Senior Projects Spring 2018

Bard Undergraduate Senior Projects

Spring 2018

Newsroom Action During the Lebanon War: A Look at American and Israeli Media Coverage

Ciara Collins
Bard College

Bard

Newsroom Action During the Lebanon War:
A Look at American and Israeli Media Coverage

Senior Project submitted to
The Division of Social Studies
of Bard College

By: Ciara Collins

Annandale-on-Hudson, New York
May 2017

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Abstract:

Since 1948, the birth of the Jewish state has been broadcasted by news media outlets all over the globe. Most audiences and viewers are driven by an ideological bias, one that influences the daily consumption of media, impeccably catered to the viewer and their political, social, and moral understandings. This paper explores biases embedded within Israeli and Western news industries through literature, news stations, and language. I will unpack these biases in media representation with concern to the hierarchical structures that exist behind the unquestioned voices or "factual" sources. Israel has been viewed and criticized as a modern Nation-State by American news industry since its origins. Questions defined by leading academics include: How does American news continue to shape Israeli politics today? What methods have been consistent over time? What methods (language, rhetoric, and medium) changed over time? Is public response embedded in the medium? Is the American media biased in favor of Israel? The goal of this paper is to analyze, examine, and evaluate the role that Israeli and the Western news media played during the Lebanon War, as both media outlets generated a strong emotional reaction to this event.
.

Introduction

The state of Israel has been in constant regional flux since the passage of the British

Mandate in 1948.[1] The establishment of the Jewish state was thoroughly documented via images

and text put forward by both Western and Israeli media sources. Across numerous reports

documenting creation of the Jewish state, concerns still linger around the concept of "fake

news." The primary journalistic concern is the falsification of information in disseminated

media. The ideologies and perspectives of individuals were, and continue to be, shaped by media

portrayals and representations of the Israeli state. Western and even Israeli news outlets have

created an image of Israel that may not reflect reality. For example, during the summer of 2006

the media lens was turned to the political conflict between Hezbollah and Israel. Long-standing

---

[1] British Mandate, also known as the Mandate for Palestine, was a geopolitical entity under British administration. The Mandate started in 1920 and didn't end until 1948.
U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of State,
history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/creation-israel.

tensions had flared into a war between the aforementioned parties of Hezbollah, a controversial

political group with ties to both Lebanese legislation and terrorist attacks, and the greater Israeli

state.[2] In examining Israeli and Western news media, it is clear that both regions share similar

perceptions of past events, thus twisting impressions of current events and changing narratives

and perspectives.

This 2006 Israel–Hezbollah War, more popularly known as the Lebanon War, was a

turning point in the pro-Palestinian land reclamation movement. Hezbollah refused to recognize

Israel as an independent state, a controversial issue for most Middle Eastern movements. During

the Lebanon War, public reactions in the United States was relatively different than those of

Israeli citizens. The on-screen communication between leading figures and the general public led

to polarized opinions, which in turn led to both violent and non-violent reactions. The general

public was only privy to the information released in the media, which can, in many

circumstances, be controlled by political influence.

Nasrallah, the founder of the radical, militant, and secretive political party, Hezbollah,

assured the media "again and again, [that they] would never turn these weapons against

Lebanon's own people - a promise that unravelled, when Hezbollah gunmen forcibly took control

of West Beirut after the Lebanese government tried to shut down the group's sprawling

telecommunications network and fire an airport head of security for having Hezbollah ties." [3]

---

[2] Hezbollah was founded in 1985 by Hassan Nasrallah. Hezbollah is a religious military group in Lebanon. This group has been accused of numerous bombings against the Jewish, including: 1983 attack on U.S. Marine barracks in Lebanon; the 1992 suicide bombing at the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires, Argentina; the 1994 suicide bombing of the Argentine Jewish Mutual Association in Buenos Aires and has also been a suspected of involvement in the February 2005 Beirut suicide bombing that killed 23 people, including former Lebanese Prime Minister.This group is recognized as a terrorist organization by Gulf Arab countries, Israel and the United States.

[3] Hu, Zoe. "The History of Hezbollah, from Israel to Syria." *Lebanon News | Al Jazeera*, Al Jazeera, 20 Dec. 2016.

News media has a way of translating to their "own people," or intended audience. This is especially evident in the coverage of charismatic figures like Nasrallah. Similarities may be drawn between the personalities of Nasrallah and the acting President of the United States, George W. Bush. As seen in the cases of Nasrallah and Bush, communication between figures of power and their audiences is clearly a factor in the creation of the Israeli image as structured by news media outlets. Data about these reflections can also be studied and used for political gain.

In addition to the effects of the Lebanon war as covered in various media outlets, I will focus on Israeli and Western propaganda and examine the dominating effects thereof. Does this hierarchical system we see being created by elites in American news coverage dictate the functions of other global networks like Al Jazeera, [Israel's] Channel 2, Channel 10, and i24News? Who controls which aspect of the media, and what does that mean for the information being broadcast or printed?

i24News is a channel that started broadcasting international and domestic affairs in Israel on July 17th, 2013. CEO Frank Melloul stated in a phone interview with *The New Yorker*, "At Al Jazeera, the goal is to excite. I want to bring some serenity."[4] It is worth asking, however, if "serenity" is a quality that belongs in intense conflict coverage of the Middle East, and if serenity and excitement can exist in the same mission statement. *New Yorker* journalist Ruth Margalit reported that "the channel's first news program didn't seem all that different compared to other Israeli news networks (after all, every news edition covered the European Union directive that day). What set it apart, perhaps, was the delivery. For the first time on Israeli television, a prime-time news edition featured an Arab-Israeli news anchor—and a woman, at that."[5] This

---

[4] Margalit, Ruth. "The Israeli Answer to Al Jazeera." *The New Yorker*, The New Yorker, 29 July 2013.
[5] Ibid., *The New Yorker*.

anchor, Lucy Aharish, is a 32-year-old native Hebrew speaker who grew up in the southern, working-class town of Dimona.[6] Having a woman of Arab-Israeli descent as a news anchor on Israeli television hugely affects the ways in which news coverage structure public perceptions of Israel.

It is evident that strategic moves have been put into place in order to promote certain narrative. Most international news channels are publicly funded through government initiatives, giving some inkling into their partisan bias. For example, Fox News, (which currently holds the title of the highest viewed network of 2017) is known for its close alignment with the Republican Party and its radically right bias. Al Jazeera has recently begun broadcasting in the United States- a move made not without controversy, as the station has been banned in Israel. Melloul notes in most interviews that i24News does not receive any money from political parties or the government. That suggests this media organization is more independent than most, allowing it more freedom in content and dialogue. This comparison gives insight into the promotional strategies between Israeli and Western news stations.

The key goal of this undertaking is to analyze the close relationship between the United States and Israel by using various outlets' coverage of the Lebanon war in 2006 as a vehicle for my argument. There is no doubt that Israel has historically been a favorite in the American consciousness. To answer the question of "why," I want to explore the ways in which Israel has shaped its own narrative through stories broadcast by Western and Israeli media coverage. When examining the Lebanon war, all forms of media exerted control through image and message. These media-created impressions produced unique circumstances for the state of Israel

---

[6] Ibid., *The New Yorker*.

as well as the surrounding regions. Many find Western media coverage particularly powerful in its ability to spread information, ideas, and cultural products in syndicated international broadcasts to billions of individuals around the world. Due to the universality of media coverage and the creation of bias, I plan to explore flaws in the media beyond the confines of this conflict as well as in this specialized study of the Lebanon War in the media. In doing so, I hope to show the negative effects that American media has had in the shaping of modern politics and law in Israel, by engaging in emotional bias, promoting misinformed ideologies, and broadcasting gut reactions over rational arguments. The American news has capitalized on the sentimental value of the tense political climate in Israel, shaping a narrative beneficial for elites to feed to viewers. This sentimentality and misinformation can later result in social uproar, turmoil, and confusion.

The American news media has played a strong role in constructing ideologies about Israel's social, political, and economic issues to promote a specific public belief based on lies told to raise ratings. This goes back to the history of the United States's ties to Israel, which did not actually cement until around the 1970s. Israel's close ties with the United States can be traced back to the 1970s. In putting this alliance under a microscope, I will examine why both nations have been seen as "friendly" with each other and why American support for Israel is so high. This media-encouraged support has led to expert help, diplomatic aid, and billions of dollars in funding for the state of Israel. As the media attempts to never miss a newsworthy moment, turning it into fodder for bias or ratings, it is important to understand the complicated entanglement between the United States and Israel. From there, we may begin to understand the truth of the matter.

Part 1:

The War

During the Mandate of Palestine, which lasted from 1917-1948, regional turmoil wreaked havoc on the land and people. There was immense fear lurking amongst the Israeli people and the government. After 1948, the Jewish state development found footing on Western news media has since been closely documented and recorded. Furthermore, public interest intensified during the Arab-Israeli conflict.[7] The Arab-Israeli conflict, as well as the negotiations period, was sensationalized due to its tense political nature. These negotiations also marked the perceived beginning of negative representations of the Middle East abroad. In response, faulty representations of Israel are now becoming increasingly recognized. It is becoming more apparent in news outlets that analyzing news coverage critically will be more beneficial economically, rather than simply inserting biased political and moral prejudices into news coverage as had been practiced in the past. The 2006 Lebanon War was the aftermath of a longstanding violent battle between Lebanon and Israel. These conflicting and ongoing system of ideas between the two lands are fueled by culture, religion, economy, and technology as witnessed in the Lebanon War of 2006. Sampling American and Israeli news outlets during the Lebanon war allows for a clearer understanding of how news media represents Israel as a modern state as well as evaluating the public opinion on the Israeli nation.

Since the first Lebanon War 1982, the Hezbollah ideologies have been represented. According to Hezbollah, "the United States was to blame for many of the country's problems in

---

[7] The Arab-Israeli conflict has been an ongoing conflict between the Israelis and the Arabs in the Middle East, starting from the establishment of Israel by the United Nations, a nation under control of Jews.

1979." Hezbollah's ideologies originated from the Iranian Revolution. Known as the 1979

Revolution, the uprising called for a religious group to help the state with oppression. With the

help of Iran, Hezbollah expanded its influence on Lebanon in the early 1980s. This revolution

was not looked at as a normal case, since it did not involve the stereotypical cases of a

revolution, such as; financial crisis, war, and conflicts. However, it was a revolution based on the

fighting of ideologies and opinions. Hezbollah views were modeled on the ideologies of Sayyid

Ruhollah Mūsavi Khomeini, former Supreme Leader of Iran.[8] Like former Supreme Leader of

Iran, Hezbollah considers the United States and Israel to be their enemies.

Since the 1980s, Israel had not battled on the Eastern shores of the Mediterranean, until

the uncontrollable fuming conflict took place in Lebanon in 2006. The Lebanon War started on

July 12th, 2006 and ended on August 14th, 2006 which compared to other wars is considered to

be a short war. The radical political group,"Hezbollah, also known as The Party of God, is a

radical Shi'a Muslim group fighting against Israel and "western imperialism" in Lebanon.[9] The

main objective was to fight against Israeli and United States power and influence. The group

does not recognize the legitimacy of the State of Israel and it has been labeled a foreign terrorist

organization (FTO) by the U.S. State Department since October 1997."[10] Hezbollah has been

connected to many terrorist terms progressing with the summer of 2006. During the summer of

2006, Hezbollah used many unexpected attacks on Israel as a diversion while launching at Israeli

---

[8] Khomeini was an Iranian religious and political leader, who in 1979 made Iran the world's first Islamic republic. Despite the language and rhetoric of releasing Lebanon from foreign occupation, Hezbollah has been clear their alliancing powers, Islamist Iranian regime. During the Lebanon war the transfer of supplies, such as weapons and aid were used to help Hezbollah against Israeli civilians.

[9] Hezbollah's ideological roots stretch back to the 1979 Revolution. Since the first Lebanon War 1982 , Hezbollah has continued to advance its military wing. This group has gained much power in Lebanon's political system and has a strong ideological influence over Lebanese citizens. The ideology of Hezbollah has been described as radical.

[10] Ibid., *History & Overview of Hezbollah.*

borders. What followed was a war between the Hezbollah leader, Sheik Hassan Nasrallah, and

the state of Israel. However this war was noted to be aggressive from both sides, using surprise

attacks.

During the surprise attack on Israel, two Israeli soldiers were captured, and eight were

killed.[11] The response from the public was notable, as was that of the superpowers of the world.

The United States issued a statement by White House Press:

"Today Hezbollah terrorists operating from Lebanon kidnapped two Israeli soldiers and

launched rocket attacks against civilian targets in Israel. The United States condemns in the

strongest terms this unprovoked act of terrorism... We also hold Syria and Iran, which have

provided long-standing support for Hezbollah, responsible for today's violence. We call for the

immediate and unconditional release of the Israeli soldiers."[12]

As political elites blamed Syria and Iran in the White House press, the Lebanese

Ambassador to the United States (from March 1999 until July 2007), Faris Abboud, was recalled

to Beirut after expressing his support for Hezbollah in the US media and making controversial

comments.[13] The difference between what was aired in the Western and Israeli news was

carefully noted and recorded within the timeline of the summer of 2006. As seen on many

Western news stations, like CNN and Fox News there are timelines of many different conflicts

throughout the world. The reason that news stations have started keeping a timeline of events and

conflicts is due to not only organizing but allowing a better understanding to the public.

After the surprise attack on Israel, the Israeli government sent a military defense unit into

Southern Lebanon not too long after the first hit.[14] The IDF (Israeli Defense Force) commanded

---

[11] Anthony Shadid, "Inside Hezbollah, Big Miscalculations," *The Washington Post*. October, 8 2006.

[12] *U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, 2001-2009.

[13] *David Schenker*, "Give Abboud the Boot:" *Give Abboud the Boot: - Why Does Syria Need Two Ambassadors in Washington? - The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.*

[14]Ibid., U.S. Department of State, 2001-2009.

that soldiers in southern Lebanon relocate to the northern part of the country. In doing so, Israel

hoped to rescue any abducted soldiers while going through all of Southern Lebanon. In search of

looking for taken Israeli soldiers. However, no Israeli soldiers were found. Israel then launched a

counterattack with air force bombings in southern Lebanon killing many women and children.[15]

This was the first instance of Israeli air strikes since Israel's pull-out in 2000. Due to the number

of shocking images that hit news stations, many people feared for the lives of the innocent. Why

do news stations show many casualty images including women and children? Is it due to the way

news teams want to frame the image of war in news coverage. As seen in many conflicts

throughout the world, the government continues to punish and endanger the lives of the innocent

and blameless in order to sell an advantageous narrative and garner media attention and public

support for their cause.

During the Lebanon War, international humanitarian laws played a crucial role in

resolving the conflict and understanding Israel as a modern state. Much of the language used in

the Western and Israeli news was centered around humanitarian laws and charismatic leaders

involved behind the curtains. "Peter Bouckaert, emergencies director for Human Rights Watch,

said in a telephone interview from Damascus that he was at the Qana hospital the day after the

bombing. Human Rights Watch, an international nonprofit organization, interviews "multiple

eyewitnesses" to calculate its numbers. Bouckaert said he felt it was "not a conscious effort" on

the part of the Lebanese health ministry "to inflate the death toll. It was a very confusing and

traumatic day."[16] This was a turning point to the understanding of a war crime, which was

projected through many images and pictures taken by nonprofit organization. Since the release of

---

[15] "Middle East | Israel Accused over Lebanon War." *BBC News*, BBC, 6 Sept. 2007.
[16] Deborah Howell, "A War of Images and Perceptions," *The Washington Post*. August 13, 2006.

many images during the war, the term "war crime" was an action that was investigated much during this time. The violence that broke out was violating not only humanitarian laws, but international rules of war. Creating a narrative that stuck out since much of the time laws were being violated.

After the Lebanon War, casualties were counted, bodies were buried, and numbers were recorded. It's important to note that civilian casualties are hard to document and government figures can be wrong.[17] During the 34-day war, the casualties and damages of the Lebanon War were compiled by the Associated Press mostly from government officials on both sides: "Deaths in Israel: 157 total--118 soldiers and 39 civilians. Deaths in Lebanon: 845 total --743 civilians, 34 soldiers, and 68 Hezbollah.[18] Lebanese casualties were much higher than Israeli ones, both of which were collected, documented, and shared in the news.

"In speeches and iconography, Hezbollah has cast the war as a "divine victory."[19] But a reconstruction of the period before and soon after the group's seizure of the Israeli soldiers reveals a series of miscalculations on the part of the 24-year-old movement that defies its carefully cultivated reputation for planning and caution."[20] In the speeches and visual images used throughout the Lebanon War, many were engineered by a charismatic leader to set a particular tone for the existing rhetoric. The Lebanon War was complex because of the historical timeline dating back to 1940's and the numerous themes that accounted for the war; language, rhetoric, terrorism, fear, religion, charismatic leaders, ideologies, etc. The history between

---

[17] "Mideast War, By the Numbers," The Associated Press.
[18] Ibid., Mideast War, By the Numbers."
[19] Divine Victory has many different meanings. In most cases it is in reference to the cause and doing of God.
[20] Anthony Shadid, "Inside Hezbollah, Big Miscalculations." Washington Post Foreign Service, WP Company, 8 Oct. 2006.

Lebanon and Israel, as well as the relationship between the United States and Israel, is critical to understanding the themes during the Lebanon War, as it was not a traditional war but an asymmetrical one. What is the juxtaposition here between a traditional war and an asymmetrical one?

The President of the United States during the Lebanon War, George W. Bush, was just like Nasrallah, the leader of the organization Hezbollah. Much of the language and rhetoric used by these leaders set narratives that people were inclined to follow and share. In this case, both leaders differed in the carefully selected language they chose to use, as their ideologies and perspectives contrasted sharply. However, Nasrallah and Bush centered their talks and speeches around the themes of religion, the Bible and God, therefore demonstrating how their rhetorics did in fact resemble each other in style but not substance.

President Bush's address to the members of the Knesset in 2009 was not only a significant event in the relationship between Israel and the United States but also the role and mindset the American leader during the Lebanon War. Even though this speech was given three years after the Lebanon War, it reflected much of the reoccurring rhetoric used by powerful leaders. During his speech to Israel's parliament, Bush stated that "Israel's population may be just over 7 million. But when you confront terror and evil, you are 307 million strong because the United States of America stands with you. (Applause)."[21] This speech promoted a message that there is an indestructible relationship between Israel and the United States that has grown closer over the years.The speech centered mostly around the Bible, stating "No one who prays to the God of Abraham could strap a suicide vest to an innocent child, or blow up guiltless guests at

---

[21] *National Archives and Records Administration*, National Archives and Records Administration, George W. Bush.

a Passover Seder, or fly planes into office buildings filled with unsuspecting workers. In truth, the men who carry out these savage acts serve no higher goal than their own desire for power. They accept no God before themselves."[22] In this way, Bush conveyed to the public that thanks to the word and power of God, an unbreakable bond exists between Israel and the U.S. This association establishes the existent biases in the relationship between Israel and the United States and the importance of religion in creating a narrative. This partiality is visible in Western news coverage when addressing issues concerning Israel.

The Lebanon War was broadcasted all over the news in the summer of 2006, which created a massive reaction within the violence that transpired. The basic understanding of the relationship between Israeli news and Western news is visible by what has been influenced, replayed, consumed. The daily reaction from the public has been influenced by the political, social and moral considerations and biases of the media in their portrayal of specific conflicts, which is a pattern continued from the past. For example, the Lebanon War can be related to the Six-Day War in 1967. During 1967 the Middle East Crisis hit, known as the Six-Day War or Arab–Israeli war. This was the first start into the complex history of the United States and Israel.

The Middle East Crisis was "a classic example of the way escalation begets war, originated from the rekindling of the ever-explosive Arab-Israeli dispute. Certain that Israel would soon acquire nuclear weapons, the radical Arabs stepped up their pressure."[23] In 1956 Israel, alongside Britain and France, invaded Egypt. During this time, the United States commanded Israel to step back from Sinai and Gaza. A threat circulated that the United States

---

[22] Ibid., George W. Bush.
[23] Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.s. Foreign Relations Since 1776*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pg 746 Print.

would suspend any financial aid to Israel unless it withdrew, and with no other choice at hand, Israel accepted. Nevertheless, this was just the start of the conflict that emerged. On the afternoon of June 8th, "Israeli aircraft and then gunboats struck Liberty with rockets, napalm, and torpedoes, killing 34 sailors, wounding 171. During the broadcasting of the attack on the United States spy ship Liberty, the language and rhetoric centered around the lives of the innocent and blameless in addition to; fear, reaction, terror, ideologies, power between leaders, etc. Mistakenly believing that Egypt or the Soviet Union was responsible for the attack, the United States immediately dispatched multiple aircraft nearby."[24] The American public thought that relations were darkened by Israel's attack in international waters however many United States administrators and intellectuals "were pleased with Israel's success" in fighting the war although they also recognized how "the war caused major problems...that would further compromise America's position in a vital region."[25] As it turned out, that was exactly the position it left the United States in.

American-Israeli relations have been changing and shifting considerably due to the complex factors that inform the relationship between the two nations such as 9/11, the tension between other countries, and the American role as the "helping hand" of the world. American interests in the Middle East have continued to grow which is causing the relationship to become even more complicated than it was after the war. The United States and Israel have a long history, beginning with the United States recognizing Israel in 1948 and President Harry Truman becoming the first leader to recognize the newly-born nation-state.

---

[24] Ibid.,*From Colony to Superpower: U.s. Foreign Relations Since 1776* 748.
[25] Ibid.,*From Colony to Superpower: U.s. Foreign Relations Since 1776* 749.

After the Six-Day War, America supported Israel throughout many different occasions especially economically. For instance, in 1973, President Richard Nixon rushed to provide Israel with some financial assistance from the United States due to the October War. Which can relay into media, since a lot of the time Israel is deemed "good" in the media because of the American government business regarding Israel, especially if they are making a sizable donation towards the news network at hand? According to analysis at the Center for Responsive Politics include that news corporation such as Fox News, FX and FUEL TV accept donations made by politician. [26] Not too long after President Jimmy Carter signed the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty. This was a marking point in regional history, as well as for the relationship between Israel and the United States, as it was the first peace treaty between Israel and an Arab country. The United States was strategically dependent on Israel because, not only of its longstanding history but "the special relationship that exist between Israel and the United States is clear. Economic, military and ideological support of the United States for Israel is undeniable."[27] Both nations had strategic interests during the late 70's throughout the early 90's that coincided with the favorable coverage of those interests by the news media. During this time different rhetoric and language were used to define war, relationships, violence, threats, and so on. This was seen in many different creative lenses; newspapers, propaganda, music (folk, rap, and pop), the internet and social media. Through these means, the foundation of how Israel was seen in Western eyes and ears was established. This was important for the United States because Israel was seen as an important

---

[26] "Not Just News Corp.: Media Companies Have Long Made Political Donations." *OpenSecrets Blog*, 23 Aug. 2010.

[27] Jalbert, Paul. "'News Speak' about the Lebanon War." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1984, pp. 17.

ally, and especially under the Nixon Doctrine, "Israel [became] a strategic asset."[28] This was a

milestone in the relationship between Israel and the United States, which was seen globally.

The continuing relationship between Israel and the neighboring states of Egypt, Jordan,

and Syria have been apparent through literature, history books, media and have been used as a

case study in comparing other neighboring conflicts around the world. The United States role

since the Six-Day War has been as a vital ally for Israel when situations go bad or when conflicts

arise. With each conflict or event that occurs whether or not directly involving the United States,

the bond between Israel and the U.S grows, therefore reinforcing pre-existing interests and

rhetoric about Israel. For instance, the signing of the Declaration of Principles on Interim

Self-Government Arrangement (also known as the Oslo Accords) in 1993 demonstrates how the

United States plays a powerful role in guiding the world, with a bias towards Israel. Later sharing

a narrative that the United States has been trying to create about Israel and the relationship they

share.

The Oslo Accords is an agreement formed on the basic guideline for negotiations in

regards for the Palestinian Interim self-government in Gaza and the West Bank. Further

explaining the measurements for the transfer of Israeli military government to authorize

Palestinians. Secretary of State James Baker under President Ronald Reagan stated during the

1990's urging both sides (Israel and Palestinian) "threw up his hands in frustration and advised

the parties to "call us . . . when you are serious about peace."[29] The Clinton administration was

serious about peace, even if that meant using tactics that were not always looked at as beneficial.

For the most part, the tactics of terrorism and violence are what undid the diplomacy of the

---

[28] Ibid., *From Colony to Superpower: U.s. Foreign Relations Since 1776 pp.* 801.
[29] Diehl, Jackson. "The Peace Process Paradox." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 13 Apr. 2014.

Clinton administration. In turn, setting up the language and guidance of not only the war on terror but the meaning of peace. These tactics were promoted, informed and documented all throughout the world through media. Not too long after, 1994, Clinton was there to see the signing of a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan. After Egypt, Jordan was the second Arab country to sign a peace accord with Israel. The treaty between the two countries settled ongoing debates prior, meaning basic trade/tourism, water disputes, and ownership. As well as making an effort to find a solution to the long-standing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Any negotiations during this period failed, as is seen during the Lebanon War. Winning the softness and hearts of many Israeli citizens during the Clinton administration. Peace was a major theme in the late 1990's, the early 2000s. As the grasping on the war on terror just begins, a movement for nonviolent rhetoric started back up again.

During the 2000 period, President George W. Bush in office broadcasts a "roadmap for peace." The Roadmap for peace was a plan to help resolve and fix the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. In his speech about the Roadmap taking place on the 24th June 2002, Bush state, "Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership so that a Palestinian state can be born. I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror." A lot of the language that was used during this speech was looked at as suitable because of the factors of 9/11, using words like; fear, terror, and security. This was also seen in many news coverage networks when relaying or writing about this speech, in addition to being used in current media coverage, as an example to other speeches. The plan of this speech was to end the violence that was brewing for almost 4 years. Although, the plan was never implemented. The Bush

administration of further implications of this plan was never met. Although, there was a dead-end while trying to find this "roadmap for peace," Bush did not stop there.

During the 2000 period, President George W. Bush in office broadcasts a "roadmap for peace." The Roadmap for peace was a plan to help resolve and fix the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. In his speech about the Roadmap taking place on the 24th June 2002, Bush state, "Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership so that a Palestinian state can be born. I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror." A lot of the language that was used during this speech was looked at as suitable because of the factors of 9/11, using words like; fear, terror, and security. This was also seen in many news coverage networks when relaying or writing about this speech, in addition to being used in current media coverage, as an example to other speeches. The plan of this speech was to end the violence that was brewing for almost 4 years. Although, the plan was never implemented. The Bush administration of further implications of this plan was never met. Although, there was a dead-end while trying to find this "roadmap for peace," Bush did not stop there.

Bush spoke on the violence that took place in the summer of 2006, the Lebanon War which shaped world opinion through many Western and Israeli news outlets. Although American soldiers were not involved in the battle that took place in Lebanon, the United States was nonetheless a crucial player in the war. The Bush administration rhetoric attracted much attention in the Western news, as it drafted much of language used for the war. The United States rhetorical support allowed an advantage for Israel. Using language that consistent with past American documentation involving conflicts, war, and security. The bond that the United States and Israel share has existence for a long time and therefore recognized and generally accepted,

even in Western Media. Since most people do not have the time or the ability to find out directly what governments are going, on a day-to-day basis, they must rely on Western media to inform them. We turn now to the most important way in which media has been founded in Western news media; language and rhetoric.

One may ask whether this articulation of the United States presence in the Middle East fully reflects American interests in the region. Western media altered perceptions of the war, as well as facts in many different occasions, in reports, newspapers, and articles. I argue that the language, rhetoric, and medium promoted during the Lebanon War in both domestic and international media has greatly shaped the political understanding and public opinion of the state of Israel. This has allowed many benefits not only for the political system of Israel but for the United States as well. It has been noted in many foreign reports that the American audience has a favoritism toward Israel, in contrast to other Middle Eastern regimes. Is the American media biased in support of Israel over Lebanon? Why does the American news media portray Lebanon in such a negative light compared to Israel? Who is controlling the overall message? Is there bias in the coverage of the Lebanon War? Perhaps the biggest issue in these questions is the inability to convey the complexity of these issues. We must question, but seek full and complete answers, considering context and evidence.

Part 2:

Portrayal in American Media

American media has attempted to cement itself as global media, reporting on news from all over the world. The "hegemony" of American news has been criticized, and for good reason--bias, ignorance, and unfamiliarity may lessen the quality of reporting. These sources are not inherently biased, though one should always question the credibility of a source. This becomes important when addressing the prolonged conflict of the second Lebanon War. The immediacy of news dissemination and the polarization of networks in modern climate does not offer viewers alternative perspectives that might clarify the reality of the situation. Viewpoints are no longer informed by the news but rather reaffirmed. This comfortable content is why much of the media bias in America is ignored and globally, people are left to create their own opinion of Israeli society and the idea of war based on dubious facts and opinions. Despite media outlets such as CNN, Fox, ABC News, etc. having a negative reputation for being dramatic and distorted, they continue to be relied upon as a source of factual, credible information. Audiences increasingly seem to prioritize confirmation over credibility. Because of this sensibility, facts are less important to the viewer than fascinating, misleading information.

Demographically, media organizations have reached out to specific audiences with parallel ideologies, which perpetuates an inherent problem in media coverage. The audience plays an important role in the narratives presented by the news outlets. Each news station pushes divergent narratives in order to draw in viewers with a similar mindset to the organization. With

regards to the media coverage of Israel, this bias has been seen to affect and shape the way the nation-state of Israel is viewed. Media coverage of Israel was planned and organized deliberately by the unofficial oligarchy of press that has been in place since the birth of these news stations, and potentially, the state itself. Media discussing or portraying the violence of the Lebanon War took many forms, highlighting on major terms like terrorism and nationalism. This is observable in all different realms of television including reality shows, documentaries, commercials, and so on.

It is impossible to imagine politics without the insidious influence of Western media. During the Lebanon War, Western media allowed for politics to become a central theme in the understanding of the conflict between Israel and Hezbollah. This war was viewed as a live war, presented on screen for gruesome entertainment and consumption. Media coverage of the Lebanon War was significant for many reasons including: live reporting, imagery, and for the West, the exoticized footage. For one of the first times, Western networks were communicating the raw reality of the foreign front. As images were being broadcast of the destruction in the lives and homes of the South Lebanese. Most documentation of the bombings and damage was conveyed live through Western media. This, though explicit and biased on news media, allowed many American people to shape their own opinions and figure out the inherent "hegemony" in Western coverage of wars. This was partly due to the advancement and democratization of technology during this period. Repetition, however, is influential in forming biases among audiences; without analysis and on-the-ground footage, there is a loss of the authenticity of media coverage. In this case, media coverage was live and on-the-ground footage. Those stations that tried for the most authentic reporting were able to avoid this repetition and deliver more

unbiased journalism. This was a moment where basic human rights laws were clearly being broken on camera, in photographs and news footage. The understanding of the reality of war, before the 24-hour-news-cycle, stemmed from newspapers and other printed forms of publication. This format remains important, nevertheless, for its influence among the political elite and ability to set the agenda for most leading broadcast networks in the United States.

Americans gather their news from three main sources; television (ABC, NBC, FOX, etc.); newspapers (*The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, etc.); and the internet (social media, twitter, instagram, etc.). These three forms of public information-spreading follow a strict guideline from a historical document ratified in 1789. All three of these main sources follow the First Amendment of the Constitution:

> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."
>
> --The First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

The First Amendment is understood to be the first set of documentation to carry out the framework of a narrative established in Western media. Freedom of the press is codified in the First Amendment as one of the first principles of a democratic government. That alone says volumes about the utility of Western media. Without freedom of press, investigative journalists could be blocked, forcing citizens to rely on information provided by the government and politicians. However, it is important to remember that what is considered "newsworthy" is influenced by the rhetoric of a nation's foundation and its leaders. Yet this rhetoric continues to be bent, twisted, and so later amended, that traditional language plays a significant role in understanding the root of a nation. In this context, a nation refers to the collective feeling of a

group mentality based on political borders. When addressing coverage in media, especially that of a prolonged war such as the Lebanon War, it becomes important to note traditional and classical language that the West has perhaps prescribed as "right," but may not practice in its own news reporting.

Traditional language in media has remained a rather important factor in how Western media expresses the development and reasoning behind the Israeli political action relating to the government, citizens, and ideologies. Literature has allowed judgments and stereotypes in the representation of Israeli citizens and neighboring countries. In the coverage of the Lebanon War, literature was a key factor to understanding warfare. However, images circling around of the horrors in the war were also important, as it allowed viewers and audiences to process one image: war. Images leave impressions on the public, since there appears to be no room for falsifying images, as there may be in text. The text includes a wide range of formats in news media, including dialogue, analysis of and the recording of speeches, and the ideologies shared by journalist/anchors.

It is this kind of language and rhetoric in Western media that changes the way people look at anyone who is different than them or that does not hold their ideologies. This was major concern for audience members during the Lebanon War, since many Arabs were being victimized. This was not the first conflict, as many instances can be named where Arabs are seen as victimized on Western media outlets. Television and literature have shaped societal norms in the observation of the average American of the state. These norms that have existed inherently in the Western system have been exposed as stereotyping. This exposure of stereotyping makes it clear why some audiences have negative perceptions of Israel. The narratives that have existed

when explaining this conflict may even pass bias and merge into racism. When describing the Arab–Israeli conflict through television, literature plays such a significant role, as judgments have already been made and expressed in news outlets. It is important to view stereotyping and victimization as a tool in attempted creation of narratives through news reporting.

When stereotyping in media (particularly Western media), a specific type of person is represented and expressed in a negative light. Statistically, during a time of war Western news stations tend to roam around the following questions: Who is the aggressor? Who is being victimized? Are they a military or terrorist threat? What are public reactions? It then becomes important to address these questions and their motivation early on, since specific political leaning Western networks tend to follow a specific narrative founded on ideologies that are inherently stereotypical. This dates back to the national existence and one's identity. The well-established history that ties stereotyping and politics is deeply rooted in governmental systems and those who abuse them for their own gain. With that being said, the relationship between the media and general stereotyping is even more complex, due to the innately judgemental nature of humanity based on societal mores. Most of the dialogue presented by Western news stations during the Lebanon conflict was judgmental, with stereotypical behavior being reported on from both sides. Even though these stereotypes (which have been floating around since the creation of various states in the Arab region, if not before) are unfounded, they follow the modern dialogue in Western coverage of war quite closely.. The Lebanese conflict is particularly unique, as much of the footage was presented as live and on-the-ground footage. This was presented in addition to interviews with victims, politicians, and reactions of civilians. This made matters worse for not only the elites that controlled the narratives during the war (leaders and politicians), but for the

world that was forced to recognize the wholly consuming horror that war brings to families, homes, and national identities. Western media outlets during the Lebanon War explored the overall damage and danger that stereotyping in war can do.

The analysis of exploring stereotypes as wartime tool utilized by news stations is extensive. Language and rhetoric shared by news stations have been carefully examined by experts in this field for the occurrence of stereotyping in the media. Although most people have established their own judgments and ideologies through everyday practice, culture, education, society, etc., this becomes problematic in practicing objectivity because of pre-existing notions. Neil J. Kressel examines the "Biased Judgments of Media Bias: A Case Study of the Arab-Israeli Dispute," exploring the analysis of stereotypes in media and their role in political conflict.[30] This is important in understanding the foundation of the ways in which Israel and other Arab countries, like Lebanon, have been represented on-screen. In addition to processing the change in dialogue presented from other comparable cases, like the Six-Day War, Kressel goes on discuss the hundreds of commentaries on the Western media coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict. His research circles around and focuses on the unfair media bias--either against the Arab states compared to Israel, which in fact have all been established by the language and rhetoric of stereotyping since the British Mandate, or vice versa. He goes on to state at the beginning of his research that, among other things, it's important to note that stereotyping has been inherently founded in one's nation and it can't disappear. His goal is to shed light on how to tell when stereotyping is happening through a news station to avoid journalistic bias among audiences. While doing so, he goes on to check, categorize, and test any accusations made about the

---

[30] Kressel, Neil J. "Biased Judgments of Media Bias: A Case Study of the Arab-Israeli Dispute," Political Psychology, vol. 8, no. 2, 1987, pp. 211–227.

Arab-Israeli conflict through literature. Previous literature on Israel's reputation helped to guide

stereotypes, and Kressel concludes that literature is, in fact, foundational to the process of

understanding of Western media.

While changing language, and rhetoric have played an important role in the coverage of

the Lebanon War, the rapid process of linguistic change has also been documented repeatedly in

history. However, many authors in this field like Kressel struggle with finding all the rapid

changes of language in discussions of Israel and its surrounding neighbors since the late 1940's.

They share in a global controversial debate over media unfairness and bias, due to the foundation

of accusations made about the Arab-Israeli conflict through literature and rhetoric. This, in fact,

lead to an "overall vantage point"[31] for the United States when explaining the relationship

between Israel. Since most of the language and rhetoric used by news sources to describe Israel

take their cues from American presidents, government officials and intellectuals, this sheds light

on the divide between progressive and reactionary. This was especially prevalent during the 2006

Lebanon War. A visible divide within the people and the government makes character become

all the more important in spreading an overall message.

Western government and Western media have two different approaches to the character

of Hezbollah. Western media networks, like CNN and Fox News, have been less hesitant in

explaining and understanding Hezbollah compared to a speeches given by those in public office.

After the 1983 bombing of a Marine compound in Beirut Lebanon, "killing 241 United States

service personnel," Western media did not cover an extensive range of Hezbollah's activities

until the 1990's.[32] During the 1990's, the military group Hezbollah was linked to many

---

[31] Ibid.,"Biased Judgments of Media Bias: A Case Study of the Arab-Israeli Dispute," pp. 226.
[32] "Beirut Marine Barracks Bombing Fast Facts." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 18 Oct. 2017.

international attacks, and continuing to grow at the time. This growth and reporting allowing Western news to prepare and understand future events, like the Lebanon War. This was a key point in the understanding of Lebanon's system.

The conceptual framework circling around the narrative presented during the war was founded on coverage before 2006. Consequently, most news stations covering events during the Lebanon War needed to replay pre-existing narratives and history to contextualize the conflict for much of the audience. As many headlines, images and reports were coming out in the summer of 2006, pre-existing information was used to help guide the American public. This, unfortunately, involved the judgments and stereotypes already made on the Arab-Israeli conflict before 2006. The terms used in coverage of the Arab peninsula and surrounding regions were traditionally founded and defined in print journalism, as well as in rhetoric by leaders. However, many Western media stations like Fox, ABC and CNN have begun to change the way viewers distinguish terms. Creating a narrative through news is shown through color, speakers--mostly men--in red or blue clothing with high lighting, precise makeup, and equally careful rhetoric. Reporters and news anchors have decided not just to describe and explain current events, but to "help." In other words, anchors and journalists "help" by getting personal with their ideologies in their news broadcasting. This is where most of the trouble originates from. Since Western news has become a global enterprise, headlines may be anything from "Fake News" to "True Leaked Scandals." This was seen often during the Lebanon War, due to an abundance of public and political opinion. As news media dominates the minds of the public, it shapes perceptions of modern day Israel, which in turn, affects the Israeli economy, culture and community.

The major theme throughout Western media was obvious. Between ABC, CBS and NBC, they covered a total of 258 stories that come out in the first 2 weeks of the war, that is calculating for an average of 18 stories a night.[33] This shows the importance in the West of trying to sort out the many questions this war brought to hand. The pressure of sharing, reporting and publicizing this war was intense, especially for a news outlet foreign to the region of conflict. One might ask, why do some conflicts get more news coverage than others? This pressure within news to cover certain stories more heavily has been established through the ongoing relationship of the United States and Israel. The history that the United States and Israel share is a major component in the "why" and "how" of Israeli conflict. Western news corporations devote their time to broadcasting themes and terms they find to be useful. This perceived utility is based on the political ideologies that networks' reputations share.

Unlike the state of Israel, Hezbollah was a private group, meaning many messages that came out from Hezbollah, from the Western perspective was catered. Looking at each and every Western segment during the war shows the effects of language, historical ties, and culture that war often changes. With many Westen news segments being shared during this war the overall displayed message becomes neglected and overlooked. A careful investigation of who may be controlling the message is a crucial part of understanding their control of the conflict narrative, in what it highlights and disregards. On the other hand, it is important to note that the state of Israel and Hezbollah had no control over the leaks and scandals that came during the war. Programs like ABC and NBC were more critical of Israel than the non-state actor, Hezbollah. The top stories included: 133 segments on discussing Israeli Military Actions, 89 on Hezbollah's

---

[33] Media Monitor (Copyright © 2006). Center for Media and Public Affairs, a nonpartisan and nonprofit research organization.

bombardment, 41 on the plight of United States citizens, 39 on the West's role during the conflict and lastly the least covered with 32 segments, Humanitarian crises. [34] Within the graph presented by Media Monitor,a nonpartisan and nonprofit research organization makes it is easier for the public to see priorities in news coverage during the Lebanon War, for these news outlets at the very least. These three representative channels are noted for leaning towards a more democratic side than organizations such as Fox News. This graph shares the major topics talked and addressed during the Lebanon War from a Western perspective, which will later help guide the underlying terms compared to the highlighted points.

Why are some themes during the Lebanon War considered newsworthy compared to other events? As noted, Israeli military actions were a crucial topic in Western media news during the Lebanon War. Since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, the modern State of Israel has been involved in a series of military operations that have also made headlines in the past. In some cases, these headlines and stories publicize Israel as an aggressor, which hits upon the complex issue of the Israeli Defense League and its actions in the region. During the Lebanon War, Western network correspondents reported on numerous accounts of apparent aggression regarding the Israel Defense Forces' operations. These reports often included clear comments that placed the aggression on the part of Israel, rather than on Hezbollah.

During the comparable Six-Day War between Israel and the entity at the time known as the United Arab Republic (formed through the political union of Egypt and Syria), the question of Israel being the aggressor arose even for the United States, in headlines of newspapers such as *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times.* The time of the Six-Day War, *The Washington*

---

[34] Ibid., Media Monitor (Copyright © 2006).

Post shared a headliner that wrote the following; "Egypt, Syria Accept Ceasefire; Israel Hits

United States Ship, 10 Killed." [35]Headliners intrigue people to keep reading.Questioning the

identity of the aggressor has been seen many times in history, for apparent reasons. This

questioning and assignation of blame occurs not only in news media reports but in the realm of

literature, rhetoric, and in daily communicative life. These other interactions help set a guideline

for the terminology to be used in news reports. Throughout newspapers that have been scanned

and archived, Israel is portrayed as aggressive. The United Nations defines the term "aggressor"

in Article 1 as:

> "[an] armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence
>
> of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set
>
> out in this Definition."[36] --Article I, The United Nations

The term can be misconstrued due to preconceived notions of past conflicts. For example,

the Lebanon War, also known to be the second war due to the continuing history of the first

Lebanon War in 1982, which in fact was started from a long-established tension. Because of

these previous conflicts and coverages, the same rhetoric was used until it was necessary to begin

evolving linguistically to convey the reality of the scenario. This shows that the language and

rhetoric are founded from previous dialogues created by elites, journalists, politicians,

intellectuals, and others in positions of power. The message that was being promoted during the

first Lebanon War was that Israel was trying to harden its attitude towards aggression. This was

in consideration of the United Nations definition, as well as their having previously shown that

behavior during the Six-Day War. However, with that attitude, Israel comes off as controlling a

---

[35] "Newspaper Coverage of the Six-Day War." Jerusalem Center For Public Affairs.
[36] United Nations General Assembly. *A/RES/29/3314 - Definition of Aggression - UN Documents: Gathering a Body of Global Agreements*, www.un-documents.net/a29r3314.htm.

message which is, in a sense, aggressive. This made headlines and changing the way people perceive the state. During the 2006 Lebanon war, coverage was on who was aggressive was interesting, considering the conflict involved a terrorist group. Right away, people can assume who the aggressor is. Although this was not that case, since Israeli military action was the favored narrative of Western news stations, such as ABC and NBC, who took a more of a leftist approach.

The starting themes of coverage on the Lebanon war throughout Western media coverage circled around the military, which in many times can be related to the term "aggressor," particularly because of security in one's nation. The first major report on the network ABC begins with images from the airstrike in Beirut, described by an ABC anchor as "Israel's biggest air strike yet."[37] His voice laid over multiple images of an Israeli airplane crashing into the villages of Lebanon's Mediterranean coast, the report went on to detail and present images of the aftermath of war, including the wounded civilians. "ABC reports then describes Israeli forces moving across the border from Haifa into Lebanon and discusses the risk of a ground invasion with local specialists."[38] Most of the language used in Western news from left-leaning stations since the beginning of the conflict involved the harsh tone of Israel being the aggressor. Only one story on ABC that day involved the "search for diplomatic solutions." Translated by CNN, Secretary-General Kofi Annan is shown in an address to the United Nations Security Council, stating:

> "While Hezbollah's actions are deplorable and, as I've said, Israel has a right to defend itself, the excessive
>
> use of force is to be condemned. But while Israel has stated its military objective is to hit Hezbollah's

---

[37] Cavari, Amnon, and Itay Gabay. "Coverage of Foreign Events on US Local Television News: The 2006 Lebanon War." *Israel Studies Review*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2014, pp. 70.
[38] Ibid., 70.

infrastructure and physical strength, it has, in the words of the Lebanese prime minister, torn the country to

shreds." [39]   --Secretary-General Kofi Annan

CNN has been known for provocative reporting around the term "aggressor," compared

to other stations like Fox. CNN shed light on the rise of terrorist attacks in the 80's, showcasing

the moment when former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher stated in her speech, held at

the Royal Albert Hall in 1985, that we "must try to find ways to starve the terrorist and the

hijacker of the oxygen of publicity on which they depend."[40] The action of terrorism creates a

collective fear among masses of people using violence. This action creates an overall terror in

order to further one's political agenda or achieve a political goal. Terrorists use ideologically

charged methodology of warfare to promoted an overall message, using news and collective

horror to their advantage. However, terrorism comes in many forms. In reality, terrorism can be

perpetrated not only by the individual or the radical splinter group, but by the state itself. State

terrorism has been a major term in the understanding of terrorism and terrorist acts.[41] In media

coverage during the Lebanon War, acts of violence conducted by a state against foreign targets

or against its own people were considered to be terrorist acts. The Lebanese government, in

which Hezbollah was represented, was responsible for harmful acts targeting their own people

for the attainment of a political goal. However, does state terrorism only apply if the violent act

is perpetrated upon their own people? Can a state commit an act of terrorism against a foreign

entity? Although extensive research has been done on state terrorism, the overall nature of the

concept is ambiguous because of the complex nature of terrorism, as well as the traditional and

---

[39]*CNN*, Cable News Network, transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0607/20/lt.02.html.
[40] Apple, R. W. "THATCHER URGES THE PRESS TO HELP 'STARVE' TERRORISTS." The New York Times, The New York Times, 15 July 1985.
[41] Owen, David. "State Terrorism, Internationalism and Collective Action." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1987, pp. 81.

classical language of the term becoming open to question. The speech by Former Prime Minister

Thatcher was announced and discussed on CNN, while Fox did not share and promote the idea

that news plays an important role in the advancement of terrorism and the achievement of their

ultimate goal.[42] News allows exposure to a population within record-breaking time. Without

publicity, a terrorist would have a hard time reaching that global power they crave.

And yet, this was not always the case. Competitors of left-leaning Western news stations

like Fox News sent a different message to their target audience. This message was mostly framed

around the the pressure of war, and how it was exerted upon Israel. Regarding the previous

research, economic pressure was applied through donors exerting their influence over networks

and therefore allowing a different narrative of Israel to be spread: a narrative the American

government wanted to frame. There are a variety of ways to define such a conflict-- for example,

those based on religion and martyrdom, along with the number of natural biases that linger

around the conflict due to the existing factors including; history, ideologies, and people who are

uninformed or misinformed. Once a news stations posts a segment, it becomes hard to rescind or

redact information. When a story is shared, information and ideology spread like a potentially

positive disease.

At the same time, ABC was communicating the tragic event that took place in Beirut by

focusing on the use of visuals to connect the audience with these events. Fox News presented an

article, with no attached image, titled "Israeli Troops Battle Hezbollah Guerrillas in Lebanon,"

which raises concerns on "legitimacy."[43] Proving legitimacy or in fact, justify the war in news

---

[42] Ibid., "THATCHER URGES THE PRESS TO HELP 'STARVE' TERRORISTS."
[43] "Israeli Troops Battle Hezbollah Guerrillas in Lebanon." Fox News, FOX News Network, July 20, 2006.

media can be a discourse tool in understanding any violence during a conflict. Fox shared an article in the middle of the conflict which claimed that "Israel's U.N. Ambassador Dan Gillerman told CNN his country would not comment about the attack until it is sure of all the facts." However, "he added, 'I can assure you that we know exactly what we hit. ... This was no religious site. This was indeed the headquarters of the Hezbollah leadership.'"[44] Not only is important to take away the overlapping happening between the communication from the network to network but Fox news portrayal of Israeli force was vastly different than politically left-leaning stations. As Fox's reporting on the conflict acted as if violence can be a responsible response. This shares the kind of pressure that circulates around war. Later concluding that "Israel has mainly limited itself to attacks from the air and sea, reluctant to send in ground troops on terrain dominated by Hezbollah."[45] The usage of the word "reluctant" is very powerful in making impression on the public. The word itself is influential and well protected. Meaning safe and unwilling to go against the role of law. The overall principle of a nationhood. This has not only been throughout the coverage done by the ABC News team but by the address to the United Nations Security Council on television that Israel attacks on Southern Lebanon have been not only aggressive but " the excessive use of force is to be condemned."[46] The difference in coverage is crucial in understanding the fact, which later alters public ideologies, as well as reaction. This will then later help solve violent reaction, in view of the fact that a nation is aiming for a non-violent community. Seeing that, much material and research have been available to explore.

---

[44] Ibid,. "Israeli Troops Battle Hezbollah Guerrillas in Lebanon."
[45] Ibid,. "Israeli Troops Battle Hezbollah Guerrillas in Lebanon."
[46] Ibid., *CNN*, Cable News Network.

Although, it becomes challenging when all material gathered follows into a specific category and group or in the case of media, fixed audiences. This category is composed of two major opposing sides centralizing around policies. Who is controlling the message throughout the conflict is a recurring question that should be asked when talking about the Lebanon war. As the questions that follow included; Is the information provided by news stations correct? Or are news stations projecting an existing narrative that follows no change or progress in that nation? Figuring out who controlled these specific questions in news media, whether or not, influenced by journalists, political figures, intellects, elites, etc., allows and seeks to explore the major divide between two splitting ideologies shared in Western news, later seen and noted in Israeli news. The overall message during the Lebanon war was the role force and terror had on the many communities. This calls for a realization that even though there was a massive divide within communities and neighboring communities, there's an overall message lingering throughout news stations reports on the Lebanon war, alarming the concerns of leaving an unresolved conflict. This became important in understanding the coverage of the Lebanon war as an unresolved conflict.

Throughout coverage, many news networks had to cover the deeply-rooted causes to the 2006 Lebanon war. However, that unique history dates so far back that even the origins of the causes can be problematic. Nevertheless, trying to figure out the how a network explains the foundation of the Lebanon war allows for a clearer knowledge of the conflict and the ideologies that specific network favors. Seen in previous data, most Western coverage segments pulls rakes in favoring the opinions of audience members that share similar beliefs on what a nation's society should consume socially, economically, and politically. Meaning controlling fixed

narratives inherently imagined through previously established beliefs. This is how news stations are steering questions, dialogue and message. The ideologies shared by a specific network can be used as clues to explain why networks like ABC and Fox News are so different. Allowing this kind of system happen within networks, creates different reactions globally. Public reactions to events and conflict like the Lebanon war creates different perceptions of the issuing state at hand. In this case, the Lebanon war shared a reaction to mourning and loss due to the violence manifesting. Looking into the reactions that the collective public had shown not only the change in the reaction of the people but the future plans that will help create non-violent and or peaceful reactions.

Reactions

On Wednesday, December 6th, 2017, Western and Israeli news stations were reporting the words of the President of the United States, Donald Trump, "Today we finally acknowledge the obvious: that Jerusalem is Israel's capital...This is nothing more or less than a recognition of reality. It is also the right thing to do. It's something that has to be done."[47] The reaction to this turning point in history was memorable. Most extreme reactions from the public can alter the upcoming elections, as well as turning to media criticism. This too may be understood as a partisan, political tool. Public reaction to news coverage in the early 1970's was very different to how the public reacts to conflict and events, like the Lebanon war. As previously argued here, language has changed and news stations have become more strategic, which has caused Israel to

---

[47] Landler, Mark. "Trump Recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's Capital and Orders U.S. Embassy to Move." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 6 Dec. 2017.

suffer great social political and economic consequences. This example shows that when a leader shares a significant and shocking news, the public can react in many different ways. In this case, there was a violent reaction to this news coming from not only the Middle East but the West as well. With the enlightenment of Trump announcement of recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital, which was broadcasted and shared through many different lenses in Western media, similar extreme reaction came from the West. Language shared by the public reactions will help guide the tone media set on the public, meaning fearful, sad, uniting, etc. Sparking recurring question such as; what tone does the media set for the public? This is also guided by the for different formats in sharing a specific narrative and rhotic; speeches, public reaction, media. Trump administration, caused major reactions, as did the Lebanon war.

Reactions in the West during the Lebanon war were significant in understanding the morality of war. Looking at previous data on the Lebanon war, images showed were horrifying and fearful. This documentation of reactions to this conflict was crucial since the technology provided was advanced compared to other terrorist attacks beforehand, like World War II. The Lebanon war was comparable different, as there were videotapes present on the screen of bombing and photos of the wounded or dead. Intellectuals say that the outcome of reaction would have been significantly different if images and videotaping did not appear on the screen.

Greg Philo and Mike Berry hosted a study to see how people would respond to world affairs involving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which in fact can be comparable to the images shared during the Lebanon war. Their studies show that "the media is a key source of information, so one dimension of our study is to analyze how people respond to images and to

examine the condition under which they accepted or rejected what they heard or saw."[48] They

also look into how people reacted to messages provided by networks. The methods used and the

questions asked the group of subjects were very influential to the documentation of changing

reaction over time. As they went over images of events people may have heard about through

American media. There are many different mediums to the questions that are asked and it is

fascinating to inspect the different types of people that establish "this level of trust,"[49] with the

seemingly elitist and popular media sources. As much as people like to trust what is being shared

with the public, a lot of the time, segments are getting cut due to censorship or specific dialogue

and narrative that needs to be followed. As what is being presented does not offend the audience

that the television network is reaching out to or that might risk losing their audience. The method

that the study uses has been found to be very beneficial when researching on public reaction and

opinion. There is evidence of a shift in public opinion, mostly generational towards Israel and the

conflicts that surround this holy land.

Reactions that viewers had while watching or reading events in Israel from late 1940's to

modern day event through American or Israeli news have changed the perceptions of people,

which can be seen in the research of looking at public reaction. As well as how those viewers

reactions might have caused the shaping of modern day Israel. It is important to look into how

the public reaction has changed over time. Collective reaction in a community has been a crucial

factor in the components of what television is airing and coveraging the understanding of modern

day Israel. Researching a study like Philo and Berry might allow a new perspective on the

---

[48] Philo, Greg, and Mike Berry. "Why Does It Happen?" More Bad News From Israel, Pluto Press, London, 2011, pp. 278.
[49] Ibid., 279.

conflicts involving the sacred land. Creating an in-depth research to the changes of people's reactions, events, and political goal can share a broader picture to the shaping of the Modern day Israel. Additionally creating the foundation to the Modern day Israel through the lens of Western media coverage.

Reaction to western coverage of the Lebanon war were notable. As much tension rise between the United States government and the American people. News media outlets and the ideologies they promote can be considered positive and informative in many ways, especially when trying to reconcile what is going on in the world. But overall mysteries within news media circulates around the factors of manipulation, control, and power but the elites of society in America, public reactions have become crucial in investigating the dilemma in news debates. This is founded on the hierarchical system that lies within the strategic movies in news stations. In knowing these news stations are becoming harder to trust, especially with all major stations like CNN and Fox News having reputations of representing untrustworthy news. Although, this shows a deeper meaning to how language is changing, as well as being recycled and even though the public views it as untruthful at times, it becomes more complex with such a subjective subject at hand, in this case, the Lebanon war. Through each Western news station, the American people will keep seeing ideologies being presented by these elites behind the camera, as some ideological messages can be considered negative and untruthful, much can be learned and informed and are where truth can be held.

News stations are having a hard time with telling truthful facts since much information changes within seconds of reporting it. As previously stated during the Lebanon war Western news networks averaged 18 segments a night for the 34-day conflict. That's why it becomes

important in seeing if anchors use words like "alleging," "possible," and "appears." Who during the Lebanon war was portrayed as a "possible" aggressor? Although, Western coverage of the Lebanon war was divided by the political ideologies viewers had. This has been a recurring concern in the covering news. Since many of times, news teams are presenting an overall picture and message they which to cater. The approach these news teams take is developed by the time period, political aims, daily practices, etc. Including the terms presented by major influential and charismatic leaders. These terms presented in stories, motives, speeches, and dialogue influence one's ideological beliefs and behavior. What the news teams are putting out to the public has become more complex over time, as new ideologies, evidence, reports are coming out. Surprisingly enough, even though terrorism has become more complex over time due to media, the public reaction has changed plenty. Meaning Western reaction to terrorism is becoming more neutral.

Western news framework of international conflicts has circulated as a global audience in understanding the idea of war. Looking into the way Western news portrayed the Lebanon war sheds light the way a state comes to be, providing background, current and future aims, media has been beneficial. However, one must look at how the Lebanon war was portrayed through the lens of the holy land. As it would formulate and break down the perspective that valuable in understanding the conflict of war.

Part 3:

Portrayal in Israeli Media

Western news media has maintained a global reach around the world in catering to the

important role in the understanding Israel. Nonetheless, looking at the perspective of those close

to the conflict can help in breaking down the idea behind the war. Israeli media during the

Lebanon War was paramount in grasping the horror that conspired from the preexisting history

between the Arab states. The foundation to news media is rooted in literature, as well as the

progression of language and rhetoric when describing Israel as a modern nation-state. The

language used across Western media to explain origins of Israel as a Nation-State is a foundation

for mass communication from within one's living room. When describing the Arab–Israeli

conflict happening on the television screen, literature plays a significant role, as new stream

judgments have already been made from history. In light of such judgments, history becomes

important in showing the controls and regulations Israeli media has to comply with. The

literature provided on the visual framing of news coverage on conflicts and events suggests that

media from different cultural and political perspectives create different images of war and

conflict. This is why it becomes important in looking at how conflicts like the Lebanon war are

understood and learned from.

The history of the press in Israel began in the early 1860's, during the Ottoman Empire.

The media of Israel follows the Basic Laws of Censorship which cater to the development of

Israel's modern society. The laws of Censorship play a crucial role in what is being covered and

said in Israeli news, especially when relating to violence and horror. The country's legal

framework is centered around media freedom, as it is "strongly protected in Israel. While the

basic laws on human rights do not include freedom of speech, the Supreme Court has affirmed

the freedom of expression is an essential component of human dignity."[50] The legal

documentation in place in Israel's Declaration of Independence 1948. The Declaration of the

establishment of the state of Israel, states:

> "it will be based on freedom, justice, and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel; it will
>
> ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race, or
>
> sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education, and culture; it will safeguard
>
> the Holy Places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United
>
> Nations."[51] --Israel's Declaration of Independence.

There are many resembling factors between the United States Constitution and Israel's

Declaration of Independence. Although, Israel's Declaration of Independence never uses the

word "freedom of the press," there are similar comparisons between both documents. As

freedom of the press plays an important role in both societies political, social and cultural

perspective on Israel.

There is much pressure on freedom of the press on the society of Israel. In fact, due to

many ongoing conflicts in Israel, media outlets are forced into gag orders or censorship.

Recently, Israel took extreme measures into banning Al Jazeera. As Israel took steps into closing

its Jerusalem office and asking specific news networks not to broadcast al-Jazeera due to

restrictions created by the government of Israel. Al Jazeera responds to Israel's bid to silence the

network by stating that "Al Jazeera stresses that it will watch closely the developments that may

---

[50] Navot, Suzie. *The Constitution of Israel: a Contextual Analysis*. Hart Publishing, 2014.
[51] Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

result from the Israeli decision, and will take the necessary legal measures towards it. The network also reiterates that it will continue covering news and events in the occupied Palestinian territories."[52] Al Jazeera is known for its critiquing on Israel, with their famous slogan, "The Opinion and The Other Opinion." Al Jazeera was changing the conversation happening between the network and the audience, which was never seen in Arabic news. At many of times, it was seen as provocative, as the traditional language was used but criticized and analyzed differently in defining the Lebanon war. Al Jazeera has been known for relaying information that is hostile to the West government and Israel, since its bias approach. However, American news media networks such as, CNN have influenced stations like Al Jazeera. Many viewpoints between the two outlets overlap in constructing a narrative of a progressive and open to change. Meaning the language used between CNN, ABC, NBC is very similar to the communication on Al Jazeera. These specific ideologies these open-minded networks bring warning to Israel's legislature, administration, and judiciary systems, in fears of challenging tradition, culture, and society.

As the pressure increased for the state of Israel, the pressure for Israeli news disclosing information grew. During the war, it becomes harder for Israeli networks to expose much about Hezbollah and the secrets of Israel, especially since the rapid pace of Western media coverage. However, Israeli news stations had many foreign advantages including the access to the on-the-ground footage. Many of times, during a rapid war like the Lebanon war, media has a hard time keeping up with the timeline. As much was being leaked and rumors were spreading fast, Israeli media had a harder time, as much that was published was unsubstantiated information. This is based on the rapid pace of information being shared by not only by the news

---

[52] Jazeera, Al. "Al Jazeera Statement on Israel's Plan to Ban Network." *News | Al Jazeera*, Al Jazeera, 7 Aug. 2017.

but by political leaders. As time can be considered valuable, as well as beneficial for the government, hierarchical figures in television and re-electing officials. The importance of time has not only been crucial for elite figures but for studies, to be used as constructive for political gain. In many of cases, leaders feel obligated to respond right away to the issue at hand, were unfinished knowledge is produced. The rate of coverage historically in Israel allows for a lack of details and oversight. The speed of media is one element to be mindful of in examining news and news bias. Other such elements include targeted demographics and manufactured facts and context. The crosswind of the reality versus perception of Israeli news will be a central observation in this research, since it has been seen the altering photograph of photographs and images during the Lebanon war.

A woman documenting her time and memories in Israel during the 2006 Lebanon war, wrote an article called, "Writing Memories of the Present: Alternative Narratives about the 2006 Israeli War on Lebanon." During her exploration in digging out the harsh truth within war and a nation's identity, she states, "unable to operate normally, we spent those long summer days repeatedly trying to reach our families and friends in Lebanon by phone, and obsessively following the details of the attacks that were being covered around-the-clock by Arabic TV stations and newspapers."[53] Sharing this information, allows people in the West to understand what it was like in Israel. This perspective is often avoided and unrecognized, especially in foreign news reporting of conflicts, like the Western portrayal of the Lebanon War. Even though, both sides share an extensive amount of coverage on the war, mortality was different in Israel since its mainly regarding a conflict centering around their homeland.

---

[53] Fadda-Conrey, Carol N. "Writing Memories of the Present: Alternative Narratives about the 2006 Israeli War on Lebanon." *College Literature*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2010, pp. 160.

Bard College premiered a film on Wednesday, April 25th, *Taste of Cement.*[54] The director was born in Syria in 1981. This is important to note because it shares the perspective and culture this narrative is founded on. *Taste of Cement* portraits the workers in exile during the Lebanon War. The documentary shared images and photos in Israeli news of workers in Beirut getting bombed by the state of Israel. The nightmares of this documentary used evidence in Israeli news to shed light on the past and future this war caused to the Lebanon people. As well as the reputation, it has created on the relationship between the Israeli people and government. Since the Israeli people had much emotion to the horror happening to their surrounding neighbors. Family and friends circle around the Middle East and in many of times that is forgotten when conflicts flare. Although, Israeli news catered to an image of emotion. The aftermath of the Lebanon War was represented in the documentary, *Taste of Cement*. Showing the overall danger, a conflict like the Lebanon War can bring to a nation and surrounding societies. The images of workers shared in this film are vivid and powerful. Leaving the audience in shock to the terror the state of Israel caused on a nation. However, using the perspective of the Israeli people captured on Israeli news.

The competitor to Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya shares a more cautious approach to defining conflict than the outspoken group. Al Arabiya is a modern news channel, financed by a Saudi businessman. In their coverage during the Lebanon war, the language used was very different from other networks, such as Al Jazeera. As Al Jazeera played a similar role to the left-leaning Western news stations. However, the documentation happening in Israeli sources during the time of the Lebanon war was not divide. This divide was seen on Western channels, like Fox News,

---

[54] Kalthoum, Ziad. "Taste of Cement." Taste of Cement, Wordpress.

were coverage was placed on themes relating to Hezbollah, circling around terrorism, Israeli civilians and defense. Including the complications that war inherently brings to a nation, rotating around the word "pressure." Different from Fox News, Al Arabiya had a different approach to constructing the breakdown of the conflict. Both Fox News and Al Arabiya has a very similar curious style and tone in covering events in the past. As well as sharing a collective audience. However, during the war, the language that was shared by Al Arabiya fell close to the elements of Al Jazeera using the same formatting and stylistic choices. Do war and violence bring nations together? If so, does war bring news stations together? Disregarding the political divide in ideological beliefs and sharing the damage war can bring to one's nation and neighboring countries.

Looking between different political leaning Israeli networks, there was major dialogue circling around the themes on military defense by Israel and the damage it can have on families and victims, as the "aggressor." As well as recognizing the opposing side as a terrorist organization with violent intent. Families of the victims described conflicts like these as in Al Jazeera as an "act of pure evil." Circling around the terms evil and war crimes. As for news stations like Al Arabiya, which has a very similar approach to Fox News, reported on themes closer to Al Jazeera, regarding Israel as the "aggressor." Switching back and forth between the two networks covering the war made it clear on the violence that is surrounding their land. The communication happening between Israel networks was shocking, as there was a united front within the news and people.

Israeli networks came together in describing this event. This was different from what was seen in the West when tackling the complexity of the Lebanon war. In the foundation of news

stations, there lies an inherent divide. This divide was seen and noted by viewer's political

ideologies and what segments were being watched. This notable divide was also seen in Israeli

news stations but not as heavy as the West. This everlasting problem of a divided community is

seen within news media and reaction. Networks differ considerably in coverage content and

terms, relating to their audience, viewpoints, and donations. However, that was disregarded

during the Lebanon war. Much weight of the conversation happening between Israeli news

outlets was sharing dialogue between victims, including images of the horror war creates on

one's society. This was not the case in the Western media portrayal of the Lebanon war. The

conversation consisted of the divide between two political agenda, as many war conflicts bring

when questioning the aim of a nation.

However, in Israeli media portrayal, there was a collective image happening between

networks, a communication and understanding within the community of the Israeli people. A

message that was being promoted through the camera; The mourning and uniting of a

community, even if their own state Israel was marked as being the "aggressor." Most Israeli

coverages focused on the death of Lebanese children and women, concluding the tragic

devastation war can bring, posting headlines: "Mental scars from the 2006 Lebanese War."[55]

This article shares the unforgettable events that took place during the summer of 2006. As well

as dialogue that took place between two people living in Lebanon during the time, "Something is

wrong. They are going to bom--," before he could finish his sentence, the deafening sound of a

bomb could be heard. Jido immediately embraced me while repeating a prayer in my left ear to

soothe my anxiety. My anxiety that led me to the bathroom with my hands covering my mouth.

---

[55] "Mental Scars from the 2006 Lebanese War." *Al Arabiya English*.

My anxiety that made me leave my Jido's embrace. My protector."[56]This heartbreaking dialogue shows the complications war can bring to not only a nation but a family. This article also includes before and after pictures of the violent scenes that took place not only on the streets of Lebanon but homes. Not only were they written about but, these visual images were being presented on the camera as well as bring on personal interviews. This was a notable approach for the viewer and audience, especially when comparing in-person dialogue to reading it. This way emotion and fear can be seen visible to the audience and viewer dissimilarity different between to a reader. As Western media was figuring out the goal for Israeli military action, Israel was coming together as a nation. People grouping together in nations can be dangerous in a governmental system. This was seen when looking at reactions from audiences and viewers in regards to the Lebanon war.

The communication presented to the public and news anchors was powerful during the Lebanon war. The dialogue between the victims, families, and friends of individuals located by Israel was reported in Israeli news. Was this a cry for help? Was Israeli news media outlets targeting a Western audience? Does this put blame on the overall history surrounding Israel? These questions are important in asking when looking at the images the Israeli news presented during the Lebanon war. As well as the statements and dialogue of individuals affected by the conflict. Which consisted of themes regarding the major loss of many family homes, the significant amount of injuries of the innocent, and the trauma these wars can bring to any nation. Political correctness was seen in the language and rhetoric provided by the Israeli people.

---

[56] Ibid., "Mental Scars from the 2006 Lebanese War."

Sharing the tension between Al Jazeera and the Israeli government, Al Jazeera had a similar approach to the conflict, sharing reports on the death and destruction on the Lebanon war. Allocating similar messages, as headlines for Al Jazeera read; "Coming to grips with the fear of war in Lebanon."[57] As stated above, "fear" was a recurring term throughout all news but mostly used in Israeli news teams portrayal of the Lebanon war. Arab news stations team wanted to spread a message that promoted an overall uniqueness. There was no divide seen when promoting terms and messages, as like the Western news portrayal of the Lebanon war. This article by Al Jazeera tackles questions including; where does fear stems from? What does it mean to fight for power? How can the balance of powers be controlled? Al Jazeera states "Hezbollah has gradually become Lebanon's strongest political and military force, possessing veto power in Lebanon's cabinet and playing the decisive role in elections."[58] This shares the kind of power circling around the Lebanon war and who was documented to be in control of power through media. The communication happening between networks on who is the aggressor of the Lebanon war is important in using and factoring in emotions of the public. This can shift the way one looks and views modern day society of Israel.

Israeli coverage of the Lebanon war was important in seeing the emotion through what was being documented and recorded. Emotion was seen in the tone and voice of the report. This is documentation that is beneficial for the people, in reaching a common ground. This makes the Israeli people feel heard, as the government was shutting them down. Emotions were high in the West but more focused on the defining the problem then the people being hurt and penalized.

---

[57] Khoury, Lisa. "Coming to Grips with the Fear of War in Lebanon."*News | Al Jazeera*, Al Jazeera, 18 Nov.
[58] Ibid., "Coming to Grips with the Fear of War in Lebanon."

Israeli news uniquely allowed the concentration of both emotion and rule of logic to be shown in their narrative on the Lebanon war. This was found to be refreshing, powerful, provocative, etc.

A current study shared by Uri Benzion, Shosh Shahrabani & Tal Shavit examine the emotions people experienced during the Lebanon war. In this study, it explores the changes in perception when imaging war, focusing specifically on the 2006 Second Lebanon War. The study consisted of a "a questionnaire that was distributed among 205 people. Some were from the north and had been directly affected by the rocket attacks; others were from the center of Israel. The questionnaires, based on emotions and perceived risk. The results show significant differences between those living in the north and those in the center of Israel."[59] Reporting the emotional difficulties Israeli citizens had during the conflict. Most Israeli citizens noting their source of education and knowledge on the Lebanon war was significantly influenced by media. This points to the effect that news can have on their everyday lives. The talk about Western media was not at all brought to light during this study. Nevertheless, the take away of the study concludes to the overall collective horror nations with significant differences between its people can face. In addition to showing the mutual anger in the Israeli public towards a government. This data is beneficial in marking the effect news can have on the shaping of one's society. Knowing a population collective emotions has become significant in addressing the reactions to the Lebanon war. These reactions draw enlightenment on the concerns and problems a war can cause a society, like Israel. Including the changing of perspectives of a nation like modern day Israel.

---

[59] Benzion, Uri; Shahrabani, Shosh & Shavit, Tal (2009). Emotions and perceived risks after the 2006 Israel–Lebanon war. *Mind and Society* 8 pp. 21.

Reactions

Reactions to news coverage in Israel during the Lebanon war were significant in understanding the morality and emotion that war can create from one's nation. As reactions to war are very similar, even in different culture regions there is a shared emotion of sadness and sorrow, globally. The Lebanon war created a different atmosphere and energy of the reaction when looking between Israeli and American citizens. The Israeli citizen's response to the coverage of Lebanon was prominent in the understanding of fear, the circled around Israel and its neighbors. As many friends and family that were close by reactions to the bombing were quick and noted. Reaction in the West was frame worked around the idea of feeling sympathy and misfortune for one's nation. Trying to make sense and break down the overall message of conflicts. This reaction was international, but for those close to the horror had a different reaction that emerged. Israeli reactions during the Lebanon war consisted of feeling, emotion, and dialogue.

The Lebanon war was raw. The footage presented in media during the Lebanon war was live. This was a new image for the idea of war which was newly introduced to the world. The truth behind the idea of war was seen. Literature is the foundation to the image of war. However, images and photos made situations real and truth like for a viewer. It was a "shock" and "awe" reaction in the images presented by Israeli news sources during the conflict. The images in many reasons were what made people tune in. Why do such media segments involving violence attract viewers? This made situations worse for the Israeli government and the people. However, this was also seen in the relationship between the United States government and the American people during this time. News and reactions are one of the major concerning factors to why

governments are careful about what is said. Pleasing the people is the aim goal for politicians

that wants to get re-elected. Due to the fear of backlash critic coming from the public about a

leader, military action and political ideologies, catered narratives form. Politicians have the fear

of not being re-elected. In that case, ironically, both reactions in Israel between the government

and the people were circling around the emotion of fear. This collective fear was coming from

both sides. Public reaction from specific media coverage is important to take note of. Just as

equally as leaders reactions to media coverage are important and many leaders in Israel had

much to say about the conflict of 2006.

Israeli reaction to news coverage of the Lebanon War consisted of demonstrations, silent

prayers and moments of coming together. These reactions range from the cause of emotions or in

aims of reaching a political goal. Reaction in Israeli media was documented during the Lebanon

war. As many news stations during the middle of the conflict talked about the "2,500

demonstrators that turned out in Tel Aviv, but many were Israeli Arabs and radical left-wingers

far from the political mainstream. A smaller demonstration in Haifa on Tuesday had to be

postponed because air raid sirens wailed to warn of incoming missiles and protesters scattered to

the shelters."[60] This reaction happened because of the emotion of fear that media coverage

brought during the Lebanon war with live shocking images and videos. It's also important to take

note of who is reacting in this manner. What political party are involved in these demonstrations?

This demonstration was shared not on Western news but Israeli media coverage on the Lebanon

war. This so called "radical left-wingers far from the political mainstream" demonstrators were

shared throughout all different Israeli news networks. Even considering the more cautious Israeli

---

[60] "The Silent Minority." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 28 July 2006.

networks, like Al Arabiya. The divide in what was being covered in the West between opposite

political sides was not seen in Israel coverage. Although what was being covered in terms of

language and rhetoric was similar in regards to the portrayal of the Lebanon war from the

perspective of the Israeli and Western. This was a reaction in which was catered by the horrific

images seen on news stations of victims. This did not only created a reaction from the Israeli

public but for leaders in Israel.

As demonstrations took place and were noted on screen during the Lebanon war,

reactions by leaders were a factor in which viewers need to take into consideration when trying

to grasp the perception of war, later concluding to the understanding the society modern day

Israel has become. Leader's reaction to events is a conversation between major figures. In the

case of the Lebanon war, charismatic leaders like Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah played a

crucial role in news coverage. As both Hezbollah and news stations need each other. Leaders use

television as a way of promoting their message. In better terms, a goal in creating a reaction out

of the people. This goes to show the messiness that can come out of the elite's advantages in

news. Reaction is controlled by the overall message being promoted. During the Lebanon war,

the message that was shared from the Israeli news and public side, was regaining both Hezbollah

and their own state as an aggressor. This was an overall message that was controlled by major

leaders during this time. This is the reaction that Hezbollah wanted; a reaction linking to fear,

awareness, concern, etc.

The political goals that major leaders aimed for during the Lebanon war, were shocking.

In that case, is the overall political goal met? The aftermath that comes from such reactions

represents a nation's society. How a nation reactions to a conflict shapes not only the way one

can look at a state but the overall future for upcoming wars. Israeli news teams helped develop the overall public reaction happening in the midst of this conflict. The reaction that occurred by the Israeli people was backed up by Israeli news stations. The overall goal for a politician, terrorist, demonstrators, protesters, etc. is to grab an audience attention. There is no way everyone in the world could be there visually seeing it but they can watch it and replay it in the leisure of one's home. It is impossible to fully imagine an individual's experiences of war, if not there. However, war brings about all different emotions, including; fear, shame, anger, love, grief, guilt, etc. These emotions were brought to light in the Israeli coverage of the Lebanon war and the reaction of the people.

The collective emotion circling around the Lebanon war was represented by Israeli news teams and citizens. This divide seen in Western media coverage was shockingly not seen in Israeli coverage of the Lebanon war. The collective framework of unity coming from the Israeli people was powerful. On the other hand, Western coverage during the Lebanon war was divided. Even though, the language used by Israeli news teams originated off the bases of Western thought. Comparing these two news outlets portrayals of the Lebanon war interprets a dialogue and communications occurring between two societies. This being said, the guidance of news helps in formulating comparisons and differences in the perspective of war and conflict. This becomes worthy of not only understand different perspectives but learning from the provided background. In hopes to benefit the overall message of war. As well as the understanding the society of Israel and how it become to be. Seeking out information relating to the Lebanon war between Israel and the United States is best educated through the news. Considering the access to news compared to intellectual research documents in regards to the Lebanon war. Comparing the

two news outlets knowledge on the conflict sets up the universal picture of Israel, surrounding

neighboring, war crimes, terrorism, and innocent victims.

Conclusion

When looking at both Western and Israeli news outlets during the Lebanon war, it indicates that media from different cultural and political perspectives create different images of war and conflict, which later creates different reactions in communities. However, most of the rhetoric circled around Western ideologies and thought. Israeli and Western portrayal of the Lebanon war documented not only the notable hierarchical system happening in news broadcasting but the way a culture can document war compared to another way of life. This is seen through the different political leaning networks globally. Seeking out the best way to relay facts, messages and terms will allow a progressive future for media. Allowing a better knowledge in case of a "next time."

A decade after the Lebanon War 2016, *The Washington Post* shared an article called, "Ten years after last Lebanon War, Israel warns next one will be far worse."[61] Addressing the concerns on when the next conflict could unfold and how important it is to never forget the kind of devastating behavior that can arise anytime. Also, sharing the importance media will play if there is an act for the third Lebanon War; both sides communicate "with each other through the media."[62] Writing for the 10-year anniversary of the Lebanon War reshapes the image that is still alive in the videos and images that were recorded since then. One might ask, why comparing two friendly networks together like the West and Israel would be beneficial in seeing differences during the Lebanon War. However, these two media sources share a very common rhetoric that needed to be further explored. This will share the overall idea that language in media no matter

---

[61] Booth, William. "Ten Years after Last Lebanon War, Israel Warns next One Will Be Far Worse." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 23 July 2016.
[62] Ibid,. "Ten Years after Last Lebanon War, Israel Warns next One Will Be Far Worse."

where in the world have a similar way of explaining and defining war and conflict. Though it's important to note that the reaction from these two culturally different nations is vastly unlike.

From the start of the Lebanon War, both media outlets had almost identical language when switching between the Western and Israeli news sources. The term aggressor was a recurring theme and term that was defined and recognized by both media outlets. This recurring thought of war was started and founded by the major political leaders circling around the Lebanon War. The images and videos that were shared during the war of victims and destruction, aired a message of violence that was acknowledged on both sides in media. This is a moment to take notice of since in many times of war many outlets did not see eye to eye. However, this notable divide occurring in Western media stands for the inherent concern in media when covering war and conflicts especially regarding a case with such a brutal history. This history helped guide the rhetoric and language that was strongly used during the second war. During many defining points in media regarding both outlets had to share the overall history, to help show the audience the changing or unchanging concerns that surface around that conflict. The audience reactions become the next major factor in the concern regarding modern day Israel. Most of time the overall message is being shared to cause emotion globally.

Israeli and American reaction circle around many of the same emotions, as most wars create that response. Although, there was a vast difference in action, as there was more reaction on the Israeli side, and for good reason. The reaction that was manifested by the Israeli people was centered on the emotion for their nation. As for American reaction during the Lebanon war, it created a collective response circling around the ideologies and morals of building support for the horror that become the outcome of the war. It's hard to imagine a future relating to horror,

war, and conflict that so many people tend to step back from and look at the narratives that elites have so tended to create in our system. This is a negative factor when comparing Israeli and Western media outlets. Looking reactions to media coverage allows a better understanding of what is being shared. The reaction is crucial because overall that is the goal. Both media outlets share and document this overall goal differently due to the variance of a nation's language, culture, background, word of the tongue, etc. It's important to look into reaction by either public or leaders, from both sides as it has been the root of seeing this difference globally through the news. Media news outlets have created meaningful consequences when looking at these vastly different reactions but very similar documentation and language when broadcasting the Lebanon War. This testimony will help in the process of understanding modern-day Israel. As well as the relationship and communication happening through media between different states. However, the reaction is notable different especially during the Lebanon War.

Newsroom action of the Lebanon War constructed a narrative that's valuable in interpreting modern day Israel. In addition to informing the public of both goods and bads in conflicts. Especially a conflict with unique grounds--- on the one side there is a nation using modern day technologies to produce surprise attacks and the other using guerrilla warfare for a religious/political aim. With these two battling sides, allows more room for complexity within the language provided to define it. With this in mind, news has been a beneficial factor in providing that language to the public, in goals of causing a reaction. This will help set future goals for the coverage of war. Although, will this inherent traditional and classical language forever be embedded in the system of news coverage? Will Israel seek to change the way foreign news teams view them as a state. Even so, would this hierarchical system in news ever change?

Will charismatic leaders still play a major factor in the overall controlled message being promoted, like during the Lebanon War.The overall message of violence throughout this war, created reactions of all kinds throughout the world. Will public reaction cater to an internationally coming together? Or will reaction be noted through environment and surroundings.

Bibliography

U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of State,

>   history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/creation-israel.

Hu, Zoe. "The History of Hezbollah, from Israel to Syria." *Lebanon News | Al Jazeera*, Al Jazeera, 20

>   Dec. 2016.

Margalit, Ruth. "The Israeli Answer to Al Jazeera." *The New Yorker*, The New Yorker, 29 July 2013.

Anthony Shadid, "Inside Hezbollah, Big Miscalculations," *The Washington Post*. October, 8 2006.

U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of State, 2001-2009.

David Schenker, "Give Abboud the Boot:" *Give Abboud the Boot: - Why Does Syria Need Two*

>   *Ambassadors in Washington? - The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.*

 "Middle East | Israel Accused over Lebanon War." *BBC News*, BBC, 6 Sept. 2007

Deborah Howell, "A War of Images and Perceptions," *The Washington Post*. August 13, 2006.

"Mideast War, By the Numbers," The Associated Press.

Anthony Shadid, "Inside Hezbollah, Big Miscalculations." Washington Post Foreign Service, WP
>   Company, 8 Oct. 2006.

National Archives and Records Administration, National Archives and Records Administration, George
>   W. Bush.

Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.s. Foreign Relations Since 1776*. New York: Oxford
>   University Press, 2008. Pg 746 Print.

"Not Just News Corp.: Media Companies Have Long Made Political Donations." *OpenSecrets Blog*, 23
>   Aug. 2010.

Jalbert, Paul. "'News Speak' about the Lebanon War." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1984,
>   pp. 17.

Diehl, Jackson. "The Peace Process Paradox." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 13 Apr. 2014.

 "The Constitution of the United States," Amendment 1.

Kressel, Neil J. "Biased Judgments of Media Bias: A Case Study of the Arab-Israeli Dispute." Political

Psychology, vol. 8, no. 2, 1987, pp. 211–227.

"Beirut Marine Barracks Bombing Fast Facts." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 18 Oct. 2017.

Media Monitor (Copyright © 2006). Center for Media and Public Affairs

"Newspaper Coverage of the Six-Day War." Jerusalem Center For Public Affairs

United Nations General Assembly. *A/RES/29/3314 - Definition of Aggression - UN Documents: Gathering a Body of Global Agreements*, www.un-documents.net/a29r3314.htm.

Cavari, Amnon, and Itay Gabay. "Coverage of Foreign Events on US Local Television News: The 2006 Lebanon War." *Israel Studies Review*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2014, pp. 70.

CNN, Cable News Network, transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0607/20/lt.02.html.

"Israeli Troops Battle Hezbollah Guerrillas in Lebanon." Fox News, FOX News Network, July 20, 2006.

Navot, Suzie. *The Constitution of Israel: a Contextual Analysis*. Hart Publishing, 2014.

Jazeera, Al. "Al Jazeera Statement on Israel's Plan to Ban Network." *News | Al Jazeera*, Al Jazeera, 7 Aug. 2017.

Philo, Greg, and Mike Berry. "Why Does It Happen?" More Bad News From Israel, Pluto Press, London, 2011, pp. 278.

Fadda-Conrey, Carol N. "Writing Memories of the Present: Alternative Narratives about the 2006 Israeli War on Lebanon." *College Literature*, vol. 37, no. 1, 2010, pp. 160.

Landler, Mark. "Trump Recognizes Jerusalem as Israel's Capital and Orders U.S. Embassy to Move." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 6 Dec. 2017.

"Mental Scars from the 2006 Lebanese War." *Al Arabiya English*.

Khoury, Lisa. "Coming to Grips with the Fear of War in Lebanon."*News | Al Jazeera*, Al Jazeera, 18 Nov.

"The Silent Minority." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 28 July 2006.

Booth, William. "Ten Years after Last Lebanon War, Israel Warns next One Will Be Far Worse." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 23 July 2016.

Owen, David. "State Terrorism, Internationalism and Collective Action." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1987, pp. 81.

Benzion, Uri; Shahrabani, Shosh & Shavit, Tal (2009). Emotions and perceived risks after the 2006 Israel–Lebanon war. *Mind and Society* 8 pp. 21.

Kalthoum, Ziad. "Taste of Cement." Taste of Cement, Wordpress.