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Abstract

This content analysis examines differences between inflammatory and conciliatory rhetoric across national and cultural boundaries in a convenience sample of two Israeli daily newspapers, one Palestinian newspaper, seven Arabic newspapers published elsewhere in the Middle East and one independent Arabic Web site. The period covered was the week following a suicide bombing on Feb. 25, 2005, outside a nightclub in Tel Aviv. Words were coded as inflammatory or conciliatory. The 11 publications used 52,191 words in 102 articles to cover the bombing during that week. Inflammatory words exceeded conciliatory words by a margin of 2:1. Israeli newspapers used significantly more inflammatory words as a percentage of all coded words than the Palestinian newspaper and about the same as the other Arabic newspapers. The study is unusual for focusing only on regional newspapers, for emphasizing conciliatory as well as inflammatory rhetoric and for breaking out self-criticism as a separate category.
This study takes as its starting point a suicide bombing by a Palestinian, Abdullah Saeed Badran, 21, on the evening of Feb. 25, 2005, outside a nightclub in Tel Aviv, Israel. Badran, from near the West Bank town of Tulkarem, detonated an explosive device he was wearing. The explosion killed five Israelis and wounded more than 50. This study will examine the use of inflammatory and conciliatory words by regional newspapers to report on the attack. The reports are taken from two Israeli daily newspapers (Haaretz and Jerusalem Post), one Palestinian daily newspaper (Al-Quds), seven daily newspapers published in other Arabic countries in the Middle East and one Arabic news Web site. The media were selected primarily on the basis of their availability in English. Translation was required only for Al-Quds, which is not published in English.

The intent is to examine the rhetoric culturally, rather than critically. There is no intent to judge the merits of the political causes or to assess the quality of reporting or editing by regional news publications. Rather, the intent is to compare the relative amount of inflammatory and conciliatory words employed in describing the suicide bombing and to provide a baseline for subsequent research into the rhetoric of terrorism. The subject is important because if harsh rhetoric can be associated with harsh deeds, perhaps conciliatory rhetoric can be associated with movement toward peace. The assumption is that language itself is a factor in the ebb and flow of conflict. Leets and Bowers (1999) quote former President Clinton that loud and angry voices, by their very words, leave the impression that violence is acceptable.

The suicide bombing on Feb. 25 was unusual in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It marked the first time since the beginning of the current intifada in 2000 that the most
militant Palestinian groups were at pains to disclaim responsibility. In previous suicide bombings, the militant groups (such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Al Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades) competed with each other to take credit for the attacks. It also marked one the few times that Israel declined to retaliate. The informal truce that had been declared earlier that month held. The window of opportunity for peace following the death of Yasser Arafat, president of the Palestinian Authority, remained open.

A columnist in the Bahrain Tribune said on March 3, “Last Friday’s suicide bombing in Tel Aviv was one of the very few operations and suicide bombings that was not claimed by any organisation, perhaps the only one in the last 10 years. Moreover, it was an operation which all Palestinian and non-Palestinian parties denied being responsible for it and was condemned by almost all Palestinian organisations.”

A rogue cell of the Islamic Jihad ultimately was identified as the instigator of the suicide bombing, but the net effect was to solidify the nascent and fragile determination by both sides to give peace a chance.

The ability of violent words to incite violent action – or, less commonly, the ability of pacific words to reduce tensions -- has been the subject of wide speculation and judicial rulings. But the intent here is not to argue the legalities – only to document the extent to which these media and their sources used inflammatory and conciliatory rhetoric to report on one event in the history of the Middle East conflict.

Previous studies of the connection between media rhetoric and violence have focused primarily on crime. The connection between rhetoric and terrorism has been less well-studied, in part because of the difficulty in defining terrorism. The Wall Street Journal (2005), quoting a U.N. panel in 2004, said, “Lack of agreement on a clear and well-known definition undermines
the normative and moral stance against terrorism and has stained the United Nations’ image” (Henninger, 2005, June 17). Black’s Law Dictionary defines terrorism as “The use or threat of violence to intimidate or cause panic, esp. as a means of affecting political conduct” (Garner, ed., 1999).

This study also is unusual for examining the rhetoric of Israeli-Palestinian relations from the standpoint of publications in the region. Most previous studies in English have focused on how media outside the region have reported on the conflict. Other unusual aspects include an attempt to separate inflammatory from conciliatory rhetoric and to examine how they are balanced. Even more unusual is the examination of the rhetoric of self-criticism by each side.

Literature Review

The connection between words and deeds is enshrined in both scientific literature and common sense. George Gerbner et al. (1980) found a significant relationship between violence that viewers see on television and their attitudes toward violence in their daily lives. “Television demonstrably affects attitudes toward violence and mistrust among adolescents,” Gerbner said (p. 24). Using violent acts depicted on television, he constructed a Violence Index, which suggests that time spent watching television correlates with the viewer’s perception of social reality. In other words, heavy viewers of television are more likely to exaggerate the amount of violence they perceive in the real world. Whether watching violent television causes violent acts or whether violent tendencies cause people to watch violent television has not been established.

Public perceptions parallel Gerber’s findings. When Joan Lefkow, a U.S. district judge, gave the following testimony² before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee on May 18, 2005, she

---

² The full quotation reads: “In this age of mass communication, harsh rhetoric is truly dangerous. It seems to me that even though we cannot prove a cause-and-effect relationship between rhetorical attacks on judges in general and violent acts of vengeance by a particular litigant, the fostering of disrespect for judges can only encourage those who are on the edge or on the fringe to exact revenge on a judge who displeases them.”
was talking about violence against judges, but with a few ellipses, her comments could apply broadly: “In this age of mass communication, harsh rhetoric is truly dangerous. It seems to me that even though we cannot prove a cause-and-effect relationship between rhetorical attacks … and violent acts of vengeance …, the fostering of disrespect … can only encourage those who are on the edge or on the fringe to exact revenge ...” (Coen 2005, May 19) Judge Lefkow’s husband and mother were ambushed and fatally shot by a man whose claims of medical malpractice the judge had dismissed.

Drawing on the notion of frames by psychologist Kenneth Burke, Macklin (1998) concludes: “Since frames result from symbolic interpretations of the world, rhetoric exploits the possibilities of identification and division inherent in these frames. Some rhetoric draws upon literary or religious catharsis, substituting the feeling of catharsis for actual change. Rhetoric in the frame of acceptance can, in this way, support an unjust regime. On the other hand, in the frame of rejection, rhetoric can lead to violent, bloody sacrifice in hopes of achieving a redeemed social order.”

Reiner (1997) found two effects of media images: the amplification of crime and violent behavior and the creation of anxiety and fear of crime. In a study of media effects on panic, Young (1971) showed that some aspects of stereotypes and fantasies could become reality. Because fearful people are more easily manipulated, they might be persuaded to accept repression (Signorielli, 1990).

Korn (2004) argues that the Middle Eastern media are complicit in the amplification of crime by focusing on the effects rather than the causes of violence, which would make sense of the violence. Instead of making sense of violence, terrorism usually is portrayed as senseless, irrational or fanatic behavior.
Reporting on the effects of suicide bombing resurrects long-standing questions about whether newspapers lead public opinion, follow public opinion, reflect public opinion or merely pick up what opinion leaders say. Mass society theories attribute an influential but often negative role to the media. Lazarsfeld (1944) found limited effects. More recent research positions the media role as a two-way flow that mirrors what is going on in society (Katz 1955, Walker & Whittaker 1990, and other investigators).

Several commentators have put forward the notion of a symbiotic relationship between terrorists and the media. ABC news anchor Ted Koppel (1984) foregrounds the connection: “Let me put forward the proposition that the media, particularly television, and terrorists need one another, that they have what is fundamentally a symbiotic relationship. Without television, terrorism becomes rather like the philosopher's hypothetical tree falling in the forest: no one hears it fall and therefore it has no reason for being. And television without terrorism, while not deprived of all interesting things in the world, is nonetheless deprived of one of the most interesting” (p. 497).

Weimann (1987) agrees: “The media are the terrorists’ best friends” (p. 213). Tsesis (2002) suggests a parallel between the rhetoric of terrorism and hate speech, which can lead to the terrorism of genocide. Terrorism, like genocide, denies the right of its target to exist.

Weimann (1976) finds rather few scholarly studies connecting rhetoric to terrorism – a lack he attributes to the complexity of the issues. His article, titled "Terrorism as Theater," says, “Concepts such as climate of opinion, status conferral, cultivation and reconstruction of reality, knowledge gap, or agenda setting may serve as examples of these specific effects that caused, to some extent, a return to the concept of powerful mass media” (p. 104). Leets & Bowers (1999)
also complain about the “dearth” of empirical work on the effects of verbally disturbing speech on terrorism (p. 325).

In contrast to the negative tone of most studies that relate media effects and violence, Doxtader (2003) takes a positive approach in a study titled *Reconciliation – a Rhetorical Concept/ion*. Doxtader contends that reconciliation is a rhetorical concept that transcends violence and summons understanding. Reconciliation's promise, he says, demands significant faith in the work of words.

Simply the labeling of violent actors as “terrorists” or as “freedom fighters” in the press encourages the cycle of violence. They become socially constructed -- and legitimated -- symbols, which become stimuli with learned meaning. Mead (1934) showed that the labels we apply to people shape how they think and act. To paraphrase the playwright George Bernard Shaw (*Pygmalion*), the difference between a freedom fighter and a terrorist is not how they behave but how they are treated. A similar point was developed by Korn (2004) who said language could densensitize as well as inflame. The wide use of the neutral phrase “killed in clashes” in Israeli newspapers to refer to Palestinian deaths, he said, “legitimated the high number of civilian casualties and contributed to the construction of the uprising as an armed conflict justifiably oppressed by military means” (p. 247).

Cable Network News (CNN), a frequent target for criticism from both sides, said, “There has been an intense internal debate over the use of words” (Fisk, 2002).

Dajani (2003), in a critical study of Palestinian coverage of the Israeli operation Defensive Shield into the Jenin refugee camp in 2002, urged newspapers to:

1. Banish highly emotional terms such as "massacres," "catastrophe," "hell," "disaster," etc. from headlines to avoid harmful ripple effects resulting in tragic consequences. Editors and
reporters should anticipate that such terms have the power to intensify public fear, cause panic and could result in flight or incite violent revenge.

2. Filter and tone down stories of high drama and violence that may cause public anger and concern.

There is considerable evidence that the political climate has changed to become more receptive to messages of reconciliation. Public opinion before and after the election of Mahmoud Abbas as president of the Palestinian Authority shows contrasting views about the prospects for peace.

In a poll taken in 2000 by the Palestinian Birzeit University, 60% of Palestinians did not believe that peaceful coexistence was possible and 80% supported military attacks against Israel (Said, 2000). The most recent poll was taken jointly in March 2005 by the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research and Hebrew University. The same questions were asked to a representative sample of Israelis and Palestinians. One of the findings: General support for reconciliation among Israelis has also increased and stands now at 84% compared to 80% in June 2004. Eighty-one percent of the Palestinians support reconciliation today compared to 67% last June. More important is the consistent, across-the-board increase in support for a list of specific reconciliation steps (Shamir & Shikaki, 2005).

Research Questions

Since restraint is required by all parties to preserve the truce, the question arises as to the role played by newspapers. Five research questions were posed regarding the balance between the rhetoric of terrorism and conciliation in 11 newspapers published in Israel, Palestine and neighboring Arabic newspapers:
RQ 1a. To what extent did the amount of inflammatory language used by the Israeli newspapers differ from the amount of inflammatory language used by the Palestinian/Arabic newspapers? The difference, if any, could shed light on where the resistance to peace is coming.

RQ 1b. To what extent did the amount of conciliatory language used by the Israeli newspapers differ from the amount of conciliatory language used by the Palestinian newspapers? The difference, if any, could shed light on where support for peace is coming from.

RQ 2a. To what extent did the amount of inflammatory language used by Haaretz differ from the amount of inflammatory language used by the Jerusalem Post? Haaretz and the Post represent opposite poles of political opinion in Israel. But do they differ significantly in their attitudes toward an act of provocation?

RQ 2b. To what extent did the amount of conciliatory language used by Al-Quds differ from the amount of conciliatory language used by the other Arabic newspapers? The Arabic press often is portrayed as monolithic. How much solidarity did they show in their reaction to an attack on Israel?

RQ 3. How did the inflammatory and conciliatory language differ among the Arabic newspapers, not including Al-Quds? This question addresses the degree of support that an attack on Israel might generate among Palestine’s Arabic neighbors.

RQ 4. How did the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by the Israeli newspapers when quoting Palestinian sources differ from the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by Palestinian/Arabic newspapers when quoting Israeli sources? The face that each side displays to the other influences public perceptions. Similarly, a newspaper’s selectivity in its choice of facts and opinions reflects and influences the opinions of its readers.
RQ 5. How did the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by the Israeli newspapers when criticizing Israeli positions (internal criticism) differ from the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by Palestinian/Arabic newspapers when criticizing Palestinian positions (internal criticism)? This might be the most interesting question because self-criticism reveals the range of potentially acceptable opinion and courses of action.

Method

This study was based on a quantitative content analysis of 102 stories in 10 daily newspapers and one Web site about the suicide bombing of a nightclub in Tel Aviv, Israel, on the night of Feb. 25, 2005. Content analysis was selected as the method of investigation because the purpose is to compare the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language by the selected media. The period covered is the seven days following the bombing. This will be a cross-sectional study of a single week because time and cost limitations preclude extending the study over a longer period and because the number of stories about a single event tends to taper off after the first week. Table 1 in Appendix A provides a breakdown of the publications, the number of stories they carried about the bombing and the number of words in those stories.

Jerusalem Post was selected for study because it is the only Israeli daily newspaper published originally in English. Politically, it is considered nationalistic. Haaretz was selected because it is the only Israeli daily newspaper that provides an official English translation of articles published originally in Hebrew. Politically, Haaretz describes itself on its Web site as liberal.

---


5 The larger Israeli daily newspapers are Yedioth Aharonot and Maariv. Yedioth reaches two-thirds of all Hebrew newspaper readers, according to the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2005). Haaretz reported on April 7, 2005, that the weekend edition of Yedioth reached 56% of the adult Israeli population, Maariv reached 29% and Haaretz
Al-Quds was selected because it has the largest circulation of the three Palestinian daily newspapers. Its stories on the first three days (Feb. 26-28) were translated from Arabic to English by the newspaper’s editorial writer and translator of English-language wire-service stories into Arabic. Al-Quds’ stories on the next four days (March 1-4) were translated by a doctoral student from Yemen at Southern Illinois University. Eight Middle Eastern daily newspapers also were selected because peace in the Middle East has become a regional, not just a local issue. Al Jazeera, which publishes a Web site, not a newspaper, was selected to provide an independent Arabic voice.

All stories published by those sources about the Feb. 25 suicide bombing during the following week are included in this study. Stories in the Israeli newspapers were slightly longer (28,338 vs. 23,853 total words) but the stories in the Palestinian and Arabic publications were slightly more numerous (57 vs. 45 total stories).

The stories included hard news (report of the incident), features (reaction of relatives and bystanders), response (by official sources) and opinion (editorials and columns).

The coding unit was the word; the context unit, in cases such as negative or hypothetical constructions, was the phrase or sentence. Words were categorized as inflammatory, conciliatory or not relevant. To assist in classification, a vocabulary was constructed with 346 words identified as inflammatory and 210 words as conciliatory. The complete vocabulary is provided in Appendix B.
Because a sample of convenience was used, generalization to populations beyond those publications included in this study should be made with extreme caution. The selection of newspapers was circumscribed mostly by the requirement to work in English. Further, generally accepted quality-control standards (double translation to English and back to the original language) were not applied to the translation of articles in Al-Quds. The work of the two individual translators was accepted as presented.

The data collection technique was a coding sheet in order to identify the inflammatory and conciliatory words by each publication in its news accounts and in its attribution of information to news sources on both sides. Each medium and each story was given a separate identifying number. Thus, for these variables, the coding units were the publication and the story. Next, the type of language (inflammatory or conciliatory) was coded. The decision on which words were inflammatory and which were conciliatory was made subjectively by this investigator. During the coding, when new inflammatory or conciliatory words were found, they were added to the list. Each word was examined in context to determine its function in the phrase or sentence. If the context clearly indicated that a listed word was being used benignly, it was not coded.

The coding technique was based on observation of the stories according to the vocabulary list. The instructions to coders were pretested by a retired U.S. foreign service officer whose last post was in Cairo, Egypt. The pretest resulted in the rewriting of some instructions to clarify the intent. For example, the original instructions did not clearly indicate that headlines should be considered as well as the stories.

Coding of 10 stories (10%) was checked by two graduate students. Three stories each were selected at random from Haaretz and from the Arabic newspapers and two each from the
Jerusalem Post and Al-Quds. Haaretz and the Arabic newspapers were overweighted because stories appearing in those publications were the more numerous than stories appearing in Jerusalem Post and Al-Quds. Intercoder reliability was 74.3%, calculated as the number of words on which we agreed as inflammatory or conciliatory divided by the total number of words on which we agreed and disagreed. Appendix C presents the instructions to coders. All measurements and instructions were created by this investigator.

Inflammatory was defined conceptually as likely to increase tensions to either Israelis or Palestinians or both. Conciliatory was defined as likely to ease tensions. Specific terms are defined operationally as whether they appear in the vocabulary list in Appendix B. Examples of inflammatory words include suicide, bomber, terrorist, martyr, killed, assassination and any reference to the fence/wall or to the occupied territories/colonies. Examples of conciliatory words include abide, truce, peace, ceasefire, cooperation, negotiations, optimism and trust. Context also is considered. For example, violence is inflammatory when used as in “All they understand is violence” and conciliatory when it is used pacifically as in “Violence only begets more violence” or “We oppose violence.”

The chi square statistical test was used to determine the extent to which the publications differed in their use of inflammatory and conciliatory language.

Analysis and Results

The first research question concerns the possible association between Israeli and Palestinian/Arabic newspapers and their rhetoric. Table 2 in Appendix A shows the total number of inflammatory and conciliatory words used by the two sides. A statistically significant difference was found in the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by the two sides ($\chi^2 = 46.65; \text{df} = 1; p < .05$). Both sides used more inflammatory language than
conciliatory language, but the Israeli newspapers used significantly more inflammatory language than the Palestinian/Arabic newspapers.

The result of the second research question, which concerned the rhetoric of the two Israeli newspapers, is shown in Table 3 in Appendix A. The two newspapers did not differ significantly in the language they used to report on the suicide bombing during the week following the event.

Research Question 3 considered the difference between Al-Quds, the daily newspaper published in Palestine, and the English language versions of seven daily newspapers published elsewhere in Arabic countries of the Middle East plus the English version of the Web site of Al Jazeera, the independent Arabic news source. The analysis indicates that Al-Quds was significantly less inflammatory than the seven other Arabic daily newspapers and Al Jazeera ($\chi^2 = 13.18; df = 1; p = <.05$). See Table 4 in Appendix A.

Research Question 4 had to do with inflammatory and conciliatory language used when quoting the other side – that is, when Israeli newspapers were attributing information to Palestinian sources and when Palestinian and other Arabic publications were attributing information to Israeli news sources. Table 5 in Appendix A shows the frequencies and percentages. The analysis indicates a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 102.18; df = 1; p = <.05$). The percentages also show a close match to the general rhetoric. When the two Israeli newspapers are quoting Israeli sources, 83.6% of the total number of inflammatory and conciliatory words are inflammatory; when Israeli sources are being quoted by Al-Quds and the other Arabic media, 78.7% of the words are inflammatory. When Al-Quds and the other Arabic media are quoting Palestinian sources, 66.4% of the words are inflammatory; when Haaretz and the Jerusalem Post
are quoting Palestinian sources, 61.9% of the total number of inflammatory and conciliatory words are inflammatory.

The final research question dealt with the rhetoric of self-criticism – i.e., critical comment by Israelis toward Israelis published in Israeli newspapers and critical comment by Palestinians toward Palestinians published in the Arabic press. For example, Haaretz, an Israeli newspaper, published this lead to a story blaming the attack on the Israel’s slow progress in completing the security fence: “Former deputy chief of staff Major General (Res.) Uzi Dayan, who currently heads the Public Council for a Security Fence, placed indirect responsibility for the suicide bombing Friday night in Tel Aviv on Prime Minister Ariel Sharon” (Alon, March 1, 2005). The words are by an Israeli citizen, quoted in an Israeli newspaper, critical of Israeli policy but inflammatory to Palestinians who view the so-called “Security Fence” as a threat. Table 6 in Appendix A shows that the two Israeli newspapers were significantly more likely than the Palestinian/Arabic press to be self-critical in ways that the other side would find offensive ($\chi^2 = 129.07; \text{df} = 1; p = <.05$). Criticism by Al-Quds and the other Arabic media was more heavily weighted toward conciliation. The difference is statistically significant at the .05 confidence level and one degree of freedom. The chi square was 129.07, with a critical value of 3.84.

The seven Arabic newspapers and Al Jazeera differed in the percentage of inflammatory words compared to the total of inflammatory and conciliatory words, although the results should be interpreted cautiously because of a low number of examples in each. The average was 74.5% inflammatory and 25.5% conciliatory of a total of 664 coded words in 29 stories. The percentage of inflammatory words ranged from 62.1% in the Times of Oman to 96.2% in the Middle East Times, although the word count in the Middle East Times is based on only 26 coded words. The Times of Oman and the Gulf News ran the most stories about the suicide bombing (seven each)
and the Gulf News gave it the most space (3,508 words, of which 180 were coded as inflammatory and 65 were coded as conciliatory). Table 7 in Appendix A has details.

One cartoon was published – in Al-Quds. The cartoon shows the footprints of the suicide bomber heading toward the bombing site, knocking down in his way a traffic sign that reads, “Stop. National Interests.” The cartoon was not coded. It is shown as Figure 1.

Discussion

The two Israeli newspapers used significantly more inflammatory words than Al-Quds and the other Arabic media (RQ1). The disparity would have been even greater if the other Arabic media were eliminated, because 75% of their coded words were inflammatory vs. 72% of the Israeli words that were coded. Al-Quds was significantly more pacific than the other Arabic media (RQ3). The rhetoric did not change significantly when one side was quoting sources from the other side. There remained a significant difference in the split between the number of inflammatory and conciliatory words (RQ4).

Of special interest was the rhetoric of self-criticism, although the number of words devoted to the subject was small. Self-criticism by the Israelis was more likely to provoke the Palestinians than to reconcile them. This is understandable, considering that it was the Israelis who were the target of the suicide bombing. Some voices in Israel blamed the government for not being tough enough (Alon 2005). Others, notably some relatives of the victims, called for revenge. For example, a story in Haaretz (Rotem, Azoulay & Ashkenazi 2005) said: “Israel Orbach [relative of a woman who was killed in the attack] delivered a fiery eulogy. … ‘This girl is the descendant of King David,’ he said, calling on his former comrades to avenge her death. ‘If they don't, I will.’ ”

Self-criticism by the Palestinians, especially Al-Quds, was more likely to be conciliatory
because both the political and militant leadership condemned the bombing as harmful to the peace process. This, too, is understandable because the suicide bomber was understood to be operating as part of a rogue cell operating outside the consensus at the time to maintain a truce, at least pending the hand-over of some land in Gaza to the Palestinians.

Although the study shows a preponderance of inflammatory rhetoric compared to conciliatory rhetoric, it could be argued that the surprise was that so much conciliatory rhetoric appeared in stories that were primarily about a suicide bombing and its aftermath. Of the total number of 3,292 words that were coded as inflammatory or conciliatory, 33% were conciliatory. A large number of the inflammatory words were unavoidable in even the most objective news accounts of the bombing, people killed and wounded, and reactions. It also is a fact that several months after the suicide bombing, the truce still held. Is there a connection between the conciliatory language following the suicide bombing and the durability of the truce? Further research will be required to demonstrate a relationship, but 33% conciliatory words in a series of stories about a suicide bombing hold significant prospects for hope.

Results of this study should be interpreted with extreme caution. All of the media were selected because of their availability in English. Al-Quds was selected because it has the largest circulation of the Palestinian newspapers and because a semi-official translation was available for three of the seven days of the study.

Perhaps the major caveat is that all the publications, with the possible exception of Al Jazeera, are subject to censorship by the governments of the countries in which they operate. The language used in the articles might or might not reflect what is acceptable to their readers. Al-Quds, which is published in Jerusalem, is subject to censorship by both the Palestinian Authority and by the Israeli military, which might explain why its ratio of inflammatory to conciliatory
language is lower than other English language Arabic newspapers in the region. The Middle East Times, which is published from Cyprus, says on its Web site: “Egyptian law gives Egypt’s ministry of information the right to ban or censor any publication. The censor reviews each issue of the Middle East Times before allowing them to be distributed” (2005).

Dor (2001), who studied how Israel’s two major daily tabloids covered the first three weeks of the current intifada, claimed that reports appearing in Maariv and Yediot Ahronot were “fragmented and highly censored” (p. 251).

There also is the question of whether newspapers published in English for foreign consumption are identical to newspapers published in the local language for local consumption. Haaretz maintains that its English language version, which was taken from its Web site, is an accurate and complete representation of the tone and style of the version published in Hebrew, although Korn (2004) maintains that Haaretz in English is a translated summary of the Hebrew Haaretz, and is far less influential on decision-makers and the public inside Israel.

Both Haaretz and the Jerusalem Post have relatively small circulations in Israel. Haaretz’s circulation, for example, is about 50,000. Israel’s largest newspaper, the tabloid Yediot Ahronot, has a circulation of more than 500,000 (Korn, 2004).

Moreover, this study examined only one week in the wake of one act of generally condemned terrorism without retaliation. Such unusual circumstances might or might not be replicated, but it cannot be concluded from this study that conciliatory rhetoric will lead to conciliatory acts.

Two words seem to symbolize the issue of rhetoric in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The words are martyr in Arabic and terrorist in Hebrew. The word favored for martyr is shahid, which is a step more revered than martyr. No equivalent in English is strong enough to convey

---

the sense of holy, religious sacrifice. The word has been applied to suicide bombers and was applied specifically by Al-Quds to the Tel Aviv bomber on Feb. 25.

Some Israelis prefer the word saboteur (mkhabel) rather than terrorist and sabotage rather than terrorism to describe suicide bombers and their work. The word for saboteur in Arabic is mokharreb. When used by the Israelis, it connotes vicious and random destruction. Abbas, who is president of the Palestinian Authority, raised eyebrows on both sides of the conflict when he used mokharreb to describe the suicide bomber.

The two words – shahid and mokharreb -- bear watching in subsequent research. As long as suicide bombers are holy martyrs in the Palestinian media and saboteurs in the Hebrew media, the prospects for rapprochement are likely to be dim. Further research will be required to demonstrate whether cumulative repetition of “fighting words” by leadership and the media trigger or reflect unthinking hate.

This study raises a central question of cultivation theory: Does the rhetoric of terrorism precede or follow acts of terrorism? By tracking rhetoric used in the media and other forms of public discourse, it might be possible to construct a Terrorism Index similar to Gerbner’s Violence Index that could predict future eruptions and perhaps control them.

At the least, further research on the rhetoric of terrorism might encourage responsible participants to consider the effect of their language and perhaps moderate it. More moderate language might lead to more moderate actions. Perhaps further research will be able to establish a Terrorism Index modeled after George Gerbner’s Violence Index.
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Appendix A

Tables

Table 1
*Sources of stories by country*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haaretz</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>12,490</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem Post</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>15,848</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Quds</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>13,151</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jazeera</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab News</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain Tribune</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf News</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7Days</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Times</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria Times</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times of Oman</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,191</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
*Number and kind of words used by the two sides*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inflammatory</th>
<th>Conciliatory</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>1,155 (72%)</td>
<td>442 (28%)</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian/Arabic</td>
<td>1,044 (62%)</td>
<td>651 (38%)</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2,199 (67%)</td>
<td>1,093 (33%)</td>
<td>3,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 46.65; df = 1; p = <.05$

Table 3
*Number and kind of words used by Haaretz and Jerusalem Post*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inflammatory</th>
<th>Conciliatory</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haaretz</td>
<td>574 (73%)</td>
<td>216 (27%)</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem Post</td>
<td>581 (72%)</td>
<td>226 (28%)</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,155 (67%)</td>
<td>442 (33%)</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .088; df = 1; p = >.05$

Table 4
*Number and kinds of words used by Al-Quds and 8 other Arabic new sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inflammatory</th>
<th>Conciliatory</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Quds</td>
<td>454 (57%)</td>
<td>342 (43%)</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arabics</td>
<td>590 (66%)</td>
<td>309 (34%)</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,044 (62%)</td>
<td>651 (38%)</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 13.18; df = 1; p = <.05$
Table 5
*Number and kinds of words used when quoting the other side*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inflammatory</th>
<th>Conciliatory</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israelis quoting Palestinians</td>
<td>138 (38%)</td>
<td>224 (62%)</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinians quoting Israelis</td>
<td>210 (66%)</td>
<td>57 (34%)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>348 (55%)</td>
<td>281 (45%)</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 102.18; \ df = 1; \ p = .05$

Table 6
*The rhetoric of self-criticism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inflammatory</th>
<th>Conciliatory</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israelis criticizing Israelis</td>
<td>90 (71%)</td>
<td>36 (29%)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinians criticizing Palestinians</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>184 (89%)</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>112 (34%)</td>
<td>220 (66%)</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 129.07; \ df = 1; \ p = .05$

Table 7
*Number and kinds of words used in Arabic media outside Palestine*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inflammatory</th>
<th>Conciliatory</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7Days</td>
<td>22 (85%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jazeera</td>
<td>33 (79%)</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab News</td>
<td>37 (74%)</td>
<td>13 (26%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain Tribune</td>
<td>75 (85%)</td>
<td>13 (15%)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf News</td>
<td>180 (74%)</td>
<td>65 (26%)</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Times</td>
<td>25 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria Times</td>
<td>47 (73%)</td>
<td>17 (27%)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times of Oman</td>
<td>77 (62%)</td>
<td>47 (38%)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>495 (75%)</td>
<td>169 (25%)</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix B**

Dictionary of words identified as inflammatory or conciliatory

**Inflammatory language**
- absolute
- abuse
- accomplice
- accuse/accusation
- act/action (military)
- activist (but not active)
- afraid
- against (moves toward peace)
- aggression
- allow (bad things to happen)
- alone (as in to act alone)
- anger/angry (note to whom the anger is directed)
- animals
- annex/annexation
- army/arms
- arrest (Palestinians by Israelis)
- assassinate
- atrocious
- attack
- avenge
- avoid (responsibility, peace moves)
- backward
- ban
- barbaric
- barrier (the wall/fence)
- baseless
- bash
- beat
- beef up (security)
- behind (the violence)
- bereaved
- biting
- blacklist
- blame
- blast
blood/bloodshed/bleeding
blow up/blow out
bodies (dead)
bombing
booby trap
break (one's word, the peace)/break up
brutal/brutalize
building housing in the settlements
building roads that destroy communities' access to former neighbors and jobs
burden
buried
cancel/cancellation
capture
cast (e.g., a shadow over peace)
casualty
catastrophe
checkpoint
claim (used dismissively)
claimed responsibility (for a terrorist act)
clamp down
clash
closing down access directly by army orders and barricades
coddling (of terrorists)
cold-blooded
collusion
colonies (occupied territories)
combat
condemn
conditions (to slow peace process)
conflict
confrontation
conspiracy
continue (talks, peace process)
counterterror
crack down (on the other side)
creation (of bad stuff)
crime/criminal
crisis
critical (condition, from injuries)
cross-fire
 crude
cruel
curse/cursed
cynical
damage
danger/dangerous
deadly
deleitful
defend (against attacks)
degrade
delay
deliberate
demand
demolish/demoliton
denounce/denunciation (note to whom the denunciation is directed)
dent (i.e., damage the peace process)
derail (the peace process)
depetration
despair
destroy
destruction
detain (i.e., arrest), detention
deter (peace)
detonate
dirty
disdain
dismantle
disproportionate
disregard
distract/distracting
disrupt (the peace process)
dramatic
danger
enemy
enlargement (of settlemens)

enough
enthusiasm (for violence)
erode (peace efforts)
escalate/escalation
ethnic cleansing
evicting people from their houses and demolishing them
evil
excessive
exclusive
excuse (to avoid peace)
executed
expand (military operations)
extensionist a (knock on Israel)
exploit
explosion
expropriation
exterminated
extremist
injure/injury
fail/failed/failure
fanatic
fascist
fatalities
fear
fence (see wall)
fighter/fighting
fire/flame
flaw/flawed
foment (violence)
force
freedom fighter*
freeze/froze (as in freeze peace efforts)
funeral (resulting from action)
genocide/genocidal
give it (i.e., to attack)
gleeful (at terror)
gore/gory
guerrilla
gun/gunmen
greed
grieve/grief
grim
gruesome
hail
harm
harsh
hatred
have to/had to (i.e., "must")
heart-broken
heavy-handed
hell
hit (meaning to attack)
horrendously
horrific
humiliate
illegal
immoral
impossible
impunity
inaccurate
incite
increase (tensions)
incursion
induce (i.e., lure or trick)
infiltrate
inflame
inhumane
inside (Palestinian territory, like the barrier)
insult
intensify (repressive operations)
interim (solutions)
Intifada (the current [second] one began in September 2000. See Oslo War.
invasion/invaded
irhabiyyo (terrorists in Hebrew)
irrational
joy (note context: joy at causing misery for the other side)
kill/killed/killing
killed in confrontations*
killed in clashes*
lack (of seriousness)
less than human
liberation*
lies
lip service
loss (of hope)
lunatic
lustful
lynch-murder
malicious
maniac
martyr
massacre
massive
military (action, activity, force, reaction, response)
missing (in the context of possible death from action)
mistake
mourner/mourning (in the context of an attack)
move (against one's will)
mukhariboon (saboteurs in Hebrew)
murder/murderer/base murderer
must
myths
Nazi
nightmare
no/not/negative (as in solution)
notorious
occupation/occupiers
offense/offensive (context of military action; not diplomatic offensive)
onslaught
opponent
opposed (to peace)
oppressed/oppression
orders (for violence)
Oslo War: how some Israelis refer to al-Aqsa (aka Second) Intifada (but not Oslo Agreements)
pain
panic
parasites
patriot*
peace, impossibility
peace … at any cost
perpetrator
perpetuate (bad things)
perpetuate
plot
postpone (implementing the peace process)
pretext
phony
premature
pretext
prevent (good things from happening)
procrastinating (in working for peace)
prolong
propaganda
provoke/provocation
punishment
quench
racist/racism
radical
raging
raid (by one side on the other)
ranting
reconsider (cooperation)
re-enact (violence)
refuse/refused/refusal
reject/rejectionist (peace)
repressive
reprisal
repulsive
respond, response (with violence)
responsible (for violence)
resume (violence)
retaliation
riot
rip
river of tears
roadblock (literal or figurative)
route (for the barrier)
rupture
ruthless
saboteur/sabotage
satisfaction (at causing misery for the other side)
savage
scum
seizing and diverting their water resources for the use of the chosen people
seizure of Gentile property
separation barrier (see barrier, fence, wall)
serious (condition, from injuries)
serving the interests of a foreign country (former charge by Palestine against collaborators w/Israel)
serving the agents of a foreign country (former charge by Palestine against collaborators w/Israel)
settlers/settlement+A462 ("Israeli citizens" is preferred)
shadow (as in to cast a shadow over peace)
shahid*#
shock
shooting incident*
short-term
should
shout
sick/sickening
slaughtered
slaying
smash
smuggling
stalling (the peace process)
state terrorism
step up (the violence)
straighten out (violently)
strictly
strike
suffering
suicide bombing
support (violence)
suspend (moves toward peace)
swastika
take (responsibility for terrorism)
target (as a verb)
tears
territories (see colonies)
terror/terrorist/terrorism/terrible
threat/threaten
tighten (security, use of force)
tolerating and protecting settlers' attacks
torment
torture
total
tragedy
trigger/trigger-happy
trust (none, loss of, lack of)
ugly
unarmed civilians
uncertainty
undermine
unilateral
unjustifiable
unnecessary (impediment to peace)
unrealistic
untrue
upset
vengeance
vermin
villain
violation
violence
violent
virulent
wall
war/ war crimes/ war criminal
warn (as in to threaten)
weapons
wicked
wipe out (the opposition)
within (Palestinian territory)
without (conferring -- i.e., unilateral)
wound/wounding
wreck
wrong (i.e., evil)
Zionist (in a derogatory reference to Jews)

* = valorizing rhetoric

**Conciliatory terms**
abide by (a truce, an agreement)
ablaze
accurate
accuse (those on one's own side of breaking the peace)
act/action (for peace)
addresses (both sides' needs)
affect (for peace)
against (violence)
agree/agreement (in support of peace)
allow (good things to, happen)
alter (for the better)
alternative
ambitions (for peace)
apprehend (those responsible for violence)
arrangement
arrest (those responsible for violence)
aspirations (for peace)
avoid (violence)
betrayal (of peace)
block (terrorism)
calm
ceasefire
challenge (the terrorists)
chance (for peace)
change
characterize (one's own side as wrong)
clarification
coalition
co-habitation
commit (to peace)
common cause (for peace)
compromise
condemn (one's own side)
confide/confidence-building
confirming (peace commitments)
confront (opponents of peace)
consideration (as in consideration shown for the other side)
contacts (between Palestinians and Israelis)
contradicts (policies for peace)
crack down
continue (peace process)
control (violence)
cooperate
coordinate
curb (as in curb the attacks)
creations (of good stuff)
define
democracy (except when used ironically)
denied responsibility (for a terrorist act)
denounce/denunciation violence by any party)
destroy (infrastructure of terror)
determination (to pursue peace)
detonated
devoid (of truth; in denying participation in violence)
dialogue
dignity
diplomacy/diplomatic
disavow (violence)
discuss
disengagement
dismantle (one's own capacity for violence)
disrupt (the peace process)
dissociate (one's self from terrorists)
distance (one's self from terrorists)
disturbed (at violence)
dragging
dreams (good dreams)
easing (of tensions)
effort (for peace)
end (as a noun: conclusion to fighting)
end (as a verb with the object: incitement, violence, war, anarchy)
endanger (as in opposition to anything that would slow peace)
endorse (peace)
enforce (peace)
enraged (at acts of violence; note context)
evacuate (used by Israelis in support of removing settlements)
exchange (i.e., negotiation)
exonerate (the other side, but not one's own side)
extremists
fight (terror)
find out (terrorists)
fired (for incompetence in stopping terrorists)
flames
flawed
freedom
friendship (between sides, not within)
fulfill
genuine
getting out (of the stalemate toward peace)
give
goal (of peace)
halt (terrorist, bad stuff)
hand over (prisoners)
happiness (with prospects for peace)
heel (as in bring to heel, subjugate)
help
hold (your fire)
honor (the truce; but not in context of revenge)
hope (for peace)
hudna [Hebrew for truce]
identify (perpetrators)
improve/improvement
inflict (punishment on terrorists)
infuriated (about acts against peace)
joint
joy (in the context of peace-making)
keep (insurgents at bay, keep the peace)
law and order
logic
make (progress)
marginalize (the terrorists)
mediator/mediations
meet/met (as in needs or obligations or meet to negotiate)
move (forward toward peace)
mutual
negotiations
normal/normalcy
notorious
obligations as in to meet one's obligations under the peace process
operation (i.e., bombing, as in "didn't have previous knowledge of the operation")
opportunity
oppose/opposition (to terror)
optimism
order (noun, as in law and order)
overcoming
pacification
peace, possibility of/peacemaking
permanent
persuade (to pursue peace)
pleased
pledge (peace, to stop violence)
political process
positive (as in positive climate and positive efforts)
praise (efforts toward peace)
press ahead (for peace)
process (if peace is omitted)
progress (toward peace)
promise/promised (peace)
promote (peace)
protect
protest (against violence)
preserve (the peace)
prevent (bad things from happening)
provoke (to peace)
pull back, pull out
punish (those who break the peace)
pursue (peace, those who break the peace)
quiet
raised (hope for peace)
rate (at violence)
rationalize
ready/readiness (to make peace)
reducing (military activity)
reform (except when used ironically)
regret/regrettable
reject (violence)
rekindle (the peace process)
release (prisoners)
respect
responsibility (see claim and deny)
restrict (one's own operations)
revive (the peace process)
reign in (the terrorists or extremists)
reinvigorated (as in peace process)
resolve
restraint
results
resume (peace efforts)
return (land, prisoners, to negotiations)
right (track)
roped into (the peace process)
rule out (violence)
sabotage (in context of condemnation)
salvage (as in salvage the peace process)
Sanity
satisfaction (at efforts toward peace)
scurrier (destroy, as in scupper the peace process)
search (for those responsible for violence)
security (only "the giving of" of "the assuring of" someone else's)
seek out
sensitive
Serious (about peace)
share (as in information)
Shout
Sincere (about peace)
solve/solution
Stability
stop (violence)
strike (against violence)
struggle (for peace)
succeed/success
support (peace)
Swoop (one fell swoop -- i.e., move quickly toward peace)
take part (in talks)
Talks
tired (of conflict)
tough (on terrorism)
track down (those who break the peace)
transfer (land, prisoners) to Palestinians
Truce
trust (gains in, improvements)
try/trial (those who break the peace)
unacceptable (applied to violence)
understand/understanding
Unilateral
croot (efforts against peace)
cupset (angry)
vacating (occupied territories)
cwin out (over one's own extremists)
Withdrawal
Appendix C

Instructions to coders (Revised July 14, 2005)

Period: Feb. 26 through March 4. (Bombing occurred on Feb. 25.)

Search terms: Tel Aviv suicide bombing.

25 stories from Haaretz, liberal Israeli newspaper, which offers English translations of its stories.

20 stories from Jerusalem Post, which is published in English.

28 stories translated from Al-Quds, the largest Palestinian newspaper.

29 stories from English-language newspapers in Arabic countries of the Middle East, from their Web sites.

Research questions:

1a. To what extent did the amount of inflammatory language used by the Israeli newspapers differ from the amount of inflammatory language used by the Palestinian/Arabic newspapers?

1b. To what extent did the amount of conciliatory language used by the Israeli newspapers differ from the amount of conciliatory language used by the Palestinian newspapers?

2a. To what extent did the amount of inflammatory language used by Haaretz differ from the amount of inflammatory language used by the Jerusalem Post?

2b. To what extent did the amount of conciliatory language used by Al-Quds differ from the amount of conciliatory language used by the other Arabic newspapers?

3. How did the inflammatory and conciliatory language differ among the Arabic newspapers, not including Al-Quds?
4. How did the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by the Israeli newspapers when quoting Palestinian sources differ from the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by Palestinian/Arabic newspapers when quoting Israeli sources?

5. How did the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by the Israeli newspapers when criticizing Israeli positions (internal criticism) differ from the amount of inflammatory and conciliatory language used by Palestinian/Arabic newspapers when criticizing Palestinian positions (internal criticism)?

**Premise:** Inflammatory words and actions encourage violence; conciliatory words and actions encourage peace.

The research lends itself to continuing study and the tracking of longitudinal trends. At the least, this research might encourage participants to consider the effect of their language, and perhaps moderate it. More moderate language might lead to more moderate actions. “Good” or “bad” and “agree” or “disagree” with any specific action or viewpoint is not at issue — only the rhetoric.

Consider headlines and stories. Read every word. Code at the word or, less often, at the phrase or clause level. Refer to the word list, which contains:

— About 325 inflammatory words that are likely to provoke one side or the other. Example: attack, terrorism, bombing, assassination, retaliation, aggression, killing.

— About 200 pacific words. Example: calm, cease-fire, negotiation, peace process, hope, disengagement, cooperation.

Three possible choices for each word: inflammatory, conciliatory or not coded.

Some ideas are inflammatory per se. There’s no way for an Israeli to say fence, barrier or wall that will not provoke Palestinians. To most Israelis, it’s a fence; to Palestinians, it’s a
wall or worse. Intifada automatically agitates Israelis. To Palestinians, a suicide bomber is shahid, which is a step stronger than martyr; to Israelis, a suicide bomber is a saboteur, which is a step stronger than terrorist. Code all references to sabotage or saboteur by an Arabic source as conciliatory.

Although we are working primarily at the word level, context is important. You might have to look at the sentence, paragraph or article. Why?

1. Violence is conciliatory when used as “Violence only begets more violence”; it is inflammatory when used as “All they understand is violence.” Code the former conciliatory; code the latter inflammatory. Similar words with contextual meanings include support, halt, deny and crack down. Support is conciliatory when it supports peace; it is inflammatory when it supports violence. To the Israelis, they are settlements; to Palestinians, they are illegal colonies. Code all forms inflammatory, since any reference will inflame one side or the other. Exception: An Israeli calling for removal of settlements from Palestinian land would be conciliatory. Israel denouncing Syria is inflammatory; Palestine denouncing Syria is conciliatory (in the context of Palestinian-Israeli relations). “Meeting” and “met” is conciliatory when it is with the other side, but do not code a meeting with one’s own side or with one’s allies. Example: “Abbas said he would fight against terror.” The last three words (fight, against and terror) are all conciliatory in this context. “Conflict” usually is inflammatory, but it is conciliatory when the context is a plea to “End this conflict.” Code end as conciliatory and do not code conflict.

2. Denunciation must be examined to determine who is denouncing whom for what. If one side is denouncing the other side, code it inflammatory; if one side is denouncing extremists on the same side for creating trouble, code it conciliatory. Anger usually is inflammatory, but if
the anger is directed at one’s own extremists, consider it conciliatory. Demand and accuse, like

denounce, depend on the context.

3. *Moderate* is conciliatory, but *moderately* as in moderately *wounded* should not be
coded. *Extremist* is inflammatory when applied to the other side; it is conciliatory when applied
critically to one’s own side.

4. Ideas can be difficult to call. Example: “We’re tired of all this.” Code *tired* as
conciliatory.

5. Some words acquire significance only in context. *Joy* is not necessarily political, but
when a partisan expresses joy at the other side’s misery, it is inflammatory in the context of
conflict.

6. *Terrorist* is inflammatory; counter-terrorist depends on the context.

7. *Saboteur* and *sabotage* are conciliatory when used by Abbas to describe a *suicide
bomber*. Why? Because Abbas has adopted the Israeli term to describe a *bomber*.

8. Mention of the *fence/wall* is inflammatory to the Palestinians. So when an Israeli
criticizes the fence, it would be pacific, right? No -- not if the reason for the criticism is that it
has not been completed. If an Israeli supports the fence but not its location, code the *barrier* as
inflammatory and *route* as conciliatory. On the other side, if a *suicide bomber* accuses the PA of
collaborating with the *enemy*, the effect is inflammatory. Also code as inflammatory language
by Arabs criticizing the PA’s efforts to bring charges against those responsible for breaking the
peace.

9. Palestinian criticism of the attack is pacific, but the *attack* itself is inflammatory. So
code the criticism as pacific but words describing the *attack* as inflammatory.
10. An Israeli official quoting a Palestinian official does not make it a Palestinian story. It’s still an Israeli story if it appeared in an Israeli newspaper. Ditto for the reverse – a Palestinian official quoting an Israeli official in a Palestinian newspaper.

11. Count phrasal verbs as one word. Examples: win out, run in, clamp down, taking over.

12. Count noun phrases according to the meaning of each word. Example: *truce agreement* gets counted as two conciliatory words; *terrorist suicide bomber* gets counted three times. But: “freedom fighter” should be counted once (under *fighter*) as inflammatory.

13. Specific coding instructions:
   a. I see an *end* to violence. Code *end* as conciliatory.
   b. They are *stalling* the *peace* process. Code *stalling* as inflammatory and *peace* as conciliatory.
   c. We are *committed* to *peace*. Code both *committed* and *peace* as conciliatory.

14. Assume that newspapers have their own sources for matters of general knowledge. Example from an Arabic newspaper: Israelis said Hizbollah might be to blame for the attack. You need not attribute disclosure of the attack to an Israeli source. (The blue indicates an Arabic newspaper is quoting an Israeli source.)

15. There’s a lot of denial going around. Stories in the Arabic press report denials of (for example): responsibility, role, knowledge, reports, involvement, accusations, allegations, statements, charges and links. If the source is disclaiming participation in the bombing, code *denied* as conciliatory, and do not code the object (responsibility, role, knowledge etc.). Example: He denied responsibility for the bombing. Code *denied* as conciliatory and *bombing* as inflammatory. Ignore “responsibility.”
16 Same with claim. If a terrorist group admits guilt, code claim as inflammatory and leave responsibility (or whatever) alone.

17 Attack, deadly, suicide, kill, weapons, bombing, bomber, militant and extremist usually are coded as inflammatory.

18. Beware of words that normally are inflammatory but that are used in a way that promotes peace. Example: sabotage. Example: In a severe condemnation of the attack, Abbas accused “third parties” of “trying to sabotage the cease-fire and the political process and to harm the national goals of the Palestinian people. We will spare no time or effort in pursuing them and bringing them to justice. We will let no one sabotage our security.” Code sabotage in blue italics. Do not code “security.”

19. Negative and contrary phrasing frequently complicates coding decisions. Examples: Israel will not agree to any diplomatic sham. Israel will not retaliate. Example: He will fight against terror (previously cited).

The hardest to code will be a nuanced analysis or an editorial. For example, Haaretz generally supports the fence/wall/barrier, as long as it’s on Israeli land and its location has been negotiated with Palestinians. Code that support inflammatory. But Haaretz opposes putting the wall on Palestinian land. Code that opposition conciliatory. Example from an editorial in a Palestinian newspaper: “Attacking and killing innocent people is a crime and terrorism.” Code it as conciliatory criticism, as shown.

Contrary wording should be coded according to the writer’s intent. Example: “The alternative is to postpone the decisions and to prolong the conflict, thus guaranteeing more suffering and more victims.” The writer clearly opposes the alternative, as would reasonable
people on both sides. Code only alternative. Example: “A fence within Palestinian territory has the same logic as home demolition.” Code only logic.

Sometimes, the best call is a no-call:

1. Outsiders. Example: The Americans are angry at X. Regardless of the identity of X, don’t code it. American emotion is not relevant to the purposes of this study. Nor are allegations of American plans against Syria. Don’t code them. Example: “Blair knows how to run a peace process.” Also irrelevant. Neither should you code calls for outside bodies to do the bidding of one side or the other. Example: Israel called on the Quartet to press the PA to disarm. But: Blaming one’s own side or one’s allies constitutes self-criticism or acceptance of responsibility, which is conciliatory. When Abbas blames a third party, he means one of his allies.

2. Negative phrasing might be a no-call. Example: He didn’t blame anyone. Example: "We are not accusing anybody at the moment.” Don’t code either one; nothing is happening.


4. Irony calls for a no-code. "We are not going to stand for terrorist attacks in the morning, attend funerals in the afternoon and negotiate at night in nice hotels as if nothing was happening.”

5. Hypotheticals and conjectures usually should not be coded. Example: If the other side really wants peace, it will trust us. Example: Other parties might want to destabilize the situation.

6. Advice. Example: Israeli leaders said he should start to arrest and disarm militants. Leave it alone.

7. “Demand” usually is codable as inflammatory but other words and the words that follow pose problems of definition.
a. Example: (The other side) must stop the violence and disarm. Don’t code. It’s also advice.

b. Example: He said the other side had to crack down on fighters to preserve the ceasefire he agreed to. Don’t code.

c. Example: The other side cannot rely on agreements with extremists. It’s both advice and negative phrasing. Do not code.

However, advice to one’s own side might be codable as conciliatory. See the fence example. Threats, on the other hand, are fully codable as inflammatory, but do not include conciliatory words that might be embedded in the threat.

7. Agreements, negotiations and meetings between Palestinians and Israelis are conciliatory; agreement between Palestinian groups is internal business and should not be coded.

8. Close calls: “We will do everything to put an end to those terrorist attacks.” “Terrorist” and “attacks” are easy, but what about end? It could mean tough; it could mean tender. Don’t code it. If a Palestinian says, “I condemn the attack,” code condemn as conciliatory and attack as inflammatory. The attack is reality; it has occurred. However, if a Palestinian says, “We are against any operation that harms civilians,” code against as conciliatory and do not code “harms.”

9. Equivocal statements, such as "Israel does not exclude the possibility of an involvement by the Lebanese Hezbollah in this attack although it is not yet certain.” Don’t code it.

Some arbitrary decisions: Code as inflammatory suicide, bombing, bomber, explosion, attack, funeral, killed, injured, wounded, fatalities, missing (in the context of possible injury or worse), mourn, tears, pain, blood, shock, death and died. Do not code “passed away.” Do not
code “died” in the context of “Arafat died.” “Violent explosion” gets counted twice, once for violent, again for explosion. Bloody clashes get counted twice. However, military action or military force gets counted once under military.

Friend/friendship gets coded only if applied cross culturally (i.e., Israeli for Palestinian). Exception to the exception: Code death inflammatory when used as “Death to the Xs!” Code death as conciliatory when an Israeli says, “People aren’t shouting ‘death to the Arabs.’”

Code intense pain as one word: pain. Code terrorist violence as two words: terrorist and violence. Code cease-fire as one word. Code political process as one word: political. Code peace process as one word: peace. Code public relations as one word: relations. Code gleeful enthusiasm as two words; they are two ideas. Code “no business there” as one word. Code “not prepared to go back” as one word. Code “cruel terror attack” as three words. Code “addresses both their needs” as one word: addresses. Code “end this conflict” as one word: end. Code “process” as one word when used as a short form for “peace process.”

In applying the word list, watch for inflected forms: blood, bloody, bloodshed, bleeding are all inflammatory. Moderate and moderation usually are conciliatory.

Internal criticism (side on side): If a criticism advances the cause of peace, code it conciliatory; if it would drive deeper the wedge between the two sides, code it inflammatory. Again, context becomes important. Vacating Gaza is conciliatory, except when a critic of the government claims it to be dangerous – an opinion that would be inflammatory to the Palestinians.

The fundamental test is that of the “reasonable person.” Would a reasonable Israeli or Palestinian consider a word inflammatory or conciliatory as regards relations between the two sides?
Specific instructions:

--By computer: **bold** for inflammatory, *italics* for conciliatory.

Addendum: In the sample story, all coded words are shown in bold: conciliatory words also are shown in italic. In the recapitulation below the story, words in the left column are inflammatory; words in the right column are conciliatory. Don’t pay any attention to whether the words in the recap are in light, bold or italics, except that if a word appears in bold among other words in lightface in a specific entry, it is to identify it as the codable word; the rest is for context.
Figure 1

This cartoon was published February 27 on the back page (p. 24) of Al-Quds. The sign reads:

“Stop. National Interests.”