

FRAMING THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT:
A STUDY OF FRAMES USED BY THREE AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
MELANIE STAWICKI
Dr. Charles Davis, Thesis Supervisor

DECEMBER 2009

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

FRAMING THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT:
A STUDY OF FRAMES USED BY THREE AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS

presented by Melanie Stawicki,

a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts in Journalism

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Charles Davis

Professor Emeritus Byron Scott

Professor Michael Grinfeld

Professor Emeritus Paul Wallace

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my daughter Stella Noora Azam and son Sam Daniel Azam, who inspire me everyday to do the best I can in life. Thank you to my husband Jesse Kasem Azam, who also encouraged and supported me through this process

I am forever indebted to my mother, Carol Stawicki, who endlessly bugged me to finish my thesis and spent hours babysitting my two lovable, but rambunctious toddlers on the weekends, so I could write. I also thank my father, Steven Stawicki, for assisting her on the effort.

I also have to thank Dave, the volunteer leader on Kibbutz Baram, who first got me thinking about peace journalism and the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for helping me through this thesis process and sticking with me to its long and arduous completion. Thanks you to my chair Charles Davis, who never gave up on me and encouraged me through the process. I am also very grateful to the wonderful professors on my committee, including Paul Wallace, Michael Grinfeld and Byron Scott.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
Chapter	
1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Framing conflict	
2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
Framing the intifada and peace journalism	
(A) Israeli-Palestinian conflict frames	9
(B) Peace journalism	16
3: METHODOLOGY:.....	21
Looking at the content of intifada coverage—framing and textual analysis	
4: FINDINGS.....	27
(A) Dominant frames: 2000 time period	29
(i) The New York Times coverage: 2000 period	30
(ii) The Christian Science Monitor coverage: 2000 period.....	36
(iii) The St. Louis Post-Dispatch Coverage: 2000 period.....	44
(B) Dominant frames: 2002 time period	48
(i.)The New York Times coverage: 2002 period.....	49
(ii) The Christian Science Monitor coverage: 2002 period.....	57
(iii) The St. Louis Post-Dispatch coverage: 2002 period.....	63

5: DISCUSSION.....	67
(A) Differences among time periods	67
(B) Differences among newspapers	69
(C) Significance of findings	71
(D) Opportunities for future research	73
APPENDIX	
1. TABLES	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of article by newspapers.....	74
2. Frames in coverage from 9/28/2000 to 10/12/2000 period.....	75
3. Frames in coverage from 3/28/2002 to 4/12/2002 period.....	76

FRAMING THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT: A STUDY OF FRAMES USED BY THREE AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS

Melanie Stawicki

Charles Davis, Thesis Supervisor

Fall 2009

ABSTRACT

This paper explored how three U.S. newspapers' covered the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, following two peak incidents—Israeli leader Ariel Sharon's 2000 visit to Jerusalem's Temple Mount and 2002's Passover Massacre—by identifying and analyzing the frames used. This study examined theories of conflict resolution and peace journalism, while looking to see how the frames used may help to inflame or calm the conflict and how the ideas of peace journalism could clash with the realities of the news business. It analyzed newspaper stories from *The New York Times*, *Christian Science Monitor* and *St. Louis Post Dispatch* in both a quantitative and qualitative manner by examining what language was used, the sources included and the context provided. It was found that the dominant frame of the 2000 coverage overall was the Israeli government's quest for security frame, while in the 2002 coverage, the frame most used was the Israelis as military strong bullies frame. The *Monitor* mostly used the thematic and balanced look frames and its coverage was most in line with peace journalism concepts, the *Times* was mixed in its use of frames and the *Post-Dispatch* mainly used the episodic frame.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION: FRAMING CONFLICT

For decades now, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has persisted, alternately heating up and cooling down but never truly being resolved. There are dramatic events and colorful characters on each side with plenty of history, culture and religion sprinkled in to make for an interesting—yet complex and often tragic—story for the world’s media to tell. And over the years, the conflict in the Middle East has been a highly emotional one with ongoing allegations of media bias on both sides.

Conflict and the media is an important topic, as the world grows more interconnected and international communication has been dramatically affected by the Internet, satellite dishes and other technological developments. Governments debate how much freedom the media should have and limits media access, particularly during a major military conflict. Opposing sides have learned how to manipulate their image and use the media to gain international support and spur action, such as military and humanitarian aid.

Israeli researcher Gadi Wolfsfeld, who has extensively studied the framing of the intifada, states:

the essence of any conflict centers on the struggle over interpretive frames: Two or more antagonists develop a dispute over ‘what’s going on,’ and they typically attempt to promote their definition onto third parties. (Cohen and Wolfsfeld, 1993, p. xiv)

The purpose of this study is to look how three U.S. newspapers’ covered the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, following two peak incidents—Israeli leader Ariel Sharon’s 2000 visit to Jerusalem’s Temple Mount and 2002’s Passover Massacre— by identifying and

analyzing the frames used. I will do an initial count of the frames, but most of my analysis will involve looking at examples of them from a qualitative perspective, which will examine what language is used, the sources included and the context provided.

War reporting has changed radically in the past century and it is important for journalists to examine their role and effect on a conflict. Most Americans don't personally witness the events in the Middle East nor have the entire historical and cultural context they need to fully understand the situation there, so journalists serve as their eyes and ears.

Studying the antiwar movement in the 1960s, Gitlin identifies early framing devices and states that:

Some of this framing can be attributed to traditional assumptions in news treatment: news concerns the events, not the underlying condition; the person not the group; conflict, not consensus; the fact that 'advances the story' not the one that explains it. (Gitlin, 1980, p.28)

He talks about how leadership in movement can be converted into celebrity with the addition of drama, charisma, mystery and radicalism. Alluding to a growing disassociation from context, he states, "Life came to seem a sequence of tenuously linked exclamation points. But what were the sentences between?" (Gitlin, 1980, p.234)

If reporters can have an influence on public opinion and foreign policy, then perhaps they have even more of a responsibility to the public to provide the best and most complete coverage they can. Of course, they may need to balance this with the tough realities of working in a foreign war zone. Still, journalists can often go beyond traditional journalistic practices and look at implementing alternative ideas and frames, including those related to theories of peace journalism and conflict resolution.

This study will examine theories of conflict resolution and peace journalism, while looking to see how the frames used may help to inflame or calm the conflict. It will also examine how the ideas of peace journalism could clash with the realities of the news business when covering the intifada, such as limited access to the scene of the fighting and a news organization's time and space constraints.

News organizations, driven by competition and time and space constraints, may be on the "lookout for colorful and punchy verbal and visual material with which to enliven a story."(Nelson, Clawson and Oxley, 1997, p. 568) In a conflict, one group may allow more access, provide better quotes or deliver information in a more organized, accurate and timely fashion.

However, if the media could play a constructive role in conflict, without abandoning traditional notions of fairness, independence, balance and accuracy, it could be a positive thing for the Middle East and the world. There are some journalists who believe that the media can be a powerful force in fostering understanding between people and assisting in conflict resolution in their coverage without sacrificing journalistic principles and ethics. If there is a clear way to practice peace journalism and some journalists are indeed doing it, perhaps their techniques can be shared with others.

"The news media can play a central role in the promotion of peace" but also "serve as destructive agents in the process." (Wolfsfeld, 2004, p.1) To promote peace, journalists can emphasize the benefits peace brings, raise the legitimacy of groups or leaders working for peace, identify possible solutions, and help transform images of the enemy. To work against peace, they can emphasize the dangers of compromise, raise the legitimacy of those opposed to concessions and reinforce negative stereotypes of the

enemy. "It is often said that it is much easier to destroy than build, and this is certainly true in the area of media and peace." (Wolfsfeld, 2004, p. 229)

This research will extend existing knowledge by adding to the topics of conflict framing and peace journalism theory, while examining and critiquing the media's coverage of an important contemporary conflict. Through research of this kind, journalists could be exposed to new, better ways of reporting conflicts that may open the door towards solutions, instead of further strife.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW: FRAMING THE INTIFADA AND PEACE JOURNALISM

Extensive research since the 1970s has been done examining how media frames can affect the public's perception of events. Erving Goffman (1974) finds people "tend to perceive events in terms of primary frameworks, and the type of frame which we employ provides a way of describing the event to which it is applied." (p. 24)

Gaye Tuchman (1978) looks at news as a frame, the organization and routines of the media and the social construction of reality. "The news media have the power to shape news consumers' opinions on topics about which they are ignorant." (p. 2) News is also an ally of legitimated institutions and sources and draws on the culture of its readers. (p. 4-5) Many Americans are relatively ignorant of the conflict in the Middle East, living so far away from it, and depend on the U.S. media to explain it to them.

Todd Gitlin (1980) defines frames as "principles of selection, emphasis, and presentation composed of little tacit theories about what exists, what happens and what matters." (p.6) Media frames "are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation of selection, emphasis and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual."(p. 7) They are unavoidable since journalists need them to process and package large amounts of information.

Routines of journalism select certain versions of reality over others and daily organizational procedures define the story. Stereotyping often results from a shortage of news time and space and increased militancy of a movement can also be rooted in the

media focusing on only certain aspects of a group. Gitlin says that the media “were always hungry for novelty,” (p. 234) and television reinforces framing of events by repetition of coverage.

Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon (1993) discuss the media’s framing of issues in episodic or thematic terms. The episodic frame depicts public issues in terms of “specific events,” honing in a particular person or event and making for live, on-the-scene coverage and good images. The thematic news frame uses a more general or abstract context with more background information and “talking heads.” (p. 370) Looking at media reports of the Gulf War, Iyengar and Simon found exposure to episodic framing of the conflict increased public support for a military resolution.

Robert Entman (1993) writes that frames define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest remedies. (p. 52) This suggests that certain media frames could affect the public’s perception of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and peaceful solutions could be offered. “Frames call attention to some aspects of reality while obscuring other elements.” (p. 55)

Thomas Nelson, Rosalee Clawson and Zoe Oxley (1997) assert that:

Media frames influence opinions by stressing specific values, facts or other considerations, endowing them with greater apparent relevance to the issue than they might appear to have under an alternative frame. (p. 569)

The battle for public opinion is affected by the way the debate is defined and the media’s use of traditional elite-sponsored frames or new frames when needed.

Attitudes and beliefs, along with information, can also push actions and solutions to conflicts. If the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is reported day after day as two diametrically

opposed groups who have been fighting forever in a series of killings and retaliations, it is easy for the reader or viewer to feel hopeless and even apathetic about the situation. Yet, stories that explore the issues more fully and deeply, contain a variety of sources with differing perspectives and show peace or positive action in the midst of war, could perhaps do the opposite and empower people.

Nelson et al. found that:

The choices journalists make about how to cover a story—from the words, phrases and images they convey to the broader ‘angle’ they take on a controversy — can result in substantially different portrayals of the very same event and the broader controversy it represents. These alternative portrayals, or frames, can exert appreciable influence on citizens’ perceptions of the issue and, ultimately, the opinions they express. (p. 576)

Michael Karlberg (1997) studies how the adversarial framing of environmental news could be harmful to the environmental movement because it limits public understanding of the issues. It employs metaphors such as “fights” and “battles” and portrays issues “as seemingly irreconcilable conflicts between neatly defined, diametrically opposed groups.” (p. 23) Differing parties share no common ground and the story focuses more on dramatic actions or words than deeper context or analysis. He argues that a better alternative would include a diversity of perspectives and a non-confrontational tone of expression.

His findings can be applied to the media’s coverage of the conflict in the Middle East, where the issue is often framed as an endless cycle of aggression and retaliation, making it seem hopeless to search for resolution. The daily drama and reporting of the dead or injured is focused on, while context and deeper underlying issues are ignored. The same radical sources seem to be included from either camp, producing dramatic quotes, while

more moderate voices or views are ignored.

Although this passion may capture the public's attention, it can cause a negative reaction, as Karlberg (1997) notes:

Extremism becomes a ticket for admission to the public sphere—with very practical consequences. Such expressions tend to polarize issues and alienate social groups from another. They tend to reduce empathy, lessen willingness to listen and close minds. And they are thus a breeding ground for further misunderstanding, prejudice, enmity and conflict. The adversarial news frame therefore amplifies as mass-mediated discourse that which is most destructive in interpersonal communications and relationships. (p. 24)

Karlberg argues that emotion has a place, but conflicting ideas, values and interests should be presented in a way that allows for clear and critical examination. That would better allow opposing groups to learn about and better understand each other's outlooks, possibly leading to a solution or peaceful resolution. "Journalists would do well to focus less on the surface expressions of conflicts and more on their underlying causes." (p. 24)

The barriers to adoption of this alternative framing of conflict are inherent in the traditional commercial mass-market news media itself. Karlberg says:

Journalistic routines and traditions, organizational and financial imperatives, audience preferences and expectations, as well as political-economic and ideological constraints all present potential barriers to such change. (p. 25)

Yet, Karlberg also says that the media are rapidly changing and many of these factors are susceptible to change.

Patti Valkenburg, Holli Semetko and Claes De Vreese (1999) looked at different types of frames, including the conflict frame which they said "emphasizes conflict between individuals, groups, or institutions" and "makes winning and losing the central concern." (p. 551). They found frames can exert a significant effect on readers thoughts and recall

of news issues and “give the audience direction on how to conceive of a specific issue or event.” (p. 567)

ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT FRAMES

The study of the framing of various conflicts has been popular and research focusing exclusively on the framing of the conflict in the Middle East has been done, especially by some Israeli scholars, such as Gadi Wolfsfeld and Tamar Liebes. They have looked at issues such as the role of the media, the mythical frames created, the tone, voices and context used in coverage and the effects of different kinds of framing.

This study will look at seven identified frames, determining which are used most often in coverage of the Intifada by three U.S newspapers during two specific time periods. The qualitative analysis will look at what language is used, the sources included, how different events and the players are described and even what topics are chosen. Only text will be analyzed, not images.

Examining framing of the first Israeli intifada and Gulf War, Israeli researcher Gadi Wolfsfeld (1993) found the role of the media in political conflict is often determined by the ability of the more powerful antagonist, often a government, to control the informational environment. This control over framing events depends on the key player’s ability to control events, regulate the flow of information and extend consensus among elites. (p.5)

Wolfsfeld identifies two main ways for the weaker party to get the media’s attention—dramatic actions or peaceful civil disobedience, as Gandhi and Martin Luther King used.

Dramatic actions can be “framed as either deviant and /or dangerous,” while non-violent protest can frame the weaker party as victims. Wolfsfeld says:

The clearest way for the news media to have a political effect on an unequal conflict is to adopt the frame being promoted by the weaker party which increases the level of political legitimacy attributed to that challenger. (p. 9)

In effect, the media can play an important equalizing role in the conflict by recognizing third parties. Wolfsfeld (1993) states the first intifada was a clear case of how the weaker party can successfully promote its frames to the media and how the media can play a significant role in a conflict. The armed Israeli army, battling stone-throwing young Palestinians, presented an image of injustice and the Israelis “found it virtually impossible to promote its “law and order” frame of the conflict to the international media.”(p.6)

Due to geographic and political reasons, Israel wasn't able to control information well. It was tough to totally seal off areas and even if Palestinian territories were closed, Palestinians might smuggle out even more dramatic images to the media. Although the army tries to censor some information, Israel is a democratic country with a free press and views on the intifada among Israeli elites were mixed.

Wolfsfeld (1993) said the Israeli army alleged the presence of the news media, especially those armed with television cameras, had a clear and direct effect on the level of violence, while Palestinians said it was minimal. Journalists covering the events admitted cameras could escalate Palestinian protests or inhibit the use of force by Israeli soldiers. “One reporter claimed that if he wanted he could start a demonstration in five minutes simply by taking his camera out.” (p. 9)

The opposite was true in the Gulf War coverage, Wolfsfeld found. Palestinian frames—supporting Iraq and dancing on the rooftops as Iraqi missiles hit Israel—weren't well accepted. (p. 16) Wolfsfeld states that those who look at the media's role in conflicts need to be conscious of what is left out, as well as what's included. "The agenda-setting function of the news media not only tells us what to think about, but also what to ignore." (p.17)

Akiba Cohen and Wolfsfeld (1993) have looked extensively at framing of the Israeli intifada by the public and media. One of the things they found is frames, taking on an almost mythical quality, are often difficult to change. Wolfsfeld states that in the case of the intifada, the Palestinians often use the "injustice" frame, highlighting their demands for self-determination, while the Israelis tend to use the "law and order" frame and focus on how to handle the violence. (Cohen and Wolfsfeld, 1993, p. xxiv)

They look at several variables affecting framing, including the existing frames and history the Palestinians and Israelis bring to the relationship, their relative power and dependency, and their cultural differences. Another aspect is content or the events covered, which "themselves serve as stimuli for the various parties, who then attempt to integrate this new information into existing frames." (p. xx) This can include the language used to describe an event, which a Palestinian may describe as a "massacre" while an Israeli might view it as "an act of self-defense."

Other framing issues include the medium used and context when covering a conflict. Television is more dependent on visuals and typically has less space, which could affect the frame's complexity. Meanwhile the interaction between the two conflicted parties, the media and the audiences all take place within a certain social and political context, which

may include a background of wars, upcoming elections and culture. "Climates have a propensity to change...when they do, neither the conflict nor its frames are likely to remain unchanged." (p. xxii-xxiii)

Wolfsfeld (1997) says "the media serve as public interpreters of events and as symbolic arenas for ideological struggle between antagonists" (p. 54) and it uses certain routine frames to cover political conflicts, based on its definition of what makes a good story. He argues three major elements contribute to the construction of media frames of conflict: the nature of the information and events being processed; the need to create a good news story; and the need to create a story resonating politically within a particular culture. (p. 41)

According to Wolfsfeld, "the construction of media frames of conflict is an interactive process in which the press attempts to find a narrative fit between incoming information and existing media frames." (p. 54) The Lebanese war in 1982 was a clear turning point for Israel's international image, he said, when "the press began to use the ironic portrayal of the Palestinian David being victimized by the Israeli Goliath." (p. 150)

In an analysis of two Israeli and one American newspapers, Wolfsfeld looks at language used by the Israeli press, stating that the passive sentence structure is used to lessen Israeli culpability when a Palestinian is killed, while the active structure is used when an Arab attacks a Jew. (p. 157) Palestinian actions are referred to as "disorders" or "protests" and biographies are included when Israelis are killed, while Palestinian deaths are more likely to be reported statistically. (p. 158)

He also talks about frames used by both parties, identifying the "law and order frame" promoted by Israeli leadership and the classic "injustice and defiance frame" used by the

Palestinians. (p. 146-147) Wolfsfeld also points to a study by Gamson identifying four major frames used in the intifada—the strategic interests, the feuding neighbors, the Arab intransigence and Israeli expansionism frames. It was found that the last two frames clearly put the blame on one side or another, but the most consistent frame was the feuding neighbors’ one. (p. 150) The Israeli “law and order” and Palestinian “injustice and defiance” frames are two of the seven frames identified in my study.

Tamar Liebes (1992) examines how journalists cover a conflict differently, depending on if it is an internal or external battle, “our war” or “their war”. Examining American and Israeli television’s coverage of both the Gulf War and the Intifada, she looked at the different framing mechanisms used. She found that in “our” war coverage, there was a tendency to excise the opposite side, sanitize the suffering inflicted on the other, attribute equal strength to both sides, personalize “our” side while demonizing “their” side and decontextualize its aggressive actions.

The sanitizing and more subtle form of framing, personalizing, extends to victims of the wars, she asserts. Israeli media identify Israeli victims by name, while Palestinians often are anonymous with ambiguous deaths. Her research suggests that escalation of conflict may affect personalization of a conflict. “It is interesting to note that coverage at the early stages of the intifada had a more balanced character, the depersonalization of the Palestinians emerged only as part of the routinization of intifada news.” (p. 51)

Liebes also talks about demonizing the enemy, which is already depersonalized, and contextualizing the conflict. She writes:

Instead of young boys we see shadowy figures with covered faces, whose attempts to hide their identities for the Israeli soldiers contribute to their demonization. They appear in disorganized, hysterical crowds,

brandishing flags, shouting abuses, hurling rocks, lighting fires, writing on walls, this is all we know about them. (p. 53)

Two of the seven frames identified in my study invoke typical stereotypes used in the Intifada—the militarily strong Israeli bully and the exotic, Palestinian terrorist.

Shoshanna Blum-Kulka and Liebes (1993) discuss the importance of the use of language and feelings or beliefs it may convey in their study of the language used by Israeli soldiers and how the terms used to describe Palestinians may indicate the way they are framing the situation in their minds and distancing themselves from the opposition. The researchers note that “terms of address and reference are well-known linguistic indicators of attitudinal stance” and “in the discourse of ethnic prejudice, for example, talk about ‘the other’ is characterized by the avoidance of naming and a preference for the use of pronouns (‘that man’/‘she’/‘he’).” (p. 34)

Liebes (1997) looks at how hegemony affects reporting the Arab-Israeli conflict, saying:

We have learned that any report on reality expresses the reporter’s point of view, that conflict makes it physically and psychologically difficult to get to the other side, that journalists have to tell stories, which are relevant and familiar to their public, and thus that journalists, willy-nilly, are servants of their culture. (p. 1)

In Israel, textual analysis of coverage of the conflict in the press and electronic media, plus interviews with journalists and the public, point to four hegemonic constraints on reporting conflict, she said. First, conflict results in technical limitations to seeing the two sides equally. Second, journalists and their audience are frequently members of one side in the battle, not complete outsiders. Additionally, it is difficult to criticize the military, which is closely connected to Israeli society. Last, the public sets limits on how much the

media can criticize the establishment and the media can't afford to totally alienate its clients. (p. 2-3)

Still, Liebes points out that alternative frames and a more sympathetic and complex look at the conflict and members of the opposite side are possible. "Viewing the conflict through alternative channels means substituting the "them and us" frame for a much more complex, sometimes oppositional, view. (p.8)

Moody-Hall (2002) examines how several mainstream British and U.S. newspapers framed Arabs in the coverage of the Middle Eastern conflict before and after the September 11 attacks in New York City. She found both countries were more likely to frame Arabs more negatively than Israelis by using negative adjectives more frequently to describe Arabs; these included: terrorism, guerrilla, horrendous, militant and radical. Out of negative adjectives used in the article analyzed, 45 referred to Arabs and six were used in reference to Israelis. However, many of the stories used described events in which Arabs attacked Israelis, rather than vice versa.

Negative frames of Arabs may be linked to Islam, which may be seen as a competitor to Christianity, history and foreign policy, according to Moody-Hall. She cites other studies that have looked at the language used in covering the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, including the identification of victims, how the armed players are described and if their death is referred to in accidental or deliberate terminology. "A high level of anonymous victims might imply a negative frame since nameless victims do not take on a human quality to readers." (p. 3) There is also a debate over whether the use of "Israeli assassinations" or the softer "targeted killings" should be used. This study will look at qualitative aspects such as the language used in coverage of the intifada.

Journalists covering international conflicts also may be subject to propaganda, she notes, which may affect a story's context, and use "frames of reference that support 'administration policy.' These are usually 'aligned with public values, government/military and corporate interests.'" (p. 2) In times of conflict, journalists may have limited access and rely too heavily on official sources, who often have their own biases and ideas of how the story should be told.

Wolfsfeld (1997) found that as the governments involved in the conflict lost control, journalists had a freer hand in choosing sources and constructing frames. Increased independence though doesn't always lead to better coverage as the media often prefers to cover terrorist attacks over peace negotiations, he says.

Overall, Israeli-Palestinian conflict frame research has identified some common frames used in reporting the intifada, including the Israeli "law and order" frame, the Palestinian "injustice" frame and the "feuding neighbors" frame. It has also examined the use of metaphors, such as the "David and Goliath" metaphor, and how language can be used to depersonalize the enemy.

PEACE JOURNALISM

The peace journalism way of framing stories is described by Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick (2002) as providing:

A new road map tracing the connections between journalists, their sources, the stories they cover and the consequences of their reporting—the ethics of journalistic intervention. It opened up a literacy of non-violence and creativity as applied to the practical job of everyday reporting. (www.transcend.org/pjmanual.htm)

They state that a peace journalist should “avoid accepting stark differences between ‘self’ and ‘other.’ These can be used to build the sense that another party is a ‘threat’ or ‘beyond the pale’ of civilized behavior—both key justifications for violence.” (p. 2) Instead, they suggest seeking the “other” in the “self” and vice versa and similarities in behavior. “Peace journalism humanizes all sides of the conflict and is prepared to document both deceit and ways to empower non-elites by tracing relations of influence between their agendas and real effects.” (p. 4)

Wolfsfeld argues there is a basic contradiction between news values and the nature of a peace process and the media's role changes in conjunction with political and media environments. Media routines have an impact with the emphasis on conflict and drama raising the intensity of the debate over peace. Plus, "the need for simple story lines and the media's inability to question conventional wisdom narrowed the range of frames that were made public." (p. 222)

Wolfsfeld (2001) also says the media demand immediacy, while peace takes patience, and peace develops mainly within a calm environment when the media tend to have "an obsessive interest in threats and violence." (p.5) There are four major factors impacting the media's promotion on peace: the amount of consensus among political elites in support of the peace process; the number and intensity of crises associated with the process; the extent to which shared media—those used by both sides of the conflict—exists; and the level of sensationalism as the dominant news value. (Ibid.)

Practicing peace journalism might include counteracting misperceptions about the conflict and the opposing side and reporting on areas of cooperation between antagonists, Wolfsfeld says. Structural changes in the news production process could also help, he

said, like creating special sections dedicated to peace issues. (p. 6-7)

Kevin Kemper and Michael Grinfeld (2002) state that many stories are framed or structured as conflict stories and studies are looking at how framing may influence the direction of the conflict being covered. Also addressed is the idea of civic journalism as a way to help solve conflict, in which journalists would facilitate dialogue and discussion among groups and inform ordinary citizens, so that they can make their own sound decisions. But there is some dispute over whether or not the press should take on that role.

In their handbook for journalists covering a conflict, Richard Rubenstein, Johannes Botes, Frank Dukes and John B. Stephens (1994) claim that “virtually every technical and editorial decision made by journalists in presenting a conflict has potential consequences for the conflict itself.” (p. 3) They also said news coverage can strongly influence how outside parties relate to a conflict.

They actually point to instances when the media played a direct role in helping to resolve serious conflicts: when journalist Walter Cronkite played mediator in a 1977 television interview with Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin; and when correspondent John Scali acted as intermediary between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. during the Cuban Missile Crisis. (p. 7)

The authors argue that “journalism that fails to put a struggle in historical perspective may actually help perpetuate it, since a conflict that seems to have no point of origin or describable causes will appear to have no possible end.” (p. 23) This is especially the case in the coverage of ethnic conflicts, they say.

Andrew Arno and Wimal Dissanayake (1984) propose four basic principles of an

international code of media ethics: prevention of war and promotion of peace; respect for culture, tradition and values; promotion of human rights and dignity; and preserve human association in the context of the home, family and community. (p. 34-35) The promotion of peace principles suggests the media increase the amount of information available on peaceful solutions, break down dehumanizing stereotypes, be aware of hidden biases while covering controversies, and help create a public mood conducive to the spirit of reconciliation.

Wolfsfeld, Rami Khouri, and Yoram Peri (2002) state that challenges to peace journalism include the media's fixations with conflict and war as a self-sustaining drama and news about enemies tending to be fundamentally ethnocentric. (p. 190-191) They also argue "the greater the number of sources and institutions promoting the same interpretive frame, the more that frame will tend to dominate media discourse." (p. 199) After studying coverage of the Israeli-Jordanian peace process, the researchers conclude "the news media are much better suited for the conduct of war than the pursuit of peace." (p. 208)

Botes (1996) argues that news coverage can strongly influence the way outside parties relate to the conflict. That means a journalist may be "forced to choose between the conflicting roles of spectator and participant." (p. 7) He asks if a journalist should report human suffering in a detached, factual manner or highlight it so public pressure may bring about outside intervention.

He compares the roles of journalists and conflict resolvers. They both analyze a conflict to determine the parties, the issues, the underlying problems and the possible outcomes and restrain their impulse to take a side.

Journalism can adhere to principles of mediation when a report allows all involved parties a chance to express their views. (p. 7) Reframing, a standard procedure in conflict resolution processes, can occur when reporters ask questions leading the conflicting parties to identify and discuss the deeper interests and needs underlying their public positions. They can also put conflict in a historical and social perspective, deepening readers' understanding of it, and mention opportunities for settlement not yet recognized. (p. 9)

But the media and conflict resolvers also differ, Botes says. News organizations must sell their story to an audience, leading them to often dramatize conflicts by focusing on irreconcilable differences between the parties, extreme positions and inflammatory statements, violent or threatening acts and win-or-lose outcomes. (p. 8) They also usually cover a conflict sporadically, when it has escalated or something considered newsworthy happens. Journalists' insistence on the public's right to know can also put them in conflict with mediators, who may initially want to keep talks between opposing parties secret to avoid derailing them.

The common assumption is that conflict sells, but conflict resolution doesn't, says Botes, but readers tune into news for more than entertainment—they want to learn about an issue and want their anxieties and fear alleviated with good news and tales of problem solving and conflict resolution. "Journalists can address these needs without becoming confidence-peddlers by describing genuine instances of conflict resolution and prevention." (p. 9)

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY: LOOKING AT THE CONTENT OF INTIFADA COVERAGE, A FRAMING AND TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

This study will look at how three U.S. newspapers' covered the Israeli-Palestinian conflict during two distinct time periods, identifying and doing a qualitative analysis of frames used.

The materials used for this study will be text from three daily American newspapers: *The New York Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor* and the *St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch*. The publications were picked to show a variety of coverage and all three are available through Lexis-Nexis. The text analyzed is a sampling of news stories covering the event, excluding photos and analysis or editorial pieces that also ran.

Overall, seven different frames will be identified and applied to the coverage periods.

The seven frames are:

- Injustice and Palestinians quest for equality, self-rule
- Israeli government's quest for law and order, security
- Palestinians as exotic terrorists victimizing Israelis
- Israelis as militarily strong bullies victimizing Palestinians
- Balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns and players, portraying each as individual human beings, not a stereotyped homogenous group.
- Episodic, simple conflict rooted in single events
- Thematic, complex conflict rooted in many conditions

Some articles will likely appear to fit into more than one frame, but they will be

assigned to whichever frame is the dominant, most apparent one. An initial count of the frames will be done, but most of the analysis involves looking at examples of them used in the news coverage from a qualitative perspective. “Qualitative interpretations result from the intensive analysis of a single case, or perhaps a few cases.” (Lindlof, 1995) That involves what language is used, the sources included, how different events and the players are described and even what topics are chosen.

Looking at the coverage from the three newspapers during the two time periods, the use of each of the seven frames will be quantified using several tables. For example, *The New York Times* may have coverage with 30 episodic and 25 thematic frames, etc. Then the best examples of each frame will be chosen and those articles will be analyzed more deeply, as described above.

Zhongdang Pan and Gerald Kosicki (1993) say that “every news story has a theme that functions as the central organizing idea” that “connects different semantic elements of a story (e.g. descriptions of an action or an actor, quotes of sources, and background information) into a coherent whole.” (p.58-59) They classify framing devices in news discourse into four categories: syntactical structure (words and phrases); script structure (events); thematic structure (issues, topics); and rhetorical structure (metaphors, visual images).

Journalists use framing as a way to organize a lot of information into a coherent story. Research has also found that the way a conflict is framed can influence the public opinion of readers. Journalists are constantly making choices about what they include and omit from a story in terms of source and language used. Using “peace journalism” ways of framing stories may help solve, deescalate or at least not further inflame a conflict.

Different newspapers also deal with a wide range of resources when it comes to reporting international conflicts, with the majority of American newspapers lacking their own international staff and relying on wire reports. Space limitations and other journalistic constraints and habits can also affect the reporting of a conflict.

This study's hypothesis is that the *Monitor's* coverage will be most in line with peace journalism and conflict resolution practices, due to their faith-based background and the more narrative, descriptive style of many of the *Monitor's* articles.

According to its website, the *Monitor*, which is owned by the Church of Christ Scientist, is "an award-winning international news organization that covers news and feature stories from every corner of the globe" and is recognized for its "balanced, insightful take on the news, and for the fresh, independent voice it offers." ("The Christian Science Monitor: About us," 2009) The Boston-based *Monitor* has eight foreign bureaus.

Further, Mary Baker Eddy founded the *Monitor* in 1908 with a mandate: "To injure no man, but to bless all mankind." That mission is clearly in line with the goals of peace journalism, in terms of conflict reporting. The *Monitor's* Web site goes on to say that its reporting "offers clarity, context and compassion" and profiles those who seeking solutions to problems, which again fits into the ideals of peace journalism and conflict resolution. It says the publication is committed to international coverage, public service and helping readers understand the world and events.

The *Times'* coverage is expected to be more mixed, with some narrative in-depth features featuring diverse voices and deeper context and other breaking news stories more focused on a single event and the voices of official sources.

The New York Times is also considered an international newspaper and has won several Pulitzer prizes for its international coverage, including the 2009 Pulitzer Prize for International Reporting, for its coverage of the U.S.'s challenges in Afghanistan and Pakistan, which was often done under dangerous conditions. According to The New York Times Company website, the *Times* has 26 foreign bureaus and an average weekday circulation of over one million readers, as of Dec. 28, 2008. ("The New York Times Company", 2009)

The *Post-Dispatch* is expected to use mostly wire stories that are breaking-news and event-focused, with little context and diversity. Like many U.S. metro dailies, a greater emphasis appears to have been placed on local news, as opposed to national or international news. The *Post-Dispatch*'s web site FAQs page states that "STLtoday.com readers respond mostly to local news," so on its newly designed web site, the coverage of national and world news have been consolidated onto one page, listing the top headlines around the globe. It also added a photo gallery of images from around the world and national news events. ("Post-Dispatch general FAQs", 2009) While this is better than no international news coverage, it still seems very limited in scope with little space devoted to in-depth reporting on an international conflict, such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

This study's analysis is focused on two specific incidents and time periods of coverage of the intifada, chosen at key points in the conflict with one selected before the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City, while the other is after them.

The first time period runs from Sept. 28, 2000 until October 12, 2000, beginning with the visit by former Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, who later became Prime Minister, to the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. That event was widely believed to have

sparked the following intifada, which has been dubbed the second intifada. The Times ran 37 articles, the Monitor published 12 and the Post-Dispatch had 10 stories over this time span.

The Israelis and Palestinians disagree on the date that the second intifada began—the Palestinians say it started Sept. 28, 2000 when Ariel Sharon, then leader of the hard-line Likud party, visited the Temple Mount, a Jerusalem site sacred to both Jews and Moslems, according to a *New York Times* article by reporter James Bennet . (“Year of intifada sees hardening on each side,” 2001). Meanwhile, Israelis tend to say the second intifada began on Sept. 27, 2000 when a soldier was killed in a Gaza bomb attack or on Sept. 29, 2000, when Palestinians rioted over Sharon’s visit and four were shot dead by Israeli police. The visit by Sharon, surrounded by hundreds of Israeli policemen and accompanied by a group of Israeli legislators, led to a stone-throwing clash between Palestinians and Israeli policemen. Violence and rioting later spread to East Jerusalem and the West Bank town of Ramallah. Palestinian leaders called his visit a deliberate provocation, while Sharon said he had a right to visit the site.

The second time period starts with March 28, 2002, starting with coverage of the Passover Massacre on March 27, 2002 and extends until April 12, 2002 which includes the Israeli’s army siege of the West Bank. Over this period, the *Times* published 67 articles, the *Monitor* had 18, and the *Post-Dispatch* ran six stories.

The Passover Massacre was the name given to a March 27, 2002 suicide bombing in Netanya, Israel. More than 200 Israelis had gathered at a hotel dining room for their Passover holiday meal when a Palestinian suicide bomber walked into the dining room and blew himself up, killing and wounding dozens of people. The Israeli military then

struck back and moved into Ramallah, where it imposed a siege with tanks and armored personnel. Soldiers also encircled Palestinian leader Yassir Arafat's compound and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, which held hundreds of Palestinians inside.

In terms of volume of coverage, the *Times* had the most articles to analyze over these time periods, sometimes several stories ran on one day. Articles were often quite lengthy with a variety of sources. Coverage was by several different reporters mostly from Jerusalem, but also other Israeli cities, too.

The *Monitor*, which does not publish papers on Saturday and Sunday unlike the other two publications, still had more stories on the Intifada during this time than the *Post-Dispatch*. Sometimes they also ran several stories on the conflict on a single day.

The *Post-Dispatch* had the least coverage and obtained all their stories from news wires, mostly from the Associated Press. It rarely ran more than one story a day on the event and sometimes had no stories about the Intifada for several days. Occasionally, it would try to localize events in the Middle East with a local story on the reaction of St. Louis-area Jews or Arabs.

The overall process involved reading each article carefully and assigning it one of the seven frames identified. Then a count of each of the frames used was done and this information was organized into three tables. Finally, a textual analysis of the stories and their frames was done, after each article was read carefully and notes were taken on the sources, tone and language used. The findings were interwoven with the knowledge gained from research on framing and peace journalism.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

A total of 149 articles were analyzed for this study. Of these, 59 covered the 2000 time period, while 90 were about the 2002 time period. *The New York Times* printed the most articles—37 over the 2000 period and 66 over the 2002 period. *The Christian Science Monitor* followed with 12 stories in the 2000 time period and 18 in 2002 one. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* had 10 articles in the 2000 period and just six in 2002.

All stories in the *Christian Science Monitor* were written by one of the paper's staff writers and some stories had more than one byline. The *Monitor* had several writers based in Israel, including Cameron W. Barr and Nicole Gaouette, and most carried Jerusalem, Gaza and various West Bank datelines. There were a few other writers, identified as "special to the *Christian Science Monitor*," who likely were correspondents. Other stories about the conflict that focused on diplomatic meetings or attempts at peace were written by other *Monitor* reporters or correspondents with Washington D.C., New York, Cairo or Paris datelines. There was one New York story that focused on American reactions to the violence in the Middle East. It focused on the Arab Jewish Peace Group and two friends in the group, an Israeli American and an American of Palestinian descent.

This finding was not surprising, since the *Christian Science Monitor*, despite its small size, is known for quality international news reporting by its own reporters. *Monitor* reporter Cameron Barr, who covered the Israeli-Palestinian conflict during the 2000 and 2002 time periods, was a Pulitzer finalist in 2003 for his Middle East coverage. John Hughes, a former *Monitor* editor and foreign correspondent, wrote a Feb. 7, 2007 column

in the *Monitor* stating his concerns out the declining number of foreign correspondents. He also connects international reporting with conflict resolution, saying, “A troubled world needs a steady flow of information about the challenges -- and how to resolve them.” (“US media can’t cover the news if they don’t cover the world, 2007)

The New York Times also used stories written mostly by its own writers—99 of its stories covering both time periods were by the paper’s staff writers, while four were by newswires. In 2000, it used an Associated Press story, dated Sept. 28, 2000, that broke the news about a clash between Israeli police officers and Palestinian stone throwers at the Temple Mount, directly following the visit of Ariel Sharon, who was then leader of Israel’s hard-line opposition. It also used an AP story about a United National Security Council resolution, condemning the excessive use of force against Palestinians during a period of unrest following Sharon’s visit.

In 2002, it used two Agence France-Presse wire stories—one was on Israeli soliders forcing reporters out of Ramallah and the other was about Israeli soldiers encircling the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, which held hundreds of Palestinians camped inside. In both cases, there was limited access into the West Bank for journalists at that point in the conflict.

However, for most of the coverage during the 2000 and 2002 time periods, the *Times* used its own core group of several writers, which included Joel Greenberg, Deborah Sontag, William A. Orme Jr. in 2000 and Serge Schmemann, Joel Brinkley and James Bennet in 2002. Datelines were primarily from Jerusalem and the West Bank, although there were also some from reporters in Paris and to cover diplomatic events.

All of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*'s stories were produced by news wires, primarily the Associated Press, and not their own writers. Most U.S. daily newspapers use international news from the news wires, with even some of the largest newspapers closing their international bureaus in recent years to cut costs and focus their resources on local news, including *The Boston Globe*, *The Dallas Morning News*, Long Island, N.Y.'s *Newsday*, and *The Baltimore Sun*.

A Jan. 24, 2007 *Boston Globe* article announcing the international bureau closure quoted Tom Rosenstiel, director of the Washington D.C.-based nonprofit, Project for Excellence in Journalism, as saying that readers no longer "have to rely on metro papers" for international news with *The New York Times* and other international newspapers easily accessible online and the papers are responding by cutting foreign coverage. ("Globe to close last three foreign bureaus", 2007)

DOMINANT FRAMES: 2000 TIME PERIOD

The dominant frame of the 2000 time period coverage was the "Israeli government's quest for security" frame, used a total of 18 times in the coverage by the three publications. The second dominant frame was the "episodic, simple conflict, rooted in single events" frame, which was used 17 times.

The frames used the least—only three times each during the 2000 time period—were more stereotypical, polar ones of both players, including one with "Palestinians as exotic terrorists victimizing Israelis" and the other of "Israelis as militarily strong bullies victimizing Palestinians."

THE NEW YORK TIMES COVERAGE: 2000 PERIOD

Out of 37 articles total during this time period, The *Times* used the “Israeli government’s request for security” frame 14 times and the episodic, simple conflict frame 10 times. The other five frames were used for articles, but much less frequently, only two to three times each.

The *Times* began its 2000 period coverage with a Sept. 28, 2000 story, using the episodic simple conflict frame, pitting Israeli police officers against Palestinian stone throwers at the Temple Mount, following a visit by Ariel Sharon, then-leader of the Likud hard-line opposition party. (“Palestinians and Israelis in a clash at holy site,” 2000) There are dramatic action-packed scenes, complete with Israeli police and soldier shooting rubber bullets at stone-throwing Palestinian rioters shouting “God is Great” in Arabic.

The Israeli government’s “quest for security” frame appears later in the *Times*’ coverage of the 2000 conflict time period, as the unrest and violence spreads and worsens to include the Hezbollah kidnapping of three Israeli soldiers. In their studies of framing the intifada, Cohen and Wolfsfeld (1993) found that Israelis tended to use the “law and order,” frame, while Palestinians often employed the “injustice” frame.

Israelis’ quest for security in dealing with the violent conflict is a key theme in the *Times* coverage. A *Times* article on Joseph’s Tomb compound in Nablus described the Jewish shrine as “a tiny island of Israeli sovereignty in a Palestinian-ruled area, (it) is a graveyard for the troops who reluctantly serve there and reportedly feel like ‘cannon

fodder.” (“A biblical patriarch’s tomb becomes a battleground,” 2000) Another *Times* article opens with the mother of a captured Israeli soldier repeatedly calling his cell phone and leaving “the same response: ‘Adi, come home.’” (“To many Israelis, a sad, familiar story,” 2000)

Other stories, using the Israelis’ “quest for security frame” include sources that point to the need for Israeli security, with some evoking the idea that the Palestinians want an end to the Jewish state and regard all Jews as enemies. A Oct. 11 *Times* article reads: “‘They’re not fighting for a state,’ said Morton A. Klein, national president of the Zionist Organization of America. “‘They’re fighting for an end to the Jewish state.’” (“Whose Holy Land? The Shock Waves,” 2000) Another *Times* article, running Oct. 10, quotes a Palestinian official as saying:

The (Israeli) settlers must now be a target by every Palestinian in order to stop their terrorism and they must be uprooted from our Palestinian occupied lands. (Whose Holy Land? The overview; Israelis extend deadline for Arafat to quell violence,” 2000)

Episodic framed stories in the *Times* follow the riots and other conflicts breaking out in the subsequent days, after Sharon’s visit, with more deaths tallied daily. Iyengar and Simon (1993) described episodic and thematic framing of conflict and how episodic frames viewed public issues in terms of specific events, honing in on a particular person or event which makes for good on-the-scene coverage and images. They also found exposure to episodic framing of the Gulf War increased public support for a military resolution.

An Oct. 1 *Times* story using the episodic frame states that the wave of Israeli-Palestinians fighting was “set off by the defiant visit on Thursday of a right-wing Israeli

leader, Ariel Sharon”. (“Mideast violence continues to rage, death toll rises,” 2000)

Instead of looking at the underlying economic and political tensions that likely also lead to the conflict, the unrest is pinned mainly on Sharon’s visit, a single event.

For example, the *Monitor* ran a Sept. 28 story that had a completely different focus, pointing to economic and political issues between Jewish and Arab Israelis and a U.S. State department report looking at discrimination against Israeli Arabs. “The report also comes at a time of increasing tension over the expropriation of Arab lands for highway constructions and the demolition of homes built without permits which Arabs say are almost impossible to get.” (“Citizens Arabs: The neglected residents of Israel,” 2000) This article fit into Iyengar and Simon (1993) description of thematic framing, which uses more general context and sources giving expert analysis.

The *Times* stories’ religious and historical background helps add some context, but also reinforces the idea that this is an endless feud between two opposing religious groups which cannot be resolved. The “feuding neighbor” frame, focusing on fanaticism and longtime grievances, is a popular frame in conflict reporting, according to Gamson (1991).

Several *Times* articles, using the episodic frame, remark on the never-ending cycle of violence. One Oct. 2 article reads:

It is a vicious—but familiar—cycle in which the sorrow roused by burials turned into the anger that fueled new rounds of violent confrontation between Palestinian youth and Israeli soldiers. (“Violence spreads to Israeli towns; Arab toll at 28,” 2000)

An Oct. 5 article calls the funeral for a Palestinian killed in the conflict “another example of what has often appeared to be a self-perpetuating cycle of bloodshed,

mourning and violent retribution.” (“Flash points in West Bank and Gaza ignite again,” 2000).

Many sources in the *Times* articles, which use either the episodic or “Israeli quest for security” frame, are official government sources, who often relay the death toll and rhetoric of each opposing side. One Oct. 2 *Times* article, using the episodic frame, reads: “‘Our people are ready to have 10 times the number of martyrs,’ said Rafik Natsheh, the Palestinian labor minister. (“Violence spreads to Israeli town, Arab toll at 28,” 2000) The same article reports that a senior Israeli official said the Israelis believed that the Palestinians wanted to exact vengeance—“a few Israeli soldiers dead to make it even”—before they cracked down on protestors. (*Ibid.*)

Other sources in *Times* articles, using the episodic frame, include people who witnessed violence, are the families of the conflict’s victims or are Israelis or Palestinians with extreme viewpoints or emotional statements. An Oct. 2 *Times* article actually describes the use of frames by the Israelis and Palestinians:

In Palestinian eyes—and those of many Israeli leftists—the present violent conflict is framed by “a devil and an angel,” said Mohammed Abu Hatem, a Gazan laborer and one of many who used the same words. As these people see it, the “devil” is Mr. Sharon and the angel is 12-year-old Muhammed al-Durrah, who was killed in the crossfire in Gaza while his father tried to save him. (“Violence spreads to Israeli towns; Arab toll at 28“, 2000)

Again, this is an example of using framing with an absolute good and evil side. The reporter failed to include in his story how these attitudes may affect the ability to achieve peace. Liebes (1992) talks about demonizing and depersonalizing the enemy in framing. It also fits into Iyengar and Simon (1993) description of episodic framing by its focus on a particular person or persons.

However, the *Times* does sometimes include sources and context that step outside the dominant frame and show the complexity of the conflict and the humanity of both sides. For example, an Oct. 3 *Times* story quotes Rifat Turk, an Arab-Israeli former soccer star, whose hometown is Jaffa, which lies just outside Tel Aviv, but who has family in the Gaza. He is quoted as saying:

And when we go out to demonstrate, we cannot be shot at like wild pigs. Even if you are a person who has spent your whole life trying to act in moderation...you discover at times like this that under your skin, with a power that surprises even you, a great rage resides. (“As Truce Fails, Fighting Rages in Middle East,” 2000)

Another Oct. 12 *Times* article about an Israeli soldier captured by Hezbollah at the Lebanese border talked about how the young man had earlier described the hilly border to his family as peaceful, quiet and beautiful. (“To many Israelis, a sad familiar story,” 2000)

The *Times* 2000 coverage of this time period also includes the use of two other frames that are more conducive to conflict resolution theories—the thematic, complex conflict frame and the “balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns and actors” frame. Liebes (1997) describes how viewing the conflict in alternative ways means a more complex frame, then the “us, them” viewpoint.

A excellent example of the balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns and actors frame is an Oct. 6 *Times* story that interviews two teenagers on either side of the conflict—a 17-year old stone-throwing Palestinian and a 19-year old Israeli soldier donning riot gear. In the article, the Palestinian says:

My father tells me, ‘This is not your role...don’t go down that road. We don’t need another generation of victims.’ But I just let him talk, I say,

O.K., O.K. and then I come here anyway. (Whose Holy Land? The combatants,” 2000)

The Israeli says:

Looking out there, at those Arab boys with their rocks and slingshots, I see a lot of anger and hate...I think I can understand. They think it's their country, their land. It's like us 50 years ago, Everybody's got a side, They throw stones. We shoot back. (Ibid.)

The story also gives some context, explaining how the Palestinian teen is one of 10 children living in a two room apartment at a refugee camp. He talks about how he's never seen the Israeli soldiers, who are off in the distance, “face to face.” The Israeli teen grew up on a kibbutz and wants to travel after the army. He says in the story that “he and his buddies were frustrated by television images that show them as the brutal aggressors.” (Ibid.) McGoldrick (2002) says that peace journalism humanizes all sides of the conflict and this particular story was an excellent example of a balanced article full of narrative detail that humanized each player in the conflict.

An Oct. 11 *Times* article used the thematic, complex conflict frame to describe how American journalist Ted Koppel had to mediate a special town meeting at the YMCA in East Jerusalem between Israelis and Palestinians. (“Whose Holy Land? The town meeting,” 2000) The story reported that Koppel said, “I surrender” at one point, as the two sides continued to argue. The article reads: “Jerry Springer himself could not have dreamed of a better audience warm-up, but the fights ahead—all verbal—were deep-seated and not contrived.”

The article included back-to-back quotes from each side including this exchange: “You cannot shoot our children and get away with it,” Ms. Ashrawi said. “You are to blame,” Mr. Sneh retorted, accusing the Palestinians of sending their children out into the

streets to be killed as well as exploiting the deaths in a move for international empathy.(Ibid.) The article's last quote was by a leftist Israeli lawmaker asking the squabbling audience for peace at the YMCA and the land, saying, "I think what is happening here is a microcosm of what's going on in the area. Trust has broken down terribly and horrifically."

The *Times* coverage of the 2000 period used mainly a mix of "Israeli government's request for security" and the episodic, simple conflict frames. The daily death toll and battles were reported, with religious and historical background provided as context to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Most of the sources were official government sources, witnesses to the violence, family members of the conflict's victims or Israelis or Palestinians with extreme viewpoints or emotional statements.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR COVERAGE: 2000 PERIOD

As expected, the *Monitor's* coverage differed greatly from the *Times*. Out of a total of 12 articles during the 2000 period coverage, the *Monitor* used the thematic, complex conflict frame for five stories. It used the "balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns" frame three times, the "injustice and Palestinians' quest for equality" frame three times and the "Israeli government's quest for law and order" frame one time. There were no stories that used the episodic, simple conflict frame. The thematic complex conflict frame works well with peace journalism techniques in providing rich context, a diversity of voices and humanizing both groups involved in the conflict.

An Oct. 2 *Monitor* article, using the thematic complex conflict frame, opens with: “Following several months of the most far-reaching peace talks in the history of their conflict, Israelis and Palestinians have again taken up the bullet and the stone.” (“Battle rages again over a holy city,” 2000) The *Monitor* includes the current death toll in the second paragraph, but mentions peace again in the next paragraph. The third paragraph also has more of an editorial, opinionated tone than I saw in the *Times*:

There is little doubt that this new wave of violence will present higher hurdles for Israeli and Palestinian peacemakers, although in the end it may remind both sides why they need to end their conflict.(Ibid.)

Again holding out optimism that the conflict will lead to a push for peace, an Oct. 4 *Monitor* story also uses the thematic complex frame for a story that discusses the possibility of peace negotiations: “The logic is that more bloodshed could make each side realize how much it needs a peace deal.” (“Latest Mideast clash: a prelude to peace?” 2000)

An Oct. 10 *Monitor* article, again using the thematic complex conflict frame, alludes to the complexity of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in its opening line:

Israeli troops may have fired the gun that killed Palestinian protester Marwan Sharmalak Friday here in the Gaza Strip, but his father blames the United States. (“Israeli crackdown unites Arabs,” 2000)

The story proceeds with the father channeling “his grief into a diatribe against America. The connection is simple; ‘The US is Israel’s big supporter and provides the Israelis with guns and all kinds of weapons.’” The article goes onto discuss how protestors from Morocco to Kuwait have demonstrated against Israel and the US against what is perceived as Israel’s use of excessive force.

The *Monitor* also uses alternative sources, like peace and policy experts, which differs from the *Time* and *Post-Dispatch*, who use more official government sources or witnesses of the conflict and violence. These sources also offer more analytical, balanced responses. In an Oct. 2 article, using the thematic complex conflict frame, Hanan Ashrawi, a former Palestinian peace negotiator and an unofficial Palestinian spokeswoman, says of Sharon's visit: "People see it for what it is. But it is aggravating a situation of conflict and potential violence. The last thing we need is provocative actions like this. Peace does not exist in a vacuum." ("Battle rages again over a holy city," 2000)

Quoted in the same article is Barry Rubin, the deputy director of the Begin-Sadat Institute for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv, who offers a different take on Sharon's visit. Rubin says Sharon "is posing as the protector of a united Jerusalem and the Temple Mount" but his visit may serve the cause of a peace deal, since Palestinians will see if they don't make peace with Barak, they will end up with a Israeli right-wing government that may be headed by Sharon. (Ibid.)

In an Oct. 4 article, using the thematic complex conflict frame, the possibility of peace following the current clashes is mentioned frequently by politicians, policy experts and university professors. Then-U.S. president Bill Clinton says, "[When] the smoke clears here, it might actually be a spur to both sides as a sober reminder to what the alternative to peace could be." ("Latest Mideast clash: a prelude to peace?," 2000) The article has a optimistic, hopeful tone and alludes to "precedents for bad turning to good in the Middle East," pointing to the 1993 Oslo interim peace agreement, which followed the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the first Gulf War. "There's a chance that something like that could happen again," says Thomas Smerling, the Washington director of the Israel Policy

Forum in the article. (Ibid.) The article also quotes Joel Singer, a former Israeli negotiator for the Oslo accord, and Jerome Segal, a University of Maryland professor and an expert on Jerusalem. While Singer is rather pessimistic about the likelihood of completing a peace agreement, Segal believes an agreement could be reached on Jerusalem. Arno and Dissanayake (1984) cite promotion of peace as one of four basic principles for an international code of media ethics.

Even when the *Monitor* uses official government sources, it also uses statements that talk about the possibility for peace and hold some optimism, instead of more negative accusations or threats. An Oct. 11 article, using the thematic complex conflict frame, quotes Nabeel Amro, a Palestinian Cabinet minister, as saying, “There is no possibility of any kind of war. We and the Israelis do not need this kind of confrontation.” (“Mideast: Back from the brink?” 2000) A couple of paragraphs later, the story quotes Shlomo Ben Ami, Israel’s acting foreign minister, as saying that Israeli forces would respond to violence with violence, but “we persist to look for avenues for peace...we don’t have any interest in tragedy. We want peace with the Palestinians, regional stability and a reasonable deal for everybody.” (Ibid.) Wolfsfeld (2001) says peace journalism may include counteracting misperceptions about the conflict and reporting on areas of cooperation between antagonists.

The *Monitor* also uses narrative techniques, which makes some of its stories feel more like in-depth features filled with detail and analysis that humanize both players in the conflict, rather than a hard news daily report on the breaking news of the day in the region. Although, both the *Times* and occasionally the *Post-Dispatch* also have some examples of this.

For example, an Oct. 10 *Monitor* story, using the thematic complex conflict frame, described a grieving Palestinian father “sitting on a plastic chair at a condolence pavilion overlooking the breezy Mediterranean,” who launches into a diatribe about why he blames the U.S. for his son’s death by Israeli gunfire. (“Israeli crackdown unites Arabs,” 2000) The details draw readers into the story, which talks about protests against Israeli and U.S. in the Arab world, concerning the perceived lack of excessive force by Israel.

That story was by *Monitor* staff writers Cameron Barr, nominated for a Pulitzer for his coverage, and his wife Nicole Gaouette—and the stories written by the two seem to be especially rich in narrative techniques. An Oct. 11 story by the couple again uses the thematic complex conflict frame and details that pull the reader into the scene of the story: “To judge from televised scenes of Israeli helicopters launching missiles and Palestinians resting on their funeral piers, one could be forgiven for thinking that the Middle East was at the brink of war.” (Mideast: Back from the brink?” 2000)

Another frame frequently used by the *Monitor* was the “balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns and actors” frame, which was the dominant frame for three stories during the 2000 coverage period. Many of these stories are full of narrative details to show the many layers of the sources and the roots of their beliefs. Yet they also weave in historical and political background to provide context. Often it was tough to decide whether to put a *Monitor* story in the balanced look frame or the thematic, complex conflict frame, since they shared similar elements, like a diversity of voices, rich context, humanization of both groups and included references to peace or conflict resolution. Both the thematic, complex conflict and balanced look frames seem to be the most conducive

to the promotion of peace and conflict resolution, when reporting a conflict like the intifada.

An Oct. 4 *Monitor* story, which uses the “balanced look” frame, opens with: “Since the peace process began in earnest in 1993, Rulia Assali has been willing to believe that Israel wants peace. But no more. ‘I’m seeing the lie that we’ve been living for seven years,’ says the Hebrew University dental student, her youthful face tight with bitterness and betrayal.” (“Israeli-Arabs: an enemy within,” 2000) The story goes on to talk about Israeli Arabs, who include Palestinians holding Israeli citizenship. It looks at Palestinians like Assali, who make claims of discrimination, land confiscation and inadequate public funding. But it also includes concerns from Israelis that the Arab citizens could turn out to be potential enemies within the country: “The loss of faith is mutual. Some Israelis are deeply disappointed in their Arab neighbors, particularly in their leadership,” seeing some as inciting the recent unrest. (Ibid.)

The article interviews a unique mix of Israelis and Palestinians sources—the Palestinian woman who is educated and attending a prominent Israeli university, an Arab-Israeli lawyer and a Haifa University lecturer. An Oct. 10 story, again using the “balanced look” frame, also draws in the reader with narrative details:

Clustered behind a three-story building on the outskirts of the West Bank city of Ramallah, the young men of Palestine take a moment to show a visitor what Israeli rubber-tipped bullets have done: One shows off a scab on this shoulder, another peels open the tape and gauze on his belly, a third unveils the bandages on his upper arm. One young man, his hair all curls on top and shorn to a crewcut on the back and sides, fingers two stones and his cord-and-plastic sling. He is not afraid of the Israelis around the corner, he is not afraid of bullets, he is not afraid of anything. “We are happy to face death,” he says, smiling and breathing heavily from the

exertions of his stone throwing. (“Dodging rocks and rubber bullets,” 2000)

The story then gives the reader the death toll in the conflict and paints a picture of the battle scene between Palestinians protestors and Israeli soldiers, on this road to Nablus. It also shows that the *Monitor* reporter attempts to talk to the Israelis, sitting nearby in jeeps: “They are well armed, well protected, and edgy. Three soldiers refuse to speak to a reporter.” But the reporter, *Monitor* staff writer Cameron Barr, goes on to say later in the story that:

Even though the Israelis are uncommunicative, the dynamics on their side of the conflict are easy to discern. They are an unpopular army in the midst of angry people. The soldiers are trying to protect themselves and their position and occasionally use deadly force to do so. (Ibid.)

That paints sort of a universal picture of the conflict and evokes images of many battles between angry residents and scared young occupying soldiers.

And the story goes full circle with the Palestinians also, reporting how Fatah distributed a leaflet encouraging the uprising to continue and instructing stores and schools to close in early afternoon. The last sentence of the story notes: “That will leave lots of young men and boys with nothing to do but pick up stones.” This again alludes to a sort of universal situation—how conflict can result from leaders urging on their followers and becomes more prevalent when young men, often lacking jobs, hope, and fear, look for action and a way to express their anger and frustration. (Ibid.)

The other frames used by the *Monitor* articles include three incidences of the injustice and Palestinians’ “quest for equality” frame and one case of the “Israeli government’s quest for law and order” frame.

One article, using the “Palestinians’ quest for equality” frame, looks at Israeli Arab bias and opens with a narrative, detail-filled first sentence:

Compared with some of its neighbors, this dusty city is decidedly down at the heel. Tired-looking palm trees line pocked, litter-strewn roads. This view makes sense, given Taibe’s dubious claim to fame as the first Israeli municipality to claim bankruptcy. (“Citizen Arabs: the neglected residents of Israel,” 2000)

The story also uses data to support the bias claim, pointing to a U.S. State Department report on Israeli-Arab discrimination and information from the Israeli Interior Ministry, which shows Arab communities getting less financial support. Still this article, which was run during the riots between Israelis and Palestinians following Sharon’s visit to the Temple Mount, concluded with an Israeli-Arab lawyer Nidal Sliwan talking about the opportunity for peace:

Palestinians living in Israel are familiar with the Israeli mentality, and we know how Palestinians think. Using us will increase confidence between both sides, and finding people both sides trust is very important. We must be used as a bridge between these two peoples, as a bridge for peace. (Ibid.)

Another Oct. 3 story using the “Palestinians’ quest for equality frame” looked at Arab resentments at accepting US-back compromises, weaving diverse voices with historical context on past peace negotiations. (“Peace that left a public behind,” 2000) It reads:

Standing in the midst of a tumultuous Gaza City demonstration, a Palestinian psychiatrist and human right activist named Eyad Serraj speaks loudly into his cell phone to make himself heard. ‘The people are very frustrated and very angry,’ he says, ‘because of disillusionment with the peace process first of all, and the Sharon visit, and the cold-blooded killing of innocent people, especially young people. (Ibid.)

The article includes the number of dead—but also who they include, a toddler in a car and a 12-year-old boy whose death was broadcast worldwide. Again the *Monitor* article

touches on the underlying economic and political reasons for the conflict, beyond just the religious and ethnic differences. It also talks to academics and policy makers who suggest improvements that may stop the violence and improve life for both Palestinians and Israelis. The article reads:

The peace process has been frustrating in economic terms as well. Although things have begun to improve recently, most Palestinians' ability to make a living wage has declined during the 1990s, mainly as a result of Israeli security measures. (Ibid.)

The story using the “Israeli government’s quest for law and order” frame looked at Israel’s cautious approach to peace. (“Israeli ambitions for peace more modest now,” 2000) But the overall tone and content was similar to other *Monitor* coverage in its use of alternative sources and underlying optimism and hope for peace. It quotes Efraim Inbar, director of the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv, as saying it is “depressing” that the military recently deployed troops to potentially protect Jews living in the north of Israel from their Israeli Arab neighbors. It also quotes Avraham Tamir, a retired general in the Israeli Defence Forces and longtime advocate of exchanging land for peace, who holds out hope for a resolution. He concludes the article by saying, “I don’t think [the Palestinians] will decide to stop the peace process, to declare a war, to declare a Palestinian state, to turn all the plates upside down.” (Ibid.)

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH: 2000 PERIOD

As anticipated, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*’s coverage tends to be sparse, with fewer and shorter stories focused more on the action and death toll of the day. It only used two frames for its 10 total stories that ran over the 2000 time period examined—seven of

those used the “episodic, simple conflict rooted in single events” frame and three stories used the “Israeli government’s quest for law and order, security” frame.

It began its coverage with a Sept. 29 story, using the episodic simple conflict frame, that read “Sharon’s presence on the mount sparked a spasm of violence and furious words. Pushing, fistfights, and screaming escalated during the visit.” (“Israeli hawk Sharon incites riots with visit to mount area claimed by Muslims and Jews,” 2000) It was straightforward, detailing that 200-to-300 Arabs threw stones at about 1,000 Israeli riot police, and used graphic, action-packed language.

It used few sources—just a quote from Sharon saying that he came in peace and any Jew can visit the Temple Mount and a sentence that read: “Arabs at the site chanted, “Murderer, get out!” as Sharon arrived and departed the mount. The only real context provided is about Sharon’s past actions as defense minister, which some Palestinians view as leading to a massacre of Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. It also gives some background about the Temple Mount, noting “the competing religious and ethnic claims to the site lie at the heart of the impasse in peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians, both of whom insist on sovereignty there.” (Ibid.)

A Sept. 30 article gives the growing death toll in the headline and uses several official government sources like U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, an Israeli police spokesman, a Palestinian minister and Sharon. (“Israeli police kill 4 Palestinians, wound 175 as they storm shrine,” 2000) It also quotes Ahmed Afani, a Palestinian whose brother died in the riots, but it has a rather stereotypical tone:

“I don’t know if I am sad or happy, because my brother gave his blood for Al Aqsa (the main Jerusalem mosque), and this is an honor for the

family,” Ahmed Afani said after thousands attended his brother’s funeral. (Ibid.)

Again, the conflict is linked to religious issues in the story, which reads: “The Palestinian Authority accused Israel of igniting a “religious war,” and it called for a general strike and a day of mourning today in Palestinian areas. (Ibid.)

Other articles detailed riots, urban battles and other violence:

The Palestinian lands, though, remained the epicenter of violence, with a shifting battlefield that hopscotched from north to south and back again. In the West Bank and Gaza, Israeli soldiers fought dozens of running battles—many with live ammunition—with Palestinian youths wielding firebombs and stones. (“Palestinians, Israelis agree to cease-fire, officer says: Albright will meet in Paris with Barak, Arafat,” 2000)

So although, the article is essentially about a cease-fire and meeting between Israel and Palestine, the focus of the story is on the action and drama of the conflict. This was expected, since drama and conflict easily capture the public’s attention. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* also appears to have less space for more in-depth coverage of the conflict and none of its own international staff to write alternative reports.

The article does provide some rich detail of the scene:

Evidence of the conflict could be seen everywhere. Jagged rocks, spent shells, and broken glass littered roadways. Black smoke from piles of burning tires mixed with a white haze of acrid tear gas. The wail of Quranic verses from mosque loudspeakers mingled with the crackle of gunfire. (Ibid.)

But it doesn’t really give the reader a deeper understanding of why the conflict broke out nor does it seek possible solutions. The scene painted is also more focused on the violence and destruction and not very positive or optimistic as far as opportunities for peace are concerned.

An Oct. 5 article covering the peace talks in Paris also used the episodic, simple conflict frame and left little hope for peace, as Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinians leader Yasser Arafat blamed each other:

A senior Israeli said Barak was heading home and saw no point in further talks...at one point Wednesday, Arafat stormed out of the talks and was on the verge of driving out of the U.S. Embassy compound, declaring, "This is humiliation; I cannot accept it!" ("Arafat, Barak end talks with a few concessions," 2000)

The story seems to focus on the disagreements and dramatic refusals to negotiate by the two sides.

An Oct. 11 article, again using the episodic, simple conflict frame, quotes U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan as appealing to Israelis and Palestinians to stop fighting and resume negotiations, but it details more violence and blaming of the other party. It reads: "It was clear, though, that Israel and Palestinians were still at loggerheads over who was responsible for the violence." ("Diplomacy intensifies to resume talks in Middle East; U.N. chief, Clinton intercede as violence abates some," 2000) It recounts the seemingly senseless cycle of violence, which almost seems to numb the reader and leave little hope for a resolution.

Other *Post-Dispatch* stories use the "Israeli government's quest for security" frame, including an Oct. 3 story on the deployment of Israeli tanks and helicopters to the West Bank and Gaza Strip, "leaving scarcely a Palestinian town or village untouched." ("Israelis deploy tanks, copters in West Bank, Gaza Strip; at least 51 people have died in 5 days of fighting," 2000)

An Oct. 7 story, using the "Israeli quest for security" frame, follows the drama of the worsening of fighting: "Nine Palestinians are killed as another cease-fire attempt

collapses, Israeli Prime Minister Barak talks of war, and rioting youths chant ‘Slaughter the Jews!’” (“Fighting Worsens in Jerusalem, West Bank and Gaza Strip,” 2000) It notes that Barak spoke of war, Palestinian youth “stormed” an Israeli police station, while chanting, “With our blood and souls, we will redeem you, Al-Aqsa!” the article evokes religious conflict by stating: “The holy city’s ancient stone walls and cobbled alleys echoed with Israeli police gunfire again Friday.” (Ibid.)

DOMINANT FRAMES: 2002 TIME PERIOD

The dominant frame in all of the 2002 time period coverage was the “Israelis as militarily strong bullies” victimizing Palestinians, used a total of 26 times in the coverage by the three publications. The second dominant frame was the “episodic, simple conflict, rooted in single events frame,” which was used 19 times. The “Israeli government’s quest for law and order, security” frame was also used frequently—on 18 occasions.

The frame used the least—only two times during the 2002 time period—was the one portraying Palestinians as exotic terrorists victimizing Israelis. That was surprising, since this time period was less than a year after the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on New York City’s World Trade Center by Arab terrorists. The hypothesis was that there might be more stereotypes of Arabs, described as exotic, religious fanatics used both in the 2000 and 2002 coverage periods. In fact, Moody-Hall (2002) examined several mainstream British and U.S. newspapers before and after the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and found both countries were more likely to frame Arabs negatively than Israelis using negative adjectives, like militant and radical, to describe Arabs.

That was not found in this study. Instead the frame portraying Palestinians as exotic terrorists victimizing Israelis was rarely the dominant one used, both before and after the Sept. 11, 2001 attack. A possible explanation for this is that Moody-Hall used many stories that described events in which Arabs attacked Israelis, rather than vice versa, while this study simply looked at all the articles in a certain time period. The different publications used by Moody-Hall and this study may also have contributed to the different findings.

However, during the 2002 coverage period, as the violence, killing and destruction intensified, there was more of an overall portrayal in all three newspapers of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a never-ending cycle of hate, violence and vengeance with little hope for resolution. As expected, religious and ethnic roots to the conflict still seemed to be accentuated and dramatized more than economic and political issues.

THE NEW YORK TIMES COVERAGE: 2002 PERIOD

The *New York Times* used the “Israelis as militarily strong bullies victimizing Palestinians” frame 18 times. This was interesting since it was one of the least used frames in 2000. I also thought since the coverage followed the 9-11 terrorist attacks, there might be more support for Israelis’ using military force against the Palestinians.

An possible explanation for this may be that the conflict was an outside one, as opposed to an internal one on American soil, so U.S. newspapers reported differently on it. As Liebes’ (1992) research has found, journalists often cover an internal conflict differently and more sympathetically than an internal one.

Another factor may have been the Israeli military's media access restrictions and treatment of the international press, who even accused the Israeli military of shooting journalists. This made it easy to dislike the Israeli military and portray them as bullies, while the Palestinians had the advantage of being able to promote their stories and curry more sympathy from the media. Wolfsfeld (1993) found that this happened points during the first intifada in the 1980s, where the international media adopted a "David and Goliath" frame, with the stone-throwing Palestinians as the brave David and the military-strong Israelis as the bullying giant.

The other main frames used by the *Times* during the 2002 coverage period were the "Israeli government's quest for law and order, security" and "episodic, simple conflict rooted in single events" frames. Both were used frequently in the *Times*—17 times each. Initially, the media seemed to use the "Israeli government's quest for law and order" frame with stories that were more sympathetic to the Israelis, who were hit with a series of Palestinian suicide bombings that killed and maimed innocent civilians. But as the conflict became more of a battlefield in the Palestinian territories, with Israeli soldiers in tanks destroying homes and arresting residents, the frame most used was the "Israelis as bullies" frame and the suffering of Palestinian civilians was highlighted more often.

The *Times* started its 2002 coverage of this period with a Mar. 28 story, using an episodic, simple conflict frame, of a suicide bomber blowing himself in a crowded Israeli hotel on the Passover holiday. The event was dubbed the "Passover massacre" by an Israeli spokesman. ("Mideast Turmoil: Bomb kills at least 19 in Israel as Arabs meet over peace plan", 2002) As the 2000 coverage period began with an event that sparked anger and violence, specifically Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount, the 2002 period also

begins with a single action that intensifies the conflict. The story included the number of dead and wounded in the first sentence, noting that many of the victims were children. It also says that the attack came as Arab leaders met in Lebanon to discuss Saudi Arabia's plan for peace in the region, noting "the attack was timed to deal a blow in the peace initiatives."

The article described the violent scene in detail, saying "body parts and pieces of furniture were scattered across the room and across the driveway 50 yards away from the blast." (Ibid.) And it alludes to how the cycle of violence and actions of one person can derail peace plans even when they are moving forward, quoting Raana Gissin, a spokesman for then-Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, saying, "the attack will cause us to re-evaluate our entire policy."

Many of the stories that followed used the "Israeli government's quest for law and order, security" frame, including a Mar. 29 story about the Israeli government isolating Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat in his Ramallah headquarters and launching operation in the Palestinian territories. ("Mideast Turmoil: The fighting," 2002) The tone is very much a defensive one for Israel, as the article notes recent terror attacks and quotes Sharon as saying "Israel had extended its hand in peace, but all we get back in response is terrorism, terrorism and more terrorism."

In the article, strong language is used by the Israelis to describe the Palestinians, with the Israeli government calling Arafat an "enemy" and Ramallah "the capital of terror." A Palestinian government official calls Israeli actions "a declaration of war," while a senior Israeli official called the Passover bombing "a declaration of war against Israel." (Ibid.) The adversarial tone and sources used in this story tend to emphasize the conflict between

the groups and makes winning and losing the main concern, which supports Valkenburg, Semetko and De Vreese (1999) findings on how conflict frames are used.

At this point, the talks about a peace agreement in Lebanon seem rather pointless, as both sides position themselves for a fight. In fact, later in the article, Sharon reacts negatively to the peace plan, saying, “A return to the 1967 borders will destroy Israel..the entire world is talking about the Saudi plan; everyone enthusiastically recommends endorsing it, and the only one that no one asks is Israel. No one!” (Ibid.)

As Israeli tanks and bulldozers rumble through Ramallah, more stories began to use an “Israelis as bullies” frame. For example, a March 30 story using this bully frame uses language in the first sentence to suggest aggression by Israel:

Israeli ground forces stormed Yasir Arafat’s compound in the West Bank city of Ramallah today, smashing through walls and battline from room to room as the Bush administration’s campaign for a truce staggered beneath a wave of anger and violence. (“Mideast Turmoil: Israelis besiege a defiant Arafat in his office,” 2002)

The story quotes an American living in Ramallah who describes Israeli forces shooting machine guns at Arafat’s compound with Palestinians not shooting back: “There’s no resistance here whatsoever.” Any prospects for peace seem to have unraveled with a former U.S. ambassador to Israel quoted as saying, “This is the rock bottom of the Oslo process.”

As the Israeli military’s siege on Ramallah intensifies, with electricity cut off and buildings destroyed, articles continue to use the “Israeli as bullies” frame and describe the suffering of ordinary Palestinian residents. An April 5 *Times* article says the town “which has been under the sway of Israeli tanks and guns for a week” is running out of water,

lacks electricity in a third of its neighborhoods and nearly every car parked on the street when “the Israelis punched into Ramallah early last Friday has been run over by a tank and flattened.” (“Mideast Turmoil: Under siege, without power and water,” 2002) It details how a Palestinian obstetrician directed a baby’s delivery by phone and a woman collected rain water off her roof and strained it through her pantyhose. One woman said she was afraid to go to the store, even if the curfew was lifted, because she saw a 14-year-old neighbor shot.

Wolfsfeld (1993) points to a similar situation during the first Intifada in the 1980s, where the weaker party, the Palestinians, successfully promoted its frames to the media, including a David and Goliath metaphor with the Israelis as the menacing, strong Goliath. The Israelis found it nearly impossible to promote its “law and order” frame to the international media during that time and it found that to be the case again in 2002, as heavily armed Israeli forces moved into Ramallah.

The article also indicates that access for journalists has been severely inhibited by the Israeli government:

The limitations the Israelis have imposed on foreign journalists make it difficult to assess the situation. The army has declared Ramallah a closed military zone, meaning journalists are banned, and government media officials have warned that those caught here could have their government press cards revoked. (“Mideast Turmoil: Under siege, without power and water,” 2002)

It notes that journalists are increasingly confined to their hotels and reporting by phone. The restrictive situation also seems to silence Israelis from having much of a voice in these stories. The soldiers aren’t talking and outside Israelis are not in Ramallah, so the only voice is that of official Israeli government sources.

Wolfsfeld (1993) examined framing of the first Israeli intifada in the 1980s and the Gulf War and found the role of the media is often tied to the government's control over access. Israel wasn't able to seal off areas of conflict well then, but it seemed to be able to do it better in 2002 and have more control of the media and its movement. He said Israeli army officials have alleged that the media's presence had a clear and direct effect on the level of violence, particularly in escalating Palestinian protests.

An interesting way that the *Times* dealt with limited access to Israeli sources in Ramallah was by doing a story, using the Israeli quest for security frame, featured several Israelis, interviewed in Tel Aviv, speaking their mind on the country's military offensive. ("Mideast Turmoil: Voices; 6 Israelis mix confusion, fear and determination, 2002) It stated: "Stunned by suicide bombings that killed and wounded scores of people, emptied cafes and theaters and thinned out crowds on city streets, many Israelis say the military action is a justified last resort in the face of a deadly threat to daily life."

There may have been international displeasure with Israel's military action against the Palestinians, but the everyday Israelis interviewed on the street in Tel Aviv said force was needed to stop the violence and they weren't convinced the Palestinians wanted to make peace. "We're fed up. We have to hit back hard to send the message that enough is enough," said Tal Uzen, a 40-year-old Israeli contractor. (Ibid.) Liebes (1992) talks about how journalists cover an internal conflict differently than an external one—specifically in "our" war, the suffering inflicted on the enemy may be sanitized and "our side" may be personalized, with "the other side" demonized. She also found that as a conflict escalates, the enemy may become more depersonalized.

However, the descriptions used in the stories with the Israelis as military strong bullies frame paint a picture of mostly fearful Palestinian residents beside heavily armed Israeli forces occupying the town, indiscriminately shooting people and destroying property. For example, the April 5 *Times* story details the Ramallah utility system's destruction and how Palestinian crews trying to fix a water pumping system were harrassed, then arrested by Israeli troops. It also reports how dozens of Palestinians are crowded into one apartment so the army can use the rest of the building and how hospital workers were "arrested, blindfolded and handcuffed, after Israeli soldiers entered the building." ("Mideast Turmoil: Under siege, without power and water," 2002)

But the *Times* 2002 coverage of the period also include the use of some other frames that fit better with conflict resolution theories. There were four stories that used the "balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns" frame and three stories using the thematic, complex conflict frame.

Again, one of the best examples of a *Times* story using a "balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns" frame looks at two teenagers side-by-side—this time a young female Palestinian suicide bomber and one of her victims, an Israeli teenage girl.

The suicide bomber and her victim look strikingly similar. Two high school seniors with flowing black hair, the teenage girls walked next to each other up to the entrance of a Jerusalem supermarket last Friday. Ayat al-Akhas, 18, from the Dheisheh refugee camp near Bethlehem, was carrying a bomb. Rachel Levy, 17, from a neighborhood nearby, was carrying her mother's shopping list for a Sabbath eve dinner. The vastly different trajectories of their lives intersected for one deadly moment, mirroring the intimate conflict of their two people. At the door of the supermarket, Ms. Akhras detonated the explosives, killing Ms. Levy and a security guard, along with herself. ("Mideast turmoil: The dead; two girls, divided by war, joined in carnage," 2002)

The story goes on to detail the Palestinian teen's life as the seventh of 11 children of a refugee family, who was a top student bound for college, engaged to be married and helped her family out around the house. The Israeli teen, the second of three children, loved photography, exercising and had spent the first nine years of her life in California. This detail humanizes and personalizes both the bomber and victim and both sides of the conflict—and also drives home the tragedy and senselessness of its ongoing hatred and violence. Lynch and McGoldrick (2002) state that a peace journalist should seek the similarities between the two players in a conflict and humanize both sides.

Another example of a *Times* story using a balanced frame is a March 31 article looking at the father of the Palestinian teenage girl, who committed the suicide attack that killed her Israeli peer. He is devastated by the event and shocked at his daughter's actions, saying he "has worked with and befriended many Jews." ("Mideast turmoil: The terrorist; Daughter concealed angry soul of a martyr," 2002) Often, suicide attackers families are portrayed as supportive and proud of their relative's deadly action. But the Palestinian father, a foreman at construction sites in a Jewish settlement, said:

Politics is one thing, and work is something else. We work together, eat together, live together, like family. I love them like my children, and they love me like an older brother. I'm concerned for them like my own son. I taught my children to love other. We hope for life. (Ibid.)

Many of the stories using the thematic frame detail the political context behind the conflict. For example a March 30 *Times* story, using the thematic frame, talks about Arafat's influence on terror attacks, noting that "with the onset of the current violence, Mr. Arafat opened the jails and released many of the terror suspects who had been rounded up." ("Mideast turmoil: The factions; in the Arabs' struggle against Israel, there

are many players,” 2002) It gives background and the history of Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Al Aksa Martyrs Brigades and other Palestinian groups and details their ties and financing.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR COVERAGE: 2002 PERIOD

The *Monitor*'s coverage was again very different than the *Times*, but it also used different frames in the 2002 coverage period than it did in the 2000 period. Specifically, the *Monitor* most frequently used the “Israelis as militarily strong bullies” frame six times, the most of any frame, except the thematic frame, which was also used six times. It did not use the “Israelis as bullies” frame even once in the 2000 period. It also used the “balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns” frame five times.

The *Monitor* begins its coverage with a story, using the thematic frame, on the suicide attack on the Passover and its result, which is a unraveling of a chance toward peace. The article begins:

As the Arab states extended an unprecedented offer of peace to Israel and as a US envoy stayed in place to mediate between Israelis and Palestinians, the Middle East yesterday braced itself for more war. “It’s all so depressing I can’t really think about it,” said a Western diplomat who spoke on the condition of anonymity. “Regardless of who is to blame for what, there was an opportunity here which is in the process of being missed.” (“Historic chance for peace recedes,” 2002)

Even the *Monitor* seems to have lost its optimistic tone, as the story details Israeli officials comments on the need for security against terror and hints at a massive invasion of Palestinian areas. The alternative sources used in the article also fear more war: “We

will see more devastation, more blood, more suffering, it's going nowhere,' said Khalil Shikaki, a US-educated political scientist, from his Ramallah office." (Ibid.)

But an April 2 *Monitor* story, also using a thematic frame, has a markedly optimistic tone and takes a unique look at a former Israeli commando's path to becoming an advocate for peace. ("One former warrior's roadmap to peace," 2002) It opens: "If the Israeli-Palestinian conflict pushes you to despair, if you think there may be no way out, spend an hour with Ami Ayalon." The story is a balanced look at Ayalon, who is convinced that an agreement is possible with a state of Israel and a state of Palestine, each with its capital in Jerusalem, although he has his critics. It also alludes to the complexities of resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict:

Unlike (Prime Minister Ariel) Sharon and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, both members of Israel's founding generation, Ayalon does not speak about an agreement with the Palestinians as the Holy Grail of Israeli political life. He sees it as an obstacle that prevents people from debating some of the issues that threaten Israel's cohesion: the evolution of Israeli democracy, the divisions between religious and secular Jews, the place of Palestinians with Israeli citizenship in the society. (Ibid.)

The *Monitor*'s stories using an "Israelis as bullies" frame appear more frequently towards the end of the 2002 coverage period, as the Israeli siege of Ramallah intensified.

An April 5 *Monitor* story, using the "Israelis as bullies" frame, says:

For Israeli army officials, the preliminary numbers spell success: 1,100 Palestinians arrested; 50 rocket-propelled grenades, seven explosive devices, and 173 pistols captured as of Wednesday evening, according to an army announcement released yesterday. ("Pressure mounts for Sharon to arrive at endgame," 2002)

It takes these statistics, put out in an Israeli army announcement, and questions Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's goal in Israel's "largest campaign in a generation."

The story is also sharply critical of Sharon, noting his track record in Lebanon in 1982 “when, as defense minister, he promised a brief, limited antiterrorism campaign and instead took the army all the way to Beirut in a failed bid to smash the PLS and install a pro-Israeli regime there.” (Ibid.) Reuven Pedhatur, a political scientist at Tel Aviv University, is quoted in the story as saying: “The government is saying we killed so and so, but there seems to be no plan and no goal. The worst thing a government can do is to go to war without a goal.”

Other *Monitor* stories, using the “Israelis as bullies” frame, also use language, details and sources to back up this aggressive, bullying frame. An April 11 story describes an Israeli soldier “devouring a hot dog” while taking a break from conducting house-to-house searches in a Palestinian refugee camp, then “he climbed into his armored personnel carrier, revved the engine, and, with a wave, rumbled back into Jenin.” (“Amid rising casualties, Israel digs in,” 2002) In an April 12 *Monitor* story, a Palestinian refugee woman cries and says Israeli soldiers destroyed the house, killed children and boys, plus there was no water and airplanes bombed day and night. (“Amid Israeli attack, tales of abuse,” 2002) In the story, *Monitor* reporter Cameron Barr notes the issues access are playing in reporting the conflict, saying:

There is no way to corroborate the accounts now emerging from the Jenin refugee camp, in part because Israel continues to bar foreign journalists from the area, as well as from many other parts of the West Bank. Yesterday, scores of reporters and television crews sought entry to Jenin, only to be turned away at Israeli checkpoints ringing the area. (Ibid.)

One story using the “Israelis as bullies” frame also includes an April 2 story on the Israelis “image management” campaign, which involves limiting journalists’ access to Ramallah. Even some Israeli journalists deplored Israel’s restrictions, with *Ha’aretz*

columnist Aviv Lavie saying, “When a city is occupied, horrible things happen. The Israeli and world media need to be there in order to document what is going on.” (“Israel launches ‘image management’ campaign,” 2002) It notes that two journalists were shot in Ramallah with more than 40 journalists casualties reported since the start of the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation in September 2000, most of them attributed to Israeli fire. However the story also said journalists have faced interference and intimidation from the Palestinian Authority also. Again, the Israeli military’s treatment of the press may have lead to coverage by journalists that was framed more critically towards Israel and portrayed them as aggressive bullies more often than in the 2000 period, especially if their fellow journalists were getting shot by Israeli soldiers.

An April 9 story, using the “Israelis as bullies” frames, talks about plans for a United Nations fact finding mission “amid mounting charges by human right groups of abuses by Israeli troops.” (“UN warns of West Bank ‘horror’,” 2002) It talks about a lack of food and medicine for the 300,000 Palestinians under the Israeli army occupation and arrests. It does says after “a series of devastating suicide bombings,” Israeli government officials have said they aim to attack the terrorist infrastructure and Palestinian fighters deliberately operate from large population centers, putting lots of civilians in the crossfire. The Israelis also says human right groups are being manipulated by the Palestinians and it is trying to facilitate humanitarian assistance. But most sources are Palestinians and United Nation workers describing “a situation of ‘pure horror’ in northern West Bank camps, with strafing from Israeli helicopters, corpses piling up and ambulances and food trucks being barred by the army.” (Ibid.) Again, access may have

been an issue here, as this reporter wrote this story from Jerusalem, not the scene of the action in Ramallah.

Another April 9 *Monitor* story, was reported from inside the West Bank by reporter Cameron Barr and used the balanced frame to look at the perspectives of both side. (“Two sides, two stories, one church,” 2002) It focuses on the armed standoff at Bethelehem’s Church of the Nativity:

Each side’s understanding of the standoff also reflects the larger ways in which Israelis and Palestinians refuse to consider the validity of each other’s claims to the land that is at the heart of the conflict. In the Israeli version, to use the words of Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, Palestinian ‘murderers...have comandeered the church and are holding the clergyman hostage.’ In the Palestinian version, fighters, clergy, and civilians are defending themselves and their church from an Israeli invasion. (Ibid.)

The story recounts the death toll on both sides and the Israeli argument that it is going after the infrastructure of terrorists to keep its citizens safe, versus the Palestinian claims that the Israeli army wants to destroy the Palestinian Authority and reassert its control over the Palestinian territories.

An April 1 *Monitor* story uses a more personalized, balanced frame to look at why some Palestinian teens want to become martyrs, following the suicide bomb attack by a teenage Palestian girl. It is full of narrative details, describing the home of a middle-class Palestinian family “with its flowered settees and polished stone tables” and the teenage girl living there with “a delicate gold chain hanging over the collar of her beige turtleneck.” (“Why a Palestinian girl now wants to be a suicide bomber,” 2002) The details bring to life the surroundings and people for the reader, making them seem familiar and normal, as opposed to exotic, fanatical and strange.

But surprisingly even Palestinian teens with middle class lives appear to want to be suicide bombers and have deep anger towards Israelis. The teenage girl said the martyr's act is "sensational, it's awesome, it make me think anyone would love to be in her place." (Ibid.) The girl's sister, who was a good friend of the suicide bomber, said "carrying out a suicide operation has long been a topic of discussion among her friends." She explains that the acts are considered revenge for Palestinians killed by Israelis, a painful attack on Israeli to end the occupation and a statement that Israel's security can't be gained at the expense of Palestinian children in refugee camps. But a balance of perspectives is present with the final comments in the story by the suicide bomber's fiancée, who does not approve of her actions and said, "I hope God forgives her for what she has done." (Ibid.)

An April 2 story, using the balanced frame, takes an in-depth look at both Israelis and Palestinians and how they are coping with the conflict using a series of vignettes from each side. "Three vignettes from each side illustrate life for civilians in this strange wartime, where going out to buy milk is not worth the risk and where a thick coat is an object of fear." ("Mideast: Every day life under fire," 2002) It looks at Palestinians living in Ramallah who are worried about having enough essentials in the siege and how family members are faring and Israelis who are afraid to go out to public places for fear of suicide bombers. It humanized both sides and portrays a mix of people's concerns in their words.

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH: 2002 PERIOD

As anticipated, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch's* coverage is surprisingly even lighter than in 2000—with only six stories during the entire 2002 coverage period. The *Monitor* has three times the amount of stories, while the *Times* has six times the coverage.

However, the *Post Dispatch's* use of frames was much more varied in 2002, than in 2000. It only used two frames for its 10 total stories during the 2000 time period and seven of those used the “episodic, simple conflict rooted in single events” frame and three stories used the “Israeli government’s quest for law and order, security” frame. In 2002, two of its stories used the “Israelis as militarily strong bullies” frame, but its other stories used four different frames: the “Israeli government’s quest for law and order”; “balanced look,” episodic and thematic frames were each used one time.

The *Post-Dispatch's* first story, which ran March 29, used the thematic frame and was an optimistic look at a proposed peace plan by the Arab world, offering Israel normal relations if it agrees to withdraw from war-won land and a Palestinian state. (“Arabs offer normal ties with Israel,” 2002) It involves comments from many government sources and provides deeper context on the Israeli-Palestinians ties to the region and the Arab League’s history with Israel. It alludes to the possibility of peace, saying in the last line “after a chaotic and divisive opening day, Arab leaders played up shows of unity Thursday.”

A March 30 *Post-Dispatch* story, using the “Israelis as bullies” frame, is dramatically different in its tone and language, as Israelis move to confine Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat in his compound. (“Israelis confine Arafat in compound,” 2002) The story’s first

line is full of action and includes the death toll: “Tanks smashed through the walls and soldier search room to room. Five Palestinians and two Israeli soldiers were killed in the operation, described as the first stage of a larger assault against militants.”

Sources on both sides used in the story used dramatic, fighting words. For example, Arafat is quoted as saying, “They want me under arrest or in exile or dead, but I am telling them, ‘I prefer to be martyred. May God make us martyrs.’” (Ibid.) Meanwhile, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said the offensive would last “weeks” and “know no borders.” The story even says that the two sides “appeared to be girding for all-out conflict,” despite the recent peace proposal. Again, the drama of the conflict appears to be played up with allusions to the idea that this is an age-old disagreement that can’t be resolved. Karlsberg (1997) says that this passion may capture the public’s attention, but can also cause a negative reaction.

An April 6 story, using the “Israelis as bullies” frame, negatively highlights Israeli troops interactions with journalists. (“Israeli troops use force against journalists,” 2002) It describes how an Israeli jeep without warning “rammed a CNN vehicle twice, and soldiers threw several stun grenades at the journalists. When the convoy backed up and tried to leave, the soldiers fired at least three bullets-possibly plastic-at CNN’s armored car, chipping its reinforced glass windows.” This article was only a brief, with Israeli army officials saying the journalists were in a closed military zone. But it also recounted another incident where journalists were fired on by Israeli troops, injuring a French television cameraman. The journalists’ stories of the Israeli aggression towards them, which sometimes included photos and taped footage of the bad behavior, adds more

weight to Palestinians' allegations of abuse, which makes the Israeli soldiers look even more like bullies.

There was also an excellent April 14 *Post-Dispatch* story, using the balanced look frame that had a local connection and was written by a *Post-Dispatch* writer Deirdre Shesgreen, who worked in the paper's Washington bureau. It looks at a friendship between an Israeli, with St. Louis roots, and a Palestinian, who are striving to remain friends and business partners, despite the conflict. It opens: "The violence in this divided city has already shaken the lives of Shmuel Mantinband and Iman Tibi. Now, they're trying to preserve their business—and their friendship." ("Israeli, Palestinian work elbow to elbow," 2002) Mantinband owns a Roman-themed restaurant that Tibi manages in Jerusalem, which has been racked with suicide bombings.

The story mentions the events of the day—another another suicide attack and the visit of U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell—but it also focuses how the conflict is impacting everyday residents like Mantinband and Tibi and the friendships between the two warring sides. "I'm a criminal walking in the street," said Tibi, who said he stopped eating out at Jewish restaurants and cafes after getting stopped by police and stared at by people who fear he may be a suicide bomber, simply because he is Palestinian. Mantinband said he is afraid to go to Tibi's house, for fear he may be attacked. (Ibid.)

The economic fallout of the conflict is also alluded to, as the story says that both men have a personal stakes in the situation, because their business has slowed dramatically since the attacks began "and as the violence has escalated, each man has watched as the other suffered indignities sparked by the current tension." ("Israeli, Palestinian work

elbow to elbow,” 2002) The article says neither man has drawn a paycheck for more than a year, as the violence keeps people at home.

However, the article doesn’t paint a picture of two men who agree on everything—it notes that their political views differ and they just don’t discuss them much—and neither one is an extremist. But the article, using a balanced frame, lays out in a nutshell the different perspectives of Israelis and Palestinians in a single sentence: “Where Mantinband sees suicide bombers, Tibi said, his people see 12 years of broken promises and humiliation.” (Ibid.) But the story also said the two men share a more overriding similarity in that they are both weary with the violence and hatred, a sentiment also felt by many Israelis and Palestinians: “We’re sick of the situation,” Tibi said.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The frames used in three U.S. newspapers' coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict differed significantly, depending on the paper's philosophy and use of its own international staff or wire services. There was also a change found overall in the frames used by all of the newspapers analyzed, in the 2000 coverage period as compared to the 2002 period.

DIFFERENCES AMONG TIME PERIODS

Specifically, the dominant frame of the 2000 coverage overall was the "Israeli government's quest for security" frame, while in the 2002 coverage, the frame most used was the "Israelis as militarily strong bullies" frame. This is significant, since it was expected that the 2002 coverage would be more sympathetic to the Israelis and their concern for security, following the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City.

In fact, Moody-Hall (2002) found several mainstream British and U.S. newspapers framed Arabs more negatively, using more negative adjectives to describe Arabs, in the coverage of Israeli-Palestinian conflict before and after the September 11 attacks frame. But her research also mostly used stories about Arabs attacked Israelis, rather than vice versa.

At the start of the 2002 coverage period, the media seemed to accept the Israeli government's quest for law and order and security frame after the Passover Massacre and

a rash of other suicide bombings killed and maimed civilians. But as the Israeli military intensified its siege on Ramallah and became more hostile and restrictive to the international media, the Israelis as military-strong bullies frame was used more frequently and the voice of Palestinian civilians and their suffering became more prevalent in coverage. Essentially, the Israelis' attempt to promote its framing of the conflict to the international media failed with the Palestinian civilians under siege looking like the victims and the armed Israeli soldiers rumbling through Ramallah in tanks looking like heavily armed bullies. Wolfsfeld (1993) found the same scenario happened during the first Intifada in the 1980s, where the world media framed the stone-throwing Palestinians as "David" and the well-armed Israelis as "Goliath."

During the 2002 coverage period, as the violence, killing and destruction intensified, there was more of an overall tone of despair and a lack of hope that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could ever be resolved in the articles of all three U.S. papers. In comparison, the tone was more hopeful in 2000, when there had been a relatively long period of relative calm, before violence broke out after Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount in September 2000.

In 2002, the conflict began to be portrayed again as a relentless religious and ethnic conflict, while in 2000 it still seemed possible that this was just a spasm of violence in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that could be quieted.

DIFFERENCES AMONG NEWSPAPERS

Most of this study's findings were as expected, in terms of how the coverage differed between the three newspapers. It was anticipated that the *Monitor's* coverage would be most in line with peace journalism and conflict resolution practices, due to its faith-based background, international staff, and the more narrative, descriptive style of its stories.

Overall, this was the case. Most of its coverage in both the 2000 and 2002 time periods used either the thematic, complex conflict or "balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns" frame. The two frames, which are most in line with peace journalism and conflict resolution practices, were used 19 times during both coverage periods, which looked at a total of 30 stories. This fits with the *Monitor's* view as itself as an "international newspaper" featuring "solution-minded journalism," as stated on its Web site. (Christian Science Monitor, 2009)

The *Monitor* also used a more diverse mix of sources and more alternative sources, like scholars and peace and policy experts, as opposed to official government sources. The tone of its stories tended to be more optimistic and held out the possibility for peaceful conflict resolution, as opposed to portraying the conflict as a religious and ethnic deeply entrenched feud that was impossible to resolve. It delved beyond single acts of violence, like a suicide bombing or shooting, to the underlying complex reasons, often tied to economics and politics, for the ongoing conflict. It also described a variety of both Israeli and Palestinian sources in detailed, narrative stories that both humanized the people and added context about their backgrounds.

The *Times'* coverage was more mixed in its use of frames, with some breaking news

pieces using the episodic, simple conflict frame along with more in-depth, narrative pieces. Overall for both coverage periods, it used the episodic frame 27 times out of 103 stories totally and it used the “Israeli government’s quest for law and order, security” frame 31 times. It does use a lot of official sources, dramatic descriptions of the violence and the tone can often be pessimistic about the chances of resolving the cycle of violence and conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians.

With its large international staff, the *Times* also did some stories using the “balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns” frame and the thematic, complex conflict frame. Some of these stories were rich in telling detail, presented alternative sources from both sides and provided a lot of important context. Like the *Monitor*, the *Times* considers itself to be an international newspaper and has won several Pulitzer Prizes for the excellence of its international reporting. Two of its best pieces, both using the balanced frame, looked at an Israeli and Palestinian teen side-by-side. In 2000, it was a deeper look at a young Palestinian man throwing rocks at Israeli soldiers and a young Israeli soldier posted in a Palestinian neighborhood with rock-throwing youth. In 2002, it was an article revealing the sad similarities between a young female Palestinian suicide bomber and her victim, an Israeli teenage woman.

The *Post-Dispatch* used mostly wire stories that mainly reported the latest event, mostly bombings and military action, during both time periods. It used the simple episodic frame for 8 of its 16 stories overall during the two times periods. Particularly in 2000, the episodic, simple conflict frame was used the majority of the time in the coverage. There was focus on the drama and violence of the breaking news, the death toll

and most of the sources were official government sources. The conflict was portrayed often as being linked to religion or culture with little hope for a peaceful resolution.

However, the *Post-Dispatch*'s use of frames differed somewhat during the 2002 coverage period and I was surprised to see it use the balanced look and thematic frames in its coverage at least one time. It used the thematic frame for an optimistic look at a proposed peace plan offered to Israel by the Arab world. It also ran a story by its Washington D.C. bureau reporter that looked at a friendship between an Israeli, with St. Louis roots, and a Palestinian, who are business partners in Jerusalem. It was an in-depth, narrative piece, full of wonderful detail and dialogue that humanized both sides of the conflict.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study are important, especially from a peace journalism and conflict resolution perspective. Tuchman (1978) says the news media has the power to shape readers opinions, particularly on topics about which they are ignorant. That means it may be possible for a journalist to convince readers that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is either an endless cycle of senseless, ethnic violence or a complex conflict with issues that can be resolved.

Thomas Nelson, Rosalee Clawson and Zoe Oxley (1997) found word choices journalists made in covering a controversial issue could result in substantially different portrayals of the same event and influence people's opinions and Karlberg (1997) found that adversarial framing of news could limit public understanding of the issues.

Journalists must use frames to package and process a large amount of information, but this research may call more attention to the decisions made in coverage and offer alternative ways to report a story that adhere to peace journalism and conflict resolution guidelines. Everything from including alternative sources to adding context and detail can make a story more balanced and more compelling, while also potentially promoting a better understanding of each side in a conflict. It can also humanize the other side in a way that transcends differences in religion and culture.

But quality in-depth reporting on international conflicts can take time and cost money and sadly, the number of U.S. newspapers doing their own international coverage has declined even further over the past few years with even major metropolitan newspapers with a long history of international reporting eliminating their international bureaus. To write a story with alternative sources and a deeper context and understanding of the conflict, a journalist would need to know the country well, not just be parachuted in during escalations of violence.

Even the *Monitor's* international coverage has been affected by cost-cutting measures. In December 2008, the Boston-based paper, with eight foreign bureaus, announced an agreement with McClatchy Newspapers, which owns 30 daily papers, to share international news stories from their bureaus in South Asia, Africa and Latin America. McClatchy is providing the *Monitor* with stories written by its correspondents in Venezuela and Kenya, while the *Monitor* will share its stories by its Mexico City and New Delhi correspondents with McClatchy's Web site and 30 daily papers. The *Monitor* shifted its daily coverage entirely to the Web in April 2009.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was limited to three U.S. newspapers and two coverage periods in 2000 and 2002. It identified seven frames used and applied them to 149 articles and analyzed the coverage from a qualitative perspective by examining the language, sources and context used.

Future researchers could examine a larger number of newspapers over a longer time periods to present a more comprehensive picture of the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. They could include both U.S. and foreign publications to see how coverage and the use of certain frames vary by country. It is expected that the cultural and diplomatic ties a country has to Israel and the Palestinians could greatly impact the coverage in that country. It may be particularly interesting to also look at Israeli and Palestinian newspapers and how their coverage differs in covering the conflict, including comparing more conservative and liberal publications in that community.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a complex, multi-faceted situation that has defied an international solution for decades. Leaders on both sides have come and gone, but the concerns and misunderstandings between the two parties remain. Perhaps, my research will help journalists covering this and other conflicts to consider the impact of their coverage and encourage them to strive to cover conflict in a different way, which may lead to a better understanding by all.

APPENDIX

Table one: Number of Articles about the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Newspaper	Dates of Coverage		Total
	9/28/2000-10/12/2000	3/28/2002-4/12/2002	
New York Times	37	66	103
Christian Science Monitor	12	18	30
St. Louis Post-Dispatch	10	6	16

Total	59	90	
-------	----	----	--

Total number of stories for both coverage periods			149
---	--	--	-----

Table two: Frames in Coverage from 9/28/2000 to 10/12/2000 period

Frames	Newspapers			Total
	New York Times	Christian Science Monitor	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	
Injustice and Palestinians' quest for equality, self-rule	3	3	0	6
Israeli government's quest for law and order, security	14	1	3	18
Palestinians as exotic terrorists, victimizing Israelis	3	0	0	3
Israelis as military strong bullies victimizing Palestinians	3	0	0	3
Balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns and actors	2	3	0	5
Episodic, simple conflict rooted in single events	10	0	7	17
Thematic, complex conflict rooted in many conditions	2	5	0	7
Total	37	12	10	59
		75		

Table three: Frames in Coverage from 3/28/2002 to 4/12/2002 period

Frames	Newspapers			Total
	New York Times	Christian Science Monitor	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	
Injustice and Palestinians' quest for equality, self-rule	5	0	0	5
Israeli government's quest for law and order, security	17	0	1	18
Palestinians as exotic terrorists, victimizing Israelis	2	0	0	2
Israelis as military strong bullies victimizing Palestinians	18	6	2	26
Balanced look at both Israeli and Palestinian concerns and actors	4	5	1	10
Episodic, simple conflict rooted in single events	17	1	1	19
Thematic, complex conflict rooted in many conditions	3	6	1	10
Total	66	18	6	90

REFERENCES

- “A biblical patriarch’s tomb becomes a battleground”. (2000, Oct. 4). *The New York Times*, pp. A20.
- “Amid Israeli attack, tales of abuse”. (2002, April 12). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.
- “Amid rising casualties, Israel digs in”. (2002, April 11). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.
- “Arabs offer normal ties with Israel”. (2002, March 29). *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A1.
- “Arafat, Barak end talks with a few concessions”. (2000, Oct. 5) *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A7.
- “As Truce Fails, Fighting Rages in Middle East,” (2000, Oct. 3) *The New York Times*, pp. A1.
- Ayish, Mohammed I. (2002). Political Communication on Arab World Television: Evolving Patterns. *Political Communication*, 19, 137-154.
- “Battle rages again over a holy city”. (2000, Oct. 2). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshanna and Tamar Liebes (1993). Frame Ambiguities: Intifada Narrativization of the Experience by Israeli Soldier. In Akiba A. Cohen and Gadi Wolfsfeld (Ed.), *Framing the Intifada: People and Media*, 27-52. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Botes, Johannes. (1996). Journalism and Conflict Resolution. *Media Development*, 4, 6-9.
- Christian Science Monitor. (2009) *About us*. Retrieved Oct. 15 from www.csmonitor.com/aboutus/about_the_monitor.html.
- “Citizens Arabs: The neglected residents of Israel”. (2000, Sept. 28) *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 7.
- Cohen, Akiba and Gadi Wolfsfeld. (1993). *Framing the “Intifada”*: *People and Media*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

- “Diplomacy intensifies to resume talks in Middle East; U.N. chief, Clinton intercede as violence abates some”. (2000, Oct. 11) *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. A1.
- “Dodging rocks and rubber bullets”. (2000, Oct. 10). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6.
- Entman, Robert M. (1991). Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents. *Journal of Communications*, 41 (4), 6-27.
- Entman, Robert M. (1993). “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm.” *Journal of Communications*, 43 (4), 51-58.
- “Fighting Worsens in Jerusalem, West Bank and Gaza Strip”. (2000, Oct. 7) *The New York Times*, pp. A2.
- “Flash points in West Bank and Gaza ignite again”. (2000, Oct. 5) *The New York Times*; pp. A10.
- Gamson, William A. (1992). *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, William A. and Andre Modigliani. (1989). Media Discourse and Public Opinion: A Constructionist Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 1-37.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1979). *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Giltin, Todd. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.
- “Globe to close last three foreign bureaus“, (2007) *Boston Globe*,
- Goffman, Erving. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- “Historic chance for peace recedes”. (2002, March 29). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.
- “Israel launches “image management” campaign”. (2002, April 2). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 7.
- “Israeli ambitions for peace more modest now”. (2000, Oct. 5). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.
- “Israeli-Arabs: an enemy within”. (2000, Oct. 4). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6.

- “Israeli crackdown unites Arabs”. (2000, Oct. 10). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.
- “Israeli hawk Sharon incites riots with visit to mount area claimed by Muslims and Jews”. (2000, Sept. 29) *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A2.
- “Israeli, Palestinian work elbow to elbow”. (2002, April 14). *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A1.
- “Israeli police kill 4 Palestinians, wound 175 as they storm shrine”. (2000, Sept 30) *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A5.
- “Israeli troops use force against journalists”. (2002, April 6). *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A9.
- “Israelis deploy tanks, copters in West Bank, Gaza Strip; at least 51 people have died in 5 days of fighting”. (2000, Oct. 3) *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A1.
- “Israelis confine Arafat in compound”. (2002, March 30). *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A5.
- Iyengar, Shanto. (1991). *Is Anyone Responsible? : How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Iyengar, Shanto and Adam Simon. (1993). News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion: A Study of Agenda-Setting, Priming and Framing. *Communication Research*, 20 (3), 365-383.
- Karlberg, Michael. (1997). News and conflicts: how adversarial news frames limit public understanding of environmental issues. *Alternatives Journal*, 23 (1), 22-28.
- Kemper, Kevin R. and Michael Jonathan Grinfeld. (2002) *Rwanda, new media, and genocide: Towards a research agenda for reviewing the ethics and professional standards of journalists covering conflict*. Paper presented at a conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
- Knightley, Phillip. (1975). *The First Casualty*. London: Pan Books.
- “Latest Mideast clash: a prelude to peace?” (2000 Oct. 4). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 2.
- Liebes, Tamar. “Our war/their war: Comparing the intifadeh and the Gulf War on U.S. and Israeli television.” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, v 9, n 1 (March 1992): 44-56.
- Liebes, Tamar. (1997). *Reporting the Arab-Israeli conflict and how hegemony works*.

New York: Routledge.

Lindlof, Thomas R. (1995). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage Publications:

Lynch, Jake and Annabel McGoldrick. (2002, June). *Peace Journalism, a Training and Lecture Programme on Ethical Reporting of Conflicts in the 21st Century and Challenges after Sept. 11*. Program presented at a three-day training workshop for professional journalists from around the world. June 20-22, 2002. Institute for Journalism, Fredrikstad, Norway. Retrieved from <http://www.transcend.org/pjmanual.htm>, Transcend in Spring/Summer 2002.

“Mideast: Back from the brink?” (2000, Oct. 11) *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.

“Mideast: Every day life under fire”. (2002, April 2). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6.

“Mideast Turmoil: Bomb kills at least 19 in Israel as Arabs meet over peace plan”. (2002, March 28). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

“Mideast turmoil: The dead; two girls, divided by war, joined in carnage,” (2002, April 5). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

“Mideast Turmoil: Israelis besiege a defiant Arafat in his office”. (2002, March 30). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

“Mideast turmoil: The factions; in the Arabs’ struggle against Israel, there are many players”. (2002, March 30). *The New York Times*, pp. A6.

“Mideast Turmoil: The fighting”. (2002, March 29). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

“Mideast turmoil: The terrorist; Daughter concealed angry soul of a martyr”. (2002, March 31). *The New York Times*, pp. A11.

“Mideast Turmoil: Under siege, without power and water”. (2002, April 5). *The New York Times*, pp. A10.

“Mideast Turmoil: Voices; 6 Israelis mix confusion, fear and determination”. (2002, April 8). *The New York Times*, pp. A9.

“Mideast violence continues to rage, death toll rises”. (2000, Oct.1). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

Moody-Hall, Mia. (2000, August) *British vs. U.S. Newspaper Framing of Arabs in Coverage of the Middle-Eastern Conflict Pre and Post Sept. 11: A Case Study*. Paper

presented at a conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, August 8, 2002.

Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson and Zoe M. Oxley. (1997). Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and its Effect on Tolerance. *American Political Science Review*, 91 (3), 567-583.

The New York Times Company (2009) *The New York Times Media Group*. Retrieved Oct. 15 from www.nytc.com/company/business_units/new_york_times_media_group.html

“One former warrior’s roadmap to peace”. (2002, April 2). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.

“Palestinians and Israelis in a clash at holy site”. (2000, Sept. 28). *The New York Times*, pp. A6.

“Palestinians, Israelis agree to cease-fire, officer says: Albright will meet in Paris with Barak, Arafat”. (2000, Oct. 3) *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, pp. A1.

Pan, Zhongdang and Gerald M. Kosicki. (1993). Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse. *Political Communication*, 10 : 55-75.

“Peace that left a public behind”. (2000, Oct. 3). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 1.

“Pressure mounts for Sharon to arrive at endgame”. (2002, April 5). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 8.

Ryan, Charlotte and William A. Gamson. (2006). The Art of Reframing Political Debates. *Contexts*: 13-18.

Rubenstein, Richard E., Johannes Botes, Frank Dukes and John B. Stephens. (1994). *Frameworks For Interpreting Conflict: A Handbook for Journalists*. Fairfax, Va.: Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University:

St. Louis Post-Dispatch. (2009) Post-Dispatch general FAQs. Retrieved Oct. 15 from www.stltoday.com/stltoday/help/stories.nsf/faqindex

Semetko, Holli A. and Patti. M. Valkenburg. (2000) Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News. *Journal of Communication*: 93-109.

Scheufele, Dietram. (1999) Framing as a theory of Media Effects. *Journal of Communication*: 103-122.

Tichenor, Phillip J., George A. Donohue and Clarice N. Olien. (1980) *Community*

Conflict & the Press. London: Sage Publications.

“To many Israelis, a sad, familiar story”. (2000, Oct. 12). *The New York Times*, pp. A8.

Tuchman, Gaye. (1978) *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: The Free Press.

“Two sides, two stories, one church”. (2002, April 9). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 9.

“UN warns of West Bank ‘horror’,” (2002, April 9). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6.

“US media can’t cover the news if they don’t cover the world”. (2007, February 7). *Christian Science Monitor*, Retrieved Sept. 25, 2009 from <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0207/p09s01-cojh.html>

Valkenburg, Patti M., Holli A. Semetko and Claes H. De Vreese. (1999) “The Effects of News Frames on Readers’ Thoughts and Recall.” *Communication Research*, 26 (5), 550-567.

“Violence spreads to Israeli towns; Arab toll at 28”. (2000, Oct. 2). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

“Whose Holy Land? The combatants”. (2000, Oct. 6). *The New York Times*, pp. A8.

“Whose Holy Land? The overview; Israelis extend deadline for Arafat to quell violence”. (2000, Oct. 10). *The New York Times*, pp. A1.

“Whose Holy Land? The shock waves”. (2000, Oct. 11). *The New York Times*, pp. A10.

“Whose Holy Land? The town meeting”. (2000, Oct. 11). *The New York Times*, pp. A10.

“Why a Palestinian girl now wants to be a suicide bomber”. (2002, April 1). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 7.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (1997) “Fair Weather Friends: The Varying Roles of the News Media in the Arab-Israeli Peace Process.” *Political Communication*, 14, 29-48.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (1997) *Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press:

Wolfsfeld, Gadi, Rami Khouri and Yoram Peri. (2002) “News About the Other in Jordan

and Israel: Does Peace Make a Difference?" *Political Communication*, 19, 189-210.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (1993) "*The Role of the News Media in Unequal Political Conflicts: From the Intifada to the Gulf War and Back Again.*" Research Paper R-8, The Joan Shorenstein Barone Center, Harvard University, June 1993.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (2004) *Media and the Path to Peace*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press:

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. (2001) "The News Media and Peace Processes: The Middle East and Northern Ireland." *Peaceworks*, 37 Washington D.C: United States Institute of Peace.

"Year of intifada sees hardening on each side". (2001, Sept. 2001). *The New York Times*, pp. A3.