .