The Hegemony of Media Misrepresentation: The New York Times' Misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict

By

Arsim Tariq

Registration No: 00000327866

Supervised By

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad

(2022)

The Hegemony of Media Misrepresentation: The New York Times' Misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict

By

Arsim Tariq

Registration No: 00000327866

Supervised By

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad

(2022)

The Hegemony of Media Misrepresentation: The New York Times' Misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict

By

Arsim Tariq

Registration No: 00000327866

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MS Peace and Conflict Studies

Supervisor

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)
Islamabad
(2022)

Thesis Acceptance Certificate

It is certified that the contents and form of the MS thesis titled "**The Hegemony of Media Misrepresentation: The New York Times' Misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict"** written by **Mr. Arsim Tariq (Registration No. 00000327866)** of Centre for International Peace and Stability has been vetted by the undersigned, found complete in all respects as per NUST status/regulations, is free of plagiarism, errors and mistakes and is accepted as partial fulfillment for the award of MS/MPhil Degree. It is further certified that the necessary amendments as pointed out by the GEC members of the scholars have also been incorporated in the said thesis and have been found satisfactory for the requirement of the degree.

Supervisor: _____

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

CIPS, NUST

Head of Department: _____

Dr. Muhammad Makki

CIPS, NUST

Associate Dean: _____

Dr. Tughral Yamin

CIPS, NUST

Dated: _____

CERTIFICATE FOR PLAGIARISM

It is certified that this MS thesis titled "**The Hegemony of Media Misrepresentation: The New York Times' Misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict"** written by **Mr. Arsim Tariq (Registration No. 00000327866)** has been examined by me. I undertake that:

a. The thesis has significant new work/knowledge as compared to the works already published. No sentence, equation, diagram, table, paragraph, or section has been copied verbatim from previous works. All material used has been directly referenced.

b. The work presented is the original work of the author (i.e., there is no plagiarism). No ideas, processes, results, or words of others have been presented as the author's own work.

c. There is no fabrication of data or results. The thesis has been checked using TURNITIN (a copy of the originality attached) and found within limits as per HEC plagiarism policy and instructions issued from time to time.

_____

Signature of Supervisor

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad, Pakistan

Author's Declaration

I, **Arsim Tariq,** hereby state that my MS thesis titled "**The Hegemony of Media Misrepresentation: The New York Times' Misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict**" written by **Mr. Arsim Tariq (Registration No. 00000327866)** is my own work and has not been submitted previously by me for taking any degree from National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST), Islamabad, or anywhere else in the country/world.

At any time if my statement is found to be incorrect even after my Graduation, the university has the right to withdraw my MS degree.

_____

Name of Student: (Arsim Tariq)

Date: 31 August 2022

Dedication

To my mother and father for their endless love, support, and encouragement, and to the people of Palestine and their resistance in the face of injustice…

Acknowledgments

"When injustice becomes law, resistance becomes duty."

- *Thomas Jefferson*

This project would not have been possible without the support of many people and the resistance of the Palestinian people that motivated me throughout this endeavour. Many thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed, for guiding me through this intellectual journey under circumstances that I wish no student in my country should ever face. I thank Dr. Waqas for holding both formal and informal sessions to inspire my research, understand my problems, and provide me relief during times of mental health crisis. The ignorance of supervisors towards students' context-specific issues and their so-called 'professional' alienation and disregard for students' personal lives is a significant factor that, I believe, is impeding passionate and dedicated research in Pakistan. I'm glad that this was not the case for me, at least not from my supervisor's side.

I would also like to thank my GEC members, Dr. Najimdeen Bakare and Dr. Imdad Ullah, for their time and support.

In the course of this interesting journey, I, along with my peers, noticed the presence and persistence of disciplinary gangs in the Pakistani social sciences academia. Because of the space constraints, it is difficult to summarize it in this section. However, the most important thing I observed is that the professors try to impose their subjectivities on students' research interests. They try to dismiss their ideas as insignificant and impractical. The main reasons for this absolute disdain may vary, but it mostly depends on the positionality (I have discussed this concept in Chapter 4 of this thesis) of professors. The only way forward, I believe, is to write more and more dissent and resist the existing toxic structures of the academy.

Lastly, I want to thank my companion, Aimen Bukhari, and my friends, Alamgeer Abbas, Dr. Mehboob Alam, Maria Jadoon, Tayyaba Razzaq, Syed Ali Abbas, and Samar Amin for their constant moral support and patience to put up with my rants. A special thanks to Gul e Henna Aftab for helping me form the theoretical framework in the earlier stages of this research.

Abstract

Many studies have claimed that the Western media coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict is biased and misrepresented in favor of Israel. During the recent Israel-Palestine crisis that erupted on 10 May 2021 and ended with a ceasefire on 21 May 2021, the New York Times faced criticism for its biased reporting in favor of Israel and misrepresentation of the Palestinian side. The misreporting raises significant concerns over the representation of the conflict in the media, consequently, limiting the capacity of 'resolving' the conflict. This research argues that the factually incorrect information and misrepresentation of one party (Palestine) by the New York Times not only negates the Conflict Resolution theory but also perpetuates the conflict by displaying the other party (Israel) as victims and legitimizing their aggression. The issue is not only national but global. The misrepresentation is creating a global environment in favor of Israel that does not want resolution of the conflict because it is dominant and in power. This research, will analyze the news and editorial coverage by the New York Times of the Israel-Palestine crisis of 2021 within a context of media manipulation, misrepresentation, and linguistic determinism through content analysis under Jürgen Habermas's theoretical model of instrumental/strategic rationality or action. Furthermore, this research will explore the knowledge dissemination through media manipulation of the New York Times, embedded in the realms of US-centric approaches of looking at peace and conflict.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

1. Introduction:

Journalists do not operate in a vacuum, and one cannot consider their work to be an isolated undertaking as a result (Amer, 2021). Journalists are social actors that frequently negotiate and respond to a variety of situations and causes, including those that are professional, ideological, cultural, and professional in nature. Journalists, as we all know, are responsible for producing meanings, documenting events, communicating opinions (including their own), and illuminating imaginations through the utilisation of a wide variety of linguistic and other resources in real-world contexts and, more specifically, during specific historical moments (Jackson, 2021). They wield a tremendous amount of influence over how viewers of news media see particular local and worldwide occurrences and realities. As a direct consequence of this, news reporting has always fulfilled a number of responsibilities concurrently and within the context of particular social and political forces or dynamics (Amer, 2021).

The media does not accurately or impartially reflect the world "out there." Journalists are inherently selective and subjective in the sense that they make educated strategic judgements about what material to include or remove, which lexical and syntactic components to utilise to identify news actors and events, how to introduce and organise information in news texts, and which socio-political, cultural, or professional principles to embrace when writing about or studying a topic (Amer, 2008). These selections typically motivate particular social groupings and bear the ideological marks of the authors as well as the operational mechanisms of the news pieces (Bagdikian, 2004).

The dissemination and inclusion of people's social values, dogmas, and philosophies, as well as the construction, influence, or challenge of people's perspectives, beliefs, and representations of 'Other' social groups and polities, are all important responsibilities that fall under the purview of the mass media. In the current environment, it is difficult to disentangle the work of media professionals from the social and ideological context in which they do their jobs. Said summed it out perfectly (1981, page 45):

> "[T]he media are profit-seeking corporations and therefore, quite understandably, have an interest in promoting some images of reality rather than others. They do so within a political context made active and effective by an unconscious ideology, which the media disseminate without serious reservations or oppositions."

In times of conflict and local or international unrest, the media either become the sites and instruments of political and social conflict and resistance to these dominant discourses by providing a platform for dominant discourses to exert influence over less powerful ones, or they provide a platform for dominant discourses to exert influence over less powerful ones. This is a pivotal and very crucial part to play in the story. (2001, page 22) Malkawi provided an explanation:

> "Media text functions as a window through which we can view the world and live the events as real. It has the power to influence readers by all means since it is an effective mechanism for affecting individual perceptions of reality. By analyzing the media text ideologically, we are able to see the debates in society through text."

As a result, journalists frequently face limitations in their coverage of social events as a result of institutional, political, or ideological constraints and concerns. As a result, they are required to produce discourses that interpret reality through the lens of their top executives and decision-

makers or through a reality to which they subscribe. Therefore, the lexical, grammatical, and other choices that are made by journalists working for a variety of organisations are typically influenced by the causes and situations related to the institutions themselves, ideologies, or politics. Each phrase that is used in the media is what is known as a "two-sided act," which depends on whose word it is and for whom it is intended. Furthermore, the meaning of any given term is continuously contested as a result of the interaction between the addresser and the addressee (Orimogunje et al., 2016).

In this regard, various studies argue that the portrayal of the Israel-Palestine issue in Western media is biassed and misinterpreted in favour of Israel. [Citation needed] [Citation needed] (Ackerman, 2001; Amer & Amer, 2011; Bennett, 1990; Ismail, 2008; Leuenberger, 2012; Munayyer, 2014; Safty, 1991; Stallings, 1990; Terry & Mendenhall, 1974; Viser, 2003). In academic circles, the notion that the American media treats Israel with "baby gloves" (Friedman, 1987) favouritism continues to be a point of contention, particularly in the context of Palestine. Some studies, for example, have analysed pro-Israel reporting, mapping, and reference tactics in Western media and found a continuous pattern of selection, exclusion, and inclusion that, for the most part, endorses Israeli justifications and expressions. Other studies have followed a similar line of inquiry and found similar results (Leuenberger, 2012; Munayyer, 2014; Terry & Mendenhall, 1974; Viser, 2003). Others have evaluated the tendency of the prevalent views in the American media to deny the reality of Palestinians as a country, thereby dismissing alternative interpretations and generally absolving Israel of culpability. This has been done in the context of the American media's coverage of the conflict in the Middle East (Ismail, 2008; Safty, 1991).

When the American media views or portrays Palestinian resistance as terrorist activity (Safty, 1991) and Israeli use of force as a matter of national security, there is a systematic disregard for

the political and historical background of the situation (Friedman, 1987). The media, in its role as a weapon of social control and influence, does more than "simply communicate;" it also replicates the societal conceptions that make up reality (Ismail, 2008). For example, the United States media coverage of the first Palestinian intifada (1987-1991) did not provide the necessary context for readers to understand the dynamics of the war (Ismail, 2008). Alternative interpretations of the Israel-Palestine conflict that are in line with the "strategic objectives" of the political elite in the United States have been marginalised as a result of the "hegemony of media deception" that has dominated coverage of the conflict (Bennett, 1990).

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, countless thinkers representing a variety of schools of thought have debated the factors that led to the conflict between Israel and Palestine (Beinin & Hajjar, 2014; Pappe, 2004; Said, 1986). Since the beginning of time, the idea of conflict has been linked with the struggle that occurs between two antagonistic groups over limited resources (McDonald & Sweeney, 2007). Lewis Coser, a German-American sociologist, views conflict as a struggle between rivals for principles and claims to limited reputation, power, and resources (Coser, 1998). When one party infringes upon the rights of the other, there is no way to avoid conflict. Many academics, like Harms and Neal (1995), Spangler (2019), and Van Oord (2008), have pondered the subject of why conflicts between Jews and Arabs in Palestine broke out in the first place (Harms; Neal, 1995; Spangler, 2019; Van Oord, 2008). Their research is founded not only on historical reports and a chronological investigation of the battle, but also on a theological point of view, with the goal of elucidating the factors that led to the conflict in the first place.

According to the findings of a large number of researchers, the conflict between Israel and Palestine is the most protracted, lawless, and unpredictable conflict in the world (Ahmed, 2021). It has been argued that the divide-and-conquer tactics employed by the British in the past

contributed to the escalation of the conflict, as they were successful in sowing the seeds of enduring hatred and animosity between Jews and Arabs (Pappe, 2004). Since the 1960s, the United States of America and the United Nations have co-sponsored a series of ineffective peace negotiations in an effort to bring an end to the conflict (Ahmed, 2021). Palestinians and people who think in a left-leaning way have been critical of the peace processes, especially the most recent peace plan proposed by US President Donald Trump, on the grounds that they are pro-Israel or give Israel the leverage of being an ally of the US, which is an exceptional position (Ahmed, 2021; Economist, 2020; Zureik, 2019). In a similar vein, the official stance taken by the US government during the 11-day crisis between Israel and Palestine in May 2021 was one that supported Israel.

In May 2021, critics of US foreign policy were harsh on the US for its acceptance of Israel's official explanation in the ongoing struggle between Israel and Palestinian resistance organisations. This conflict was between Israel and Palestinian resistance organisations. (Povilus, 2020; Waxman & Pressman, 2021). In spite of the fact that there had been conflicts in the past, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict of May 2021 did not start until May 10, 2021, and it lasted until May 21, 2021, when a ceasefire was announced (Hallward, 2021). At least 243 individuals were killed, including more than 100 women and children, according to the Ministry of Health in Gaza. Among the victims were also women. Only twelve people were reported killed in Israel (Panayotova & Rizova, 2021). On May 6, tensions between Israeli settlers and Palestinians were brought to a head in Sheikh Jarrah, where Palestinian houses were threatened with eviction due to an order from an Israeli court (Hallward, 2021). In East Jerusalem, about one thousand Palestinian protesters were hurt by Israeli security forces between the 10th and 14th of May. (Panayotova & Rizova, 2021). During this time, the coverage of the crisis provided by Western media outlets was marked by a consistent pro-Israeli bias (JEGIC, 2021).

Since the beginning of modern international politics, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has been one of the most pressing, difficult, and fascinating problems to face the global community. According to Tasseron (2021), the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict continues to be a focus point for the world news media, which has become more sensitive to the turbulent events that have been taking place in this Middle Eastern region (see also Philo & Berry, 2011; Wolfsfeld, 2018). The Gaza Strip, which is around 365 square kilometres in area and is home to over two million Palestinians, is of particular significance. Since the Palestinian Hamas organisation won a shocking election win in 2006, it has been subject to an oppressive Israeli occupation embargo. This embargo has been in place since 2006. Since that time, the little enclave has been the target of four major military operations carried out by Israel, the most recent of which lasted for eleven days, beginning on May 10 and ending on May 21, 2021.

Following incidents of tension and violence at the Al-Aqsa Mosque in East Jerusalem, Israel's most recent and massive escalation on the Gaza Strip took place there. It all started when Jewish settler groups backed by the Israeli army and police attempted to evict and confiscate the property of Palestinian residents in East Jerusalem's Sheikh Jarrah's neighbourhood, which sparked protests at Al-Aqsa Mosque that were violently suppressed by Israeli occupation forces, resulting in 350 Palestinians being injured. This was the beginning of the conflict (Anadolu Agency, 2021). The Palestinian resistance organisations in Gaza have given Israel an ultimatum, demanding that by six o'clock in the evening, all of its troops, security officers, and police leave the Al-Aqsa Mosque compound. On May 10, you will stop attacking those who attend religious services. During this time, Palestinian factions began shooting rockets into territories controlled by Israel.

The Israeli attack on Gaza and Palestinian resistance prompted extensive media coverage, heated diplomatic involvement, and global protests against the Israeli occupation army's hostility and

airstrikes against Palestinians in the besieged Gaza Strip. These actions were taken in response to the Israeli occupation army's hostility and airstrikes against Palestinians in the besieged Gaza Strip. The Israeli attacks that took place in Gaza resulted in the deaths of 260 people, 129 of whom were civilians, and 66 of whom were minors, according to the United Nations. According to the local authorities in Gaza, more than 2,000 industrial, commercial, and service facilities were totally or partially destroyed, more over 50,000 residential units were damaged, and 2,400 dwelling units were rendered uninhabitable as a result of the conflict (Human Rights Watch, August 2021). The Israeli military carried out strikes in the Gaza Strip that illegally targeted civilians, resulting in the destruction of high-rise buildings, shops, houses, and other civilian infrastructure. This caused residents of the Gaza Strip to suffer irreparable harm (Human Rights Watch, August 2021). In retaliation for Israeli occupation bombs, Palestinian armed factions fired thousands of rockets into Israeli-held territory. As a result, 12 Israelis were killed, including two children and a soldier.

Throughout the course of the conflict, activists and journalists such as Sana Saeed and Muhammad El Kurd criticised the Western media for portraying Israel's strikes on civilians as being justified as a form of self-defense against Hamas. The coverage of the crisis and interpretations of various events in the media such as the New York Times, The Guardian, and the Washington Post were viewed as part of Western bias and orientalism towards the Arabs, as well as the West's strategic alliance with Israel in the Middle East. Examples of these publications include: (JEGIC, 2021). For instance, a research conducted by the G5 Internet Observatory found that during the crisis that occurred in May 2021, over 300 of the news headlines that were created by The New York Times and The Guardian displayed an obvious bias in favour of Israel. [Citation needed] This pattern, however, began to wane once Western media outlets and government leaders saw that it was difficult to justify Israeli violence.

As was said earlier, the media engages in the practise of manipulating the news in order to produce and repeat the hegemonic principles of the state (Howell et al., 1980). It is a significant figure in the political and cultural life of the nation, especially in the United States, where it maintains a prominent place. Gitlin (1980) asserts that people depend on the media for their realities, symbols, and heroes. Because the media has access to all lines of communication and text, it serves as an excellent platform for the ruling class to construct and put into practise a reality and a consensus that is in line with the goals that they have set for themselves; they control the means of communication (Strinati, 1995).

Therefore, the media is the most significant marketplace of ideas, and the sense of objectivity that is attached to it allows it the legitimacy to propagate ideologies and views that are either intentionally or unintentionally in accordance with the interests of the ruling class, which is another name for the state. A decontextualized picture of the Palestinian struggle is the result, for example, of the media's unfavourable portrayal of Palestinian resistance against Israel (Ismail, 2008). Concerning the conflict between Israel and Palestine, politically uneducated people are being indoctrinated with notions that aid politically powerful people in maintaining their support for the United States government's policies toward Israel (Hallward, 2011; Handley, 2009; Hawkins, 2002).

This inquiry looks into how The New York Times (henceforth NYT) reported on the Israeli assault on Gaza in May of 2021. It explores the discursive techniques and linguistic resources utilised by the New York Times, as well as their contribution to a particular picture of political players and events. The focus of this investigation is on how the New York Times portrays political actors and events. The New York Times is recognised as one of the most influential news outlets in the world, and its coverage of the conflict in the Middle East is closely analysed by influential politicians,

policy-making circles, organisations, and international actors. Recent decades have seen an increase in the number of empirical investigations that have demonstrated a pro-Israel bias in the reporting of the New York Times (Jackson, 2021; Philo & Berry, 2004; Nashashibi et al., 2016; Ozohu-Suleiman, 2014; Viser, 2003; Zelizer, Park, & Gudeluns, 2002; Zelizer, Park, & Gudeluns, 2002)

This research is extremely important because it aims to differentiate between the depictions of Palestinians and Israelis during the most recent Israeli attack on Palestinians in Gaza. The purpose of this research is to investigate the language structures, settings, hegemonic formulations, and ideological ramifications that have defined, instructed, or affected the discourses of the New York Times throughout this historic period. Additionally, the study investigates the manner in which other alternative readings of events are marginalised or ignored.

This study contends that the misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine conflict by the New York Times through its hegemonic power produces a decontextualized and negative portrayal of the Palestinian resistance in the United States and perpetuates the conflict by portraying Israel as the victim, thereby legitimising their use of force. Additionally, this study contends that the misrepresentation of the conflict by the New York Times through its hegemonic power produces a negative portrayal of the Palestinian resistance in The hegemonic ideas that are spread through the language produced by The New York Times are normalised in part due to the legitimization of Israel's official narrative, which adds to this normalisation. This study analysed the news and editorial coverage of the 11-day Israel-Palestine crisis in May 2021 using content, contextual, and textual analysis within the theoretical frameworks of Speech Act Theory, Jurgen Habermas' Strategic Action, and Antonio Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony. The crisis occurred in May 2021 and lasted for 11 days. The overall number of periodicals utilised in this study is 88. There are 71

news stories and 17 editorials and opinion pieces included. In order to retrieve information from the "World News" section of the New York Times, the term "Israel-Palestine" was utilised.

1.1. **Methodology:**

Assuming that there is a common pro-Israel bias in the US media based on the existing literature on the subject, this research will examine all news pieces and editorials in the New York Times regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict from the 10th to the 21st of May 2021. This time period covers the conflict between Israel and Palestine. The overall number of periodicals utilised in this study is 88. There are 71 news stories and 17 editorials and opinion pieces included. In order to retrieve information from the "World News" section of the New York Times, the term "Israel-Palestine" was utilised. The editorial coverage and news coverage of the newspaper are taken into consideration because, in contrast to opinion pieces, they reflect the newspaper's official perspective. The approach that will be used for this research will include content analysis, contextual analysis, and textual analysis. It is being investigated because content analysis has emerged as a viable alternative to public opinion and media research. This implies that it can now be used to monitor markets, political leanings, and new ideas; it can also be used to resolve legal issues and investigate people's views (Krippendorff, 2018). "That it is fundamentally empirically grounded, exploratory in process, and predictive or inferential in intent; that it transcends traditional notions of symbols, contents, and intentions; and that it has been pushed to produce its own methodology, one that allows researchers to plan, execute, communicate, reproduce, and critically evaluate an analysis regardless of the desirability of its resutls," is how Klaus Krippendorff describes the three characteristics of content analysis. "That it transcends traditional notions of symbols" (Krippendorff, 2018).

In contrast to contextual analysis, which investigates the socially, politically, and historically removed interpretations of an event, this method investigates the presence of certain texts and themes and how they are related to one another as well as the meanings they convey and the relationships between them. According to the concept of contextual analysis, meaning is derived from the interaction that takes place between the text, the setting, and individual observers. This strategy, to put it another way, explores the contextual factors that could be responsible for a variety of different interpretations of the text (Staiger, 1992).

In conclusion, our investigation is predicated on a textual analysis that goes beyond counting stories, defining their substance, assessing their authenticity, and determining if they have a positive or negative tone. Understanding of the culture in which these works circulate can be gained through the use of this strategy (Ismail, 2008). Textual analysis is a subset of qualitative analysis that, in addition to the text's explicit content, investigates the text's implicit ideological and cultural assumptions. Text is often conceptualised as an intricate set of discursive tactics that are embedded within a particular cultural milieu. An attempt is made in textual analysis to comprehend or characterise the text's meaning in addition to its structure and substance. The linguistic structures of representations are the primary emphasis of this approach. In addition to this, it is necessary to combine assessments of the text with those of its setting. Because a text cannot speak for itself, Bennett (1982) asserts that literary interpretations need to be contextualised within the social, political, economic, material, institutional, and cultural settings in which they are produced and consumed. Staiger's study (1992) examines, from a material-historical point of view, the manner in which the placement of textual meaning occurs not only in the text itself, but also in the contacts that audiences have with a text. Research of this kind begins with the presumption that the meanings of texts might alter over time as a result of shifting contextual

variables. A researcher needs to investigate not only the text itself, but also the external discourse that surrounds the production and reception of the text. This includes everything that has been said about the text, as well as everything that has been written about the text (Bennett, 1982).

1.1.1. The New York Times

The New York Times is selected due to its ideological stance and structural placement. The New York Times, commonly known as the unofficial newspaper of record in the United States, is among the most important newspapers in the world due to its "huge circulation among politically influential individuals" (Howell et al., 1980). According to Gitlin (1980), this publication "sets agendas, producing and validating concerns in political, commercial, intellectual, professional, and academic circles" (Howell et al., 1980). Therefore, The New York Times is an immensely significant barometer of the issues and events that are deemed noteworthy and indicative of how these concerns are being addressed in influential US circles.

In addition, this study focuses on the reporting of the New York Times because it is one of the most influential newspapers in the United States and has a strong national and international reputation. Cotter (2003) claims that the New York Times is the "newspaper of record" for society and that its news "often makes its way into policymakers' and politicians' conversations, essentially setting (or following) the national agenda for public discourse."

> "[I]t is the only national newspaper for the general audience and has more than 250 print and broadcast news organizations that subscribe to its services, most of which use news or syndicated columnists from the New York Times daily. For these reasons, when the Times

succeeds or fails it has a disproportionate effect on most of the other printed and broadcast news and, of course, on the American public."

In a similar vein, Friel and Falk (2004) assert that the New York Times "occupies such a lofty position in the political and moral imagination of powerful Americans and others as the most authoritative source of information and direction on matters of public policy." The New York Times is a trustworthy source of information and provides well-informed commentary on events and issues that are of interest to its readers. Therefore, policy-making circles as well as political and economic elites in the United States are likely to pay a great deal of attention to the coverage of key events provided by the New York Times. One example of this would be the Israeli attack on Gaza. It is very possible that it will play a key part in the dissemination and selling of information pertaining to the conflict in the Middle East. As a result, it has the potential to actively form or influence both United States foreign policy and public opinion towards this incident.

1.2. Research Objective:

The aim of this research is to explore the knowledge dissemination and normalization of hegemonic ideas to legitimize the Israeli rationale through media misrepresentation embedded in the realms of US-centric parochialism of looking at peace and conflict. This research will, specifically, analyze the media misrepresentation of the 11-day Israel-Palestine crisis of May 2021. Furthermore, this study aims to apply a critical theoretical framework to explore how the hegemonic ideas and interpretations of the dominant actor have pushed the alternative interpretations to the margins.

1.3. Research Questions:

2. How did the NYT represent the 11-day Israel-Palestine crisis of May 2021?

3. How does this coverage and representation contribute to the construction of a particular ideological representation of the crisis?

4. How does the news media play a role in representing, legitimizing, or delegitimizing political actors and their actions and maintaining power asymmetries between different political groups?

5. How do the methodological and theoretical approaches utilized in the study explain the NYT coverage of the May 2021 crisis?

1.4. Research Significance:

This research will focus on the dissemination of knowledge that is being circulated by the media in the US and the world over by misrepresenting the Palestinian side. As mentioned above in detail, much has been written on the link between media and the Israel-Palestine conflict but no study has utilized Habermas' Strategic Action, Speech Act Theory and Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony to explain the dissemination of hegemonic ideas through media. Secondly, the research will explain the marginalization of alternative voices in the US media by the dominant class.

Chapter Two

2. Literature Review:

Contradictory findings emerge from the extensive corpus of research on media bias, which nearly entirely concentrates its attention on examinations of prominent television news programmes and leading newspapers' coverage of important events. Some studies claim that there is a liberal bias in the media since the vast majority of prominent journalists in the United States are regarded to adhere to a liberal philosophy (see Berryhill, 1994; Goldberg, 2002; Lichter, Rothman, and Lichter, 1986; Rusher, 1988). Others argue that the media are conservative because they are profit-driven, owned by corporations, and dependent on the government, corporations, and other elite forms of information. They also claim that the media are dependent on elite sources of information (see Alterman, 2003; Bagdikian, 2004; Croteau and Hoynes, 1994; Herman and Chomsky, 1988; Hertsgaard, 1989).

The vast majority of such books contain significant errors. In the first place, they rely on anecdotal evidence and don't provide a solution to the question "Biased by what standard?" In the second place, they don't differentiate themselves from other media organisations or make any comparisons between them. They do not inquire as to whether or not they are more conservative (or more liberal) in comparison to other news sources. Thirdly, they refuse to acknowledge the idea that the perspective of a newspaper or news organisation can shift depending on the topic at hand and over the course of time.

Even though most, if not all, discussions of media bias have relied on anecdotal evidence, some researchers concerned with the generalizability and reproducibility of their findings have done research utilising clearly defined methodology. This is because these researchers want to ensure

that their findings can be replicated. The approaches that centre on one or more of the following topics—sources, gatekeeping, language use, and journalistic attitudes—are the ones that are used most frequently.

One of the most prevalent approaches of determining bias involves looking at the individuals who are mentioned or given a voice in the media's coverage of contentious social and political issues. Gans (1979) is credited with being the first person to differentiate between "knowns" and "unknowns" as sources in his landmark examination of television newscasts and news magazines. Investigating ideological imbalances in source selection (Croteau and Hoynes, 1994), reliance on government and other officials (Brown et al., 1987; Reese, Grant, and Danielian, 1994; Sigal, 1973), and reliance on famous spokespersons and experts has been done with the help of the source-bias technique (Salwen, 1995; Steele, 1995; Welsh et al., 1997).

Atwater, 1987; Hofstetter and Buss, 1978; White, 1950; Whihelm, 2005; Williams, 2002); geographic regions (Dominick, 1977; Epstein, 1974; Whitney et al., 1989); and divergent perspectives on social and political issues (Doll and Bradley, 1974; Stempel, 1969; Stempel and Windhauser, 1989; Stovall, 1985) that receive media attention and those that are largely ignored (Doll and Bradley, 1974; Stempel and Windhauser

Communication theorists argue that bias in news reporting is unavoidable because of the inherently evaluative structure of language (Geis, 1991). In the field of language use studies, efforts are undertaken to assess the tenor of news coverage of the participation of contrasting opinions in social and political debates. In most cases, the analysis is determined by the number of times particular evaluative words or phrases are used (Adkins Covert et al., 2000; Ashley and Olson, 1998), or by the number of times positive, neutral, or negative statements are made (Adkins Covert et al., 2000; Ashley and Olson, 1998). (Niven, 2003).

A number of commentators are of the opinion that media bias is a direct result of the political leanings of individual journalists and that it is possible to quantify this phenomenon by analysing the proportion of journalists who have liberal or conservative viewpoints (Lichter, Rothman, and Lichter, 1986; Patterson and Donsbach, 1996). It is unclear whether journalists' personal perspectives actually inform us about their subsequent coverage given what others (Gans, 1985; Mindich, 1998; Reeves, 1997; Shoemaker and Reese, 1991) have identified regarding the editorial and news-production processes as well as the journalistic code of "objectivity."

Each of the approaches that were just now enumerated offers some new perspectives. On the other hand, bias in the media is not the result of a single aspect of news collection or coverage; rather, it is the influence of the entire process of news gathering and production.

2.1. Media Bias:

Media outlets wield a great amount of influence over the perspectives, attitudes, and behaviours of citizens since they are, for the vast majority of people, the single most important source of information on politics and armed conflicts. The media has a significant influence on the dynamics and consequences of conflicts, and consequently on the likelihood of a peaceful resolution between parties who are at war as a result of this influence. The media does this by publicising certain disputes but not others, and by portraying the problems they cover in particular ways. Because of this, the media is able to push depictions of a dispute or a contending party that are congruent with their own interests. This allows the media to further its own agenda.

The bias that exists in the media is not the result of random chance; rather, it tends to move in the same general direction over and over again. Businesses are given preference over their critics, US dominance of the so-called "developing world" is given preference over revolutionary or populist attempts at social reform, and the national security policy is given preference over its opponents.

It is not often that dominant ideologies, which are responsible for the generation of prejudice, take acts that are inconvenient to the political aims they favour. "The objective of media outlets is to influence public opinion through ideology," say Hoffman and Wallach. "The attempt to produce a story that the public finds memorable is referred to as spin." Some forms of prejudice are more covert, such as omitting certain stories or reporting them inaccurately, while other forms of bias are more overt, such as adopting an opinion that is not neutral towards a topic. Christopherson asserts, on the other hand, that certain editorial staff "may be well aware that their political viewpoints influence their selection of significant information." [C]ommentary editors According to the explanation provided by Robert A. Stallings, the general public only discusses certain aspects of risk. He used the example of a bridge that had been reported to have collapsed in the New York Times. It was his contention that the increased frequency and breadth of coverage in the media was to blame for the emergence of certain worries or threats in the public debate.

An image of risk, including patterns of causality, is chosen during the process of selecting news sources. Because the Times could not name or cite any Marxist sources, there were no Marxist explanations of bridges falling as a result of advanced capitalism. Rather, there were just explanations that advanced capitalism was to blame.

In a similar vein, an article that was released in January 2010 revealed that the son of Ethan Bronner, who was the chief of the Times' Palestine/Israel desk, had joined the Israeli Defense Forces. This served to illustrate the prejudice that exists within the media. An online news organisation known as Electronic Intifada (EI) contended that there was a "serious conflict of interest" and used the Times' very own "Company Policy on Journalism Ethics" in support of their claim. The editorial in the Economist advised readers of the Times to find their news elsewhere until the publication begins to "report fully, accurately, and without Israeli spin" on the Israel-

Palestine conflict. During the time that Israel was conducting Operation Cast Lead, the organisation Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting, which acts as a watchdog over the media, criticised Bronner for his "pro-Israeli bias reporting." The Times published an editorial stating that it "does not believe this to be a concern, and has not even informed its readers of the situation."

In light of cases such as the one that was detailed above, Vatz describes accusations of media bias as "a permanent feature of political life," and acceptance of such bias is also "a permanent aspect." Even though this statement was made in reference to the biassed coverage of the left by the news media, it is still relevant when discussing bias in the media in general. For instance, despite the fact that "a substantial majority of the population believes that the news media is biassed," relatively little methodical research has been carried out on the subject of bias in the media.

This study, on the other hand, examines the hegemonic effects of such biases on peace and conflict by addressing the bias of Western media within the context of the conflict between Israel and Palestine.

2.2. Media Representations and Hegemony

Tymoczko (2010) defines representation as "a statement or account designed to transmit a given viewpoint in order to influence beliefs." This is sometimes accomplished through linguistic manipulations that change audience opinion and promote specific ideological or political contestations. Because of the opaque nature of the manufactured realities created by the media, word-based information providers are able to mislead recipients by presenting false information (Hatim 1997, 2001; Tymoczko 2010).

The media assists us in conceiving of particular identities and groups, which can have a significant impact not only on how individuals see the world, but also on how they are viewed by others and

how laws are enacted to protect them. This demonstrates how information is created and how it is often infused with strong cultural and ideological biases towards what is considered to be normal or common knowledge. As an illustration, the most prestigious news outlets in the United States, such as The New York Times, exhibit systematic biases and operational frameworks that promote individuals to have unfavourable perceptions about Africa. The construction of these representations is impacted by four structural media biases, as well as myths and stereotypes. Colonial discourses also play a role in the formation of these representations. These aspects contribute to the agenda of the media, which is driven by a crisis, and they undercut the legitimacy of favourable images of certain communities.

In the 1950s, media coverage of the Mau Mau movement concentrated mostly on discrediting the group by portraying them as terrorists, a criminal operation, and having communist links, without adequately addressing the cause of the movement. Because many high-circulation periodicals in the United States held the view that national liberation movements were the product of communist influence and posed a threat to US interests after World War II, this perception persisted for decades. These pictures, in addition to determining the parameters of the discussion on the fights for national independence, were a contributor to the persistence of unfavourable perceptions about Africa during the period following the end of colonial rule. There are different levels of expertise involved in reporting about Africa; as a consequence, there is a preponderance of particular kinds of pictures and narrative views in all mainstream media, which helps to build and maintain prejudices and subordination systems. These can also be viewed through Hofstede's "six cultural dimensions," which illustrate regions where there is a significant power difference, such as mentalities that set "us" against "them." For example, the Mau Mau movement was portrayed as becoming increasingly violent, with its warriors becoming "the face of worldwide terrorism in the

1950s." This was said to have occurred after the movement degenerated into a bloody civil war. In the early phases of the revolution, there was a series of political and religious awakenings that the colonial rulers incorrectly categorised as subversive. These depictions were strengthened by this sequence of events. The establishment of dominance structures and knowledge hierarchies is helped forward by additional discernable discourses on despair and violent language. As a consequence, the media, which Gramsci would refer to as a middle-class intellectual, controls the global representations of individuals, groups, and nations. The representations, on the other hand, are dependent on the political leanings of the firms that own the media outlets.

According to Das (2009), with the rapid advancement of science and technology in the twenty-first century, the role of the media is pervasive in all "positive and negative changes" in society, regardless of the geographical location. However, it is entirely dependent on how the media fulfils its role and responsibilities in such situations. As a result, the "potential to either affect social growth or to be influenced by the forces of social change" is present across the entirety of the media.

In point of fact, the most important sources of information regarding the actions of governments and politicians are television broadcasts and articles published in newspapers. Over the course of the past few years, there has been a steadily growing interest in the ways in which the media might impact the public's knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour. This pattern is supported by the central role that the media play in deciding the information that the public gets. It is possible for media outlets to sway public opinion not just by selecting which angle to take in an article, but also by selecting which topics to cover.

As a direct result of this, people have the impression that the news media are biassed. However, the issue that needs to be asked is this: where may biassed reporting occur, and what are the ways

that it could happen? In response to this challenge, Richardson (2007) suggests using "Language as the medium for this goal." [Citation needed] Language, in his perspective, is a "non-neutral factor," and he analyses how newspapers employ language and discourse in their articles.

> [...] Language is a product of social construction. Language is not only crucial to human behaviour but also one of the characteristics that sets humans apart from other animals. Our deeds take on new significance as a result of our use of language; on the other hand, we might employ language in an effort to minimise the significance of our deeds.

In addition, additional research offers a more in-depth comprehension of the hegemonic role played by the news media (for example, Anderson, 1988; Dahlgren, 1982; Golding, 1981). According to this research, the news media is an essential medium via which the ideology of the dominant group can be communicated to the members of the subordinate groups. These data demonstrate that the worldview that is most prevalent now is fairly consistent and coherent. In contrast, other studies present a more dynamic picture of the hegemonic function of the news media (see Carragee, 1991; Bruck, 1989; Hallin, 1987 & 1986; Gitlin, 1980; Hall, 1980a & 1979). These studies demonstrate that there are at times contradicting discourses embedded inside news pieces, which undermines the meanings and values that are generally accepted. In this sense, news texts operate as venues of cultural warfare, which allow for the expression of contrasting points of view.

2.3. Language and Media

"Personal and cultural identity, in addition to the transfer of knowledge, are both dependent on the use of language" (Askeland & Payne, 2006). Language, as suggested by Rogers and colleagues (2005), not only indexes, expresses, and forms social relationships, but it also poses obstacles to these connections. Language shifts to become "dialogic, intertextual, and historically rooted"

within the framework of this method. In terms of the societal and cultural aspects of language, Bell (1997) states that "language both produces and reflects social reality" (language is both a producer of and a reflector of social reality) (Wang, 2009). In addition, Bakhtin (1981) contends that no development of language in discourse is independent of certain social groups, classes, discourses, situations, or relationships; hence, we consider language to be "both constitutive of the social reality and generated by other social activities" (Wang, 2009; Li, 2009; Joye, 2010). Studies that use a critical and analytical approach are required to study the relationship between language selection in the media and the media itself. This is the reason why Popp (2006) asserts that "media language selection is an institutionalised paradigm for framing reality." As a consequence of this, the language that is utilised by the mass media, particularly the printed news media, plays a significant role in the structuralization of social, political, cultural, economic, and ideological realities. Ives (2004) defines Gramsci's position on language in this context.

Gramsci saw language as vital to the development and comprehension of consent organisation, according to what Ives described as Gramsci's perspective on language. According to Ives (2004), the most important factor in the dissemination of new languages, phrases, or words is not the compulsion of governments or states, nor the involvement of the military or the police; rather, it is the prestige and utility of the new language(s), phrase(s), or word(s). The idea that we have perfect command over the words that we use and the language that we employ is, however, patently false. (Ives, 2004; DemontHeinrich, 2008)

In addition, Reah (2002) states that:

> *"Language can be a powerful tool. It is, perhaps, at its most powerful when its role in presenting the world to an audience is not explicit; in other words, it is easy to resist a*

particular viewpoint or ideology when you know it is being presented to you, but not so easy to resist when the viewpoint or ideology is concealed".

2.4. Western Media and the Israel-Palestine Conflict

The literature present on US media's misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine conflict highlight's a significant bias in the language of news articles (Ackerman, 2001; Amer & Amer, 2011; Bennett, 1990; Hallward, 2011; Handley, 2009; Hawkins, 2002; Ismail, 2008; Leuenberger, 2012; Munayyer, 2014; Safty, 1991; Stallings, 1990; Terry & Mendenhall, 1974; Viser, 2003). Ackerman (2001) argues that there's a systematic absence of context in the US media when dealing with the Israel-Palestine conflict. He stresses the need to have both political and historical context while reporting the news. For instance, in the context of the Al-Aqsa intifada that began after September 2000, Ackerman notes that

> *"While Palestinian rock-throwers, fuel bombs, and militiamen are in full view on American TV screens night after night, the Israeli occupation of Palestinian land is almost ethereal in its absence. The word 'occupation' has become taboo for the US media. An interesting comparison is of the Iraq-Kuwait war with the Israel-Palestine conflict. The US media used this taboo word with Iraq's occupation of Kuwait while in the Israeli context, it is hardly ever mentioned" (Ackerman, 2001).*

According to the argument put up by Norman Finkelstein, "the American media judged the Israel-Palestine problem with double standards" (Finkelstein, 1991). Some media outlets have suggested that cultural bigotry is what drives Palestinians in their struggle. Second, several news outlets in the United States pointed the finger of blame at Arafat for starting the war. The mainstream media in the United States frequently used phrases like "pro-Palestinian prejudice" to shift attention away

from the obvious pro-Israel bias (Finkelstein, 1991). And according to Friedman (1987), the Israeli lobby in the United States applies pressure on journalists by attacking critics, limiting the flow of information, and attempting to stifle debate within the Jewish community. This strengthens "the hand of Israelis determined to hold on to the occupied territories," according to Friedman (Friedman, 1987). Amani Ismail asserts that the media's connection of the Palestinian resistance with terrorism weakened their political struggle or marginalised their voices, and she cites several examples to support this claim (Ismail, 2008). For instance, W. Lance Bennett contends that alternative narratives are relegated to the background because the media places so much emphasis on the statements made by state authorities as a source of information (Bennett, 1990).

In a manner analogous to this, Edmund Ghareeb, Peter Jennings, Ronald Koven, James McCartney, Lee Eggartstrom, and Marilyn Robinson demonstrate a significant bias in favour of Israel (Ghareeb et al., 1975). Other academics suggested that coverage of the topic is limited because of institutional flaws, despite the fact that all of the scholars cited above agreed that Palestine is not portrayed effectively in the news media in the United States. In a manner analogous to this, Matt Viser claims that the New York Times is more sympathetic to Israelis than it is to Palestinians, and that this bias has become increasingly obvious over the course of time. The Palestinians lose all agency as a result of inaccurate depictions and interpretations of the war (Viser, 2003). According to Safty (1991),

> "The dominant interpretations of the Palestine conflict and the language that conveys them show that the consensus of the print and electronic media is based on denying the existence of the Palestinians as a nation, generally absolving Israel of responsibility. They instead blame the victim… the media used language to reinterpret or reconstruct the realities such as oppressor became oppressed and oppressed became the oppressor… the media's

dominant interpretations of the Palestinian conflict remain compatible with official policy and responsive to the needs of powerful interest groups" (Safty, 1991).

On the other hand, Tahira Firdous (2009) labels Al-Jazeera as an alternative to Western media. Al-Jazeera explains the viewpoint of the Palestinians while the Western media does not have an understanding of certain realities that exist in the Middle East (Firdous, 2009). The study uses content analysis to examine CNN's and Al Jazeera English's news coverage of the Gaza crisis (December28-Jan.19, 2009), and the results indicate that there are indeed differences in how the two networks framed the Gaza Crisis. The author points out the irony that CNN's worldview is primarily Western but the news stories they cover are international. She uses the example of the Iraq and Afghanistan war that Al Jazeera's coverage of the Afghanistan war and the Iraq war represents an alternative viewpoint in global news during the three-week Gaza conflict.

Chapter Three

3. Language, Discourse and Hegemony: Habermas, Speech Act Theory and Gramsci

In order to analyse the exercise of power in the dissemination of hegemonic ideas and misrepresentation of the Israel-Palestine conflict, this research was carried out within the theoretical frameworks of Speech Act Theory, Strategic Action, and Antonio Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony. This resulted in the legitimization and normalisation of Israel's official narrative in public and intellectual circles. According to the Speech Act Theory, language should be viewed as an action as opposed to a medium for communication and expression (Ludwig & de Ruyter, 2016; Ozarslan, 2014; Zagorcic). The idea that all forms of linguistic interaction are made up of linguistic activity (Smith, 1991). The words and phrases that are being utilised both have a specific meaning and are being employed for a specific purpose. It was previously thought that the fundamental unit of communication is either words, symbols, sentences, or a token of all of these; however, speech act theory suggests that the fundamental unit of communication is the creation or issue of words and symbols. In other words, the speech act theory suggests that the fundamental unit of communication is the creation or issue of words and symbols (Ludwig & de Ruyter, 2016). The users of this production or replication experience a specific reality as a result because they are dependent on the media for their own realities.

According to the reasoning presented by Stephan Ludwig and Ko de Ruyter (2016), language is not only a medium through which one may transmit objective information or provide descriptions of reality; rather, it is also a means by which one can create reality. The central tenet of the Speech Act Theory is the idea that a speaker's underlying meaning and intention can be deduced from the

words, phrases, and interactions that they use in their language output, whether that language production takes the form of speech or writing (Ludwig & de Ruyter, 2016).

There is not one single truth to be found when seen through the lens of Stuart Hall's representation. The media serves its own goal and communicates information in a way that is consistent with that agenda using language (Hall, 1997; Kraemer et al., 2014). To put it another way, while reporting on any incident or debate, the media keeps certain intentions in its words reserved (illocutionary speech act).

This action will be investigated via the prism of Habermas' Strategic Action since, according to the Speech Act Theory, language is a form of action. In the words of Habermas, the strategic use of language aims to address the problem of action coordination through the exertion of influence; in contrast to the communicative use of language, it is not concerned with reaching an understanding or resolving a conflict (Filipiak, 2017; Niemi, 2005). There are two sorts of strategic language use that Habermas identifies: obvious and latent. It is possible for the use of strategic language to come across as overt threats (Niemi, 2005). An example of an overt threat is when former President George W. Bush said, "You are either with us or against us!" in his speech. While some examples of latent language use include a person who asks a friend to complete a chore only to end up falling into a trap themselves, other examples include In the context of the conflict between Israel and Palestine, the New York Times engages in reporting that is motivated by an agenda and engages in covert strategic activity because it attempts to legitimise the position taken by the Israeli government. Strategic action does not have the goal of establishing an agreement (Smith, 1991), and the dominant actor in a communication has influence over the flow of communication as well as the outcomes of that communication. The dominant actor serves the role

of a hegemon and maintains control over the communication channels. In a nutshell, the media is the most influential actor in the communication of its readers, and it does so with particular intentions or agendas. The media is a powerful force in society, and as such, it decides which events are notable and how those events should be portrayed.

Additionally, Antonio Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony is the one that does the best job of describing this media hegemony. Gramsci conceived of the idea of hegemony as a reaction to the power that he observed the dominant class exercising (Bates, 1975). According to the definition provided by Strinati (1995), it is a situation in which:

> Dominant groups in society, including fundamentally but not exclusively the ruling class, maintain their dominance by securing the "spontaneous consent" of subordinate groups, including the working class, through the negotiated construction of a political and ideological consensus that incorporates both dominant and dominated groups (Parker, 2011).

Hegemony is described as the dominance of a political, moral and intellectual authority a class has over others (Chandler, 2000; Gramsci, 2005). Hegemony does not rely on propaganda in order to create a certain political or cultural reality (Chandler, 2000; Evans, 2002). Rather, it relies on civil society institutions such as education, the family, religion, mass media, popular culture etc., to disseminate dominant or hegemonic values (Gramsci, 2005). In his Prison Notebooks, Gramsci notes that hegemony operates through the creation of a "false consciousness" through these institutions, by which the subordinate class believes the ideology and interests of the ruling class to be its own (Golding & Murdock, 2018; Gramsci, 2005). According to Gramsci, hegemony is perpetuated by the middle-class intellectuals in a society, who unconsciously undertake the task of

organizing and passing on the dominant values. In today's modern world, media is the most significant institution among middle-class intellectuals (Altheide, 1984).

Simply put, the Speech Act Theory argues that language is a form of action and that action is identified as a strategic action, for this research, which maintains that the dominant actor controls the communication. This dominance, in turn, will be analyzed by using Gramsci's notion of hegemony.

3.1. Gramsci's Hegemony and Media

There is no such thing as an independent concept of hegemony. This section seeks to construct a logical sequence of components that may provide a thorough explanation of Gramsci's hegemony on the basis of many different notions. Because hegemony is the most significant topic in this research, this section's primary focus is on establishing this sequence. Gramsci did not present any concrete ideas regarding hegemony. Buci-Glucksmann (1980) makes the argument that the meaning of the term "hegemony" has undergone a startling transformation in comparison to its earlier application. In Gramsci's earlier writings, the term "hegemony" alluded to a different strategy for the proletariat. However, in his later writings, the term "hegemony" referred to the hegemonic apparatuses and methods of the ruling class. In addition, in his later Notebooks, he expanded the meaning of hegemony to encompass the structure of the state as well as the preeminence of a certain social class in the revolutionary transformation process (Gramsci, 1980).

Ives (2004) believes that hegemony has a long history preceding them and searches for the term's beginnings in Ancient Greece. Other researchers, following the work of Gramsci, search for the origins of hegemony in Marxist and Leninist conceptions of economic warfare. However, Ives (2004) believes that hegemony has a long history preceding them. Gramsci doesn't simply reiterate the concept of the leadership and dominance of a dominant class; rather, he develops on the idea

and argues that hegemony is founded on consent, intellectual leadership, and dominance. Gramsci also places a strong emphasis on the significance of hegemonic apparatuses. These apparatuses make it possible for the ruling classes to maintain its hegemonic control over the populace and add a cultural dimension to the idea of hegemony. In conclusion, he grounds his research on the conditions of consent and coercion, as well as the function that the modern state plays.

Hegemonic rule, as described by Femia (1981), is essentially rule by consent. Within the framework of the idea of hegemony, Femia places a focus on the significance of consent. In order to understand the ambiguity and variety of interpretations that are associated with permission, he begins by offering some historical backdrop. Femia adds that in current political thought, the authority of governments to exert power is not related with consent in the same way that it once was. "Consent has evolved to denote the manner in which individual individuals should participate directly or indirectly in the action of governing, as well as the manner in which the government should be organised and formed." Femia demonstrates that when Gramsci talks about permission, he is actually referring to a psychological condition that involves some kind of acceptance of the sociopolitical order. This is what Gramsci means when he talks about consent. In order to shed light on what Gramsci meant by "consent," she proceeds to examine a variety of behaviours that include complying to various political and social norms. According to Femia, conforming behaviour is distinguished by three distinct types of attitudes, which are as follows: To begin, an individual may feel pressured to conform out of dread of the consequences of nonconformity. This is compliance through the use of force.

It's possible that conformity is a habitual behaviour that aims to achieve particular goals in particular ways. The third kind of conformity is connected to the idea of legitimacy, which refers to the conviction that requests for conformity are appropriate and warranted in a certain context.

A level of conscious commitment to or agreement with particular societal underpinnings is the basis for this type of conformity, which is founded on conformity. According to Gramsci's theory, the connection between consent and hegemony can be seen to be illustrated by these three different sorts of conforming behaviour.

According to the hegemony theory, permission is in fact the most important core idea. Gramsci is said to be alluding in his writings to three distinct degrees or varieties of hegemony, all of which are derived from the idea of consent, according to Femia. Integral hegemony is the first level or type of hegemony, and it is characterised by an organic link between those who rule and those who are ruled, as well as by a stable environment in which there are no disagreements or hostilities between the two groups. The second phase of hegemony is known as degenerate hegemony, and it is characterised by discord and strife between the populace and the leaders of the populace. The third level or type of hegemony is known as minimum hegemony. This form of hegemony is characterised by the ideological unification of economic, political, and intellectual elites with the general populace, which ultimately results in the expansion of the ruling class. These degrees of hegemony suggest that governments or ruling elites are unable to easily guarantee the acceptance of the general populace. As a result, hegemony and consent are both dependent on elements of power and authority. It is precisely this link between power and consent that is at play across the many levels of hegemony.

It is vital to provide an explanation of the idea of force or power in order for one to comprehend Gramsci's hegemony. The relationship between power and permission lies at the centre of Hannah Arendt's body of work. She claims that the desire for power and the desire to be submissive are connected, that it is the support of the people that gives state institutions their authority, and that this support is a continuation of the consent that led to the development of norms. Furthermore,

she claims that the desire for power is connected to the desire to be submissive (Arendt, 1970). Arendt provides definitions for the ideas of force, power, and violence, all of which many academics continue to use interchangeably with the term "coercion."

In particular, she emphasises the fact that these words have their own identity. Power is equivalent to the capacity of humans to act in concert with one another; it relates to a group; and it can only exist so long as the group is whole. When we speak of someone as being powerful, what we really mean is that a significant number of other people have delegated to him the authority to make decisions and take action on their behalf. In everyday parlance, the term "force" is synonymous with "violence," particularly when violence is employed as a coercive tool; this is the case despite the fact that "force" can also refer to the energy given by physical or social processes. The pragmatic nature of violence, which is closely related to the idea of power, is what sets it apart from other forms of conflict. Arendt provides an analysis of the distinctions that exist between the aforementioned categories in order to provide support for her claim that power is the fundamental component of all governments and groups that hold a dominant position, as well as to clarify that power is not synonymous with violence. Arendt, on the other hand, defines power in terms of consent. Coercion and consent are the two pillars upon which hegemony is built, and it is via an understanding of these two concepts that one can fully comprehend the roles that political and civil society play within a capitalist state. In addition, it appears that one of Gramsci's most sophisticated contributions to the study of state function and social transformation is the consideration of the link between permission and coercion through the concept of hegemony. Gramsci is always concerned with the link between force and consent, as well as the equilibrium between civil and political society, according to Buci-Glucksmann (1982). This is because Gramsci is a Marxist.

3.1.1. Us and Them: Media as Supranational Traditional Intellectuals

The dualistic tension between the superior "Us" and the inferior "Them" is frequently reflected in political and media discourses about the "Other" through stereotypical images of the "Other." The construction of "Us" and "Others" through discursive means leads to inclusion/exclusion methods, which in turn establish power relations and demonstrate that "racism manifests discursively as both a social practise and an ideology" (Wodak, 2008). In addition, elites are the ones responsible for creating the gap between "Us" and "Them." According to Van Dijk's definition from 1987, elites are "social (minority) groups with various sorts of power and control, whether it be political, economic, social, or cultural authority, or personal and legitimate authority." In addition to this, he classifies sociopolitical, economic, and cultural elites, claiming that all three, and most notably cultural elites like the media and instructors, dominate knowledge and perspectives, and as a result, indirectly the information that the general public is aware of regarding minorities and migrants.

As a consequence of this, in my opinion, the mainstream media serve the same purpose as a dominant elite or as "traditional intellectuals" (using Gramsci's terminology), in that they construct hegemonic discourse and control the public's conception of "the Other." It explains the part that elites play in the formation of hegemonic knowledge and how audiences provide their assent to that knowledge. Because of this, I place a lot of focus on Gramscian intellectuals in my research on the discourses and representations of the "Palestinian Other" in the media as well as the role that the media plays in the discursive formation of their identity in the media.

Another very significant aspect that has to be emphasised here is that the concept of "the Other" has a synchronic and diachronic bearing on the process of national unification. To be more specific, Barker (1999) contends that the dominant media cultivate a sense of national culture and heritage through the representation of a variety of nations and cultures. Additionally, Barker contends that

the mainstream media transform an institutional concept, such as that of nation, into an everyday experience of cultural similarities and differences.

As a result, the mass media provide their audience members a sense of national cohesion and distinguish them from the cultural "Other," who is often portrayed as an adversary or a threat. This study investigates whether or not and how the "Other" transcends national imaginaries and helps to the discursive creation of a transnational identity through the discourses of mainstream media. Specifically, this research focuses on how mainstream media portrays people of colour. As was mentioned before, I wish to highlight in this study, in accordance with Gramsci's theory, how the media as intellectuals promote hegemonic knowledge about the 'Other,' namely Palestine.

3.2. Media Discourse and the Representation

Beyond the purview of media sociology, a wide range of academic disciplines have examined how audiences react to the influence of various forms of media, including the news. It would be a waste of time and effort to make an attempt to describe them in this research, as there are several studies on media and news that go beyond the scope of this study. Despite this, I was not able to avoid considering a number of important concepts from the fields of media and news studies that are required to finish my research. There are a lot of different ones, such as the concept of representation and news values.

According to Preston and Metykova (2009), when there is a political crisis, both the independence of the media and the impartiality of the job done by journalists are called into doubt. According to the findings of researchers from the Glasgow Media Group, news broadcasts generally reflect the beliefs and attitudes of political and economic elites, thereby contributing to the formation of dominant ideologies. This is the case despite the assertions of journalists that they provide independent and objective information about significant events (1995). (Eldridge 1995). Georgina

Born (2004) discovered the intertwined links between British journalists and political leaders through the course of her ethnographic research on the BBC.

As a direct result of this, the degree of interconnection between journalists and elites varies. Journalists can be considered a powerful elite in the same sense as other professions that develop and spread hegemonic knowledge about "Us" and "Them" through various representation tactics. In addition, Schudson (2003) asserts that the news is not a reflection of reality but rather a skewed portrayal of the world and that it does not accurately reflect what is going on in the world. It would appear that there is a direct connection between the power held by elites in the mass media and representation, both in its theoretical and practical forms. Not only does it create a visual world, but it also reaffirms that world as if it were genuine (Dijk, 1988). In this way, he demonstrates that news framing and representation are multidisciplinary notions that are significant not just to cognitive studies and discourse analysis but also to the field of media studies.

According to Stuart Hall (1997a), representation can be defined as "using language to say something meaningful about, or to show the world to other people in a meaningful way." The process by which meaning is formed and conveyed among members of a culture includes representation as an essential component of the overall process. It necessitates the employment of words, signs, and images that represent or stand in for the respective commodities. In particular, Hall offered a comprehensive investigation into the relationship that exists between language and culture. In addition to this, he demonstrated that the concept of representation is not limited to the realm of language; rather, it extends to knowledge and general sensibility as well (Hall, 1997b).

This is due to the fact that difference is continuously the subject of representation, which "favours" the building of an artificially superior image of "Us." People who considerably diverge from the majority are typically subjected to binary forms of representation, as Hall emphasises in his talk.

They appear to be represented by extremes that are intensely opposed, polarised, and binary, such as good and terrible, civilised and primitive, ugly and extremely attractive, revolting because they are different and alluring because they are weird and exotic. Not only is this sort of binary differentiation crucial for media sociologists, but also for discourse analysts, particularly in times of crisis. It delineates a binary opposition between the superior "Us" and the inferior "Them."

3.3. Representation: Towards a Media Reality

The significance of having preconceived notions for one's comprehension of representation is demonstrated by Stuart Hall (1997b). He believes that stereotypes are able to distil everything about a person down to a handful of characteristics, then exaggerate and simplify those characteristics while also preventing them from evolving over time. He also believes that stereotypes are able to do this despite the fact that most people are familiar with and recognise these characteristics. As Lacey (1998) elucidates in additional detail, stereotypes are an effective method for gaining an understanding of the world. If our previous assumptions were completely false, then the impact they have on our lives would be far less significant. Indeed, this nugget of reality may be found inside stereotypes due to the fact that they are representative of the prevalent mentality. As a consequence of this, "the perceptions we have of places we have never seen, people we have never met, and even individuals who are different from 'Us' are the result of the prejudices with which we grew up." [Citation needed]

The vast majority of portrayals in the media of people of different races, ethnic groupings, and even gender distinctions continue to be governed and dominated by stereotypes and assumptions. According to Morley and Robins, historically, Western anthropology claimed the right to represent the 'native,' but today, Western mass media claim the right to represent all non-Western 'Others' and develop stereotypes about other cultures. Western anthropology historically claimed the right

to represent the 'native,' but today, Western mass media claim the right to represent all non-Western 'Others (Morley and Robins, 1995).

On the other hand, representations of the "Other" in the media rarely act as a catalyst for new media constructs. On the other hand, contrary to what Lacey (1998) emphasises, "the media has a very substantial influence on the propagation of preconceptions, but it must be recalled that stereotypes were not formed by the media; they are daily concepts" (Lacey, 1998).

To put it another way, the exotic or archaic images that Westerners believe reflect distant people and settings, or even their Muslim neighbours, are not merely the outcome of a modern reality that has been filtered through a historical lens. These are the results that come about as a consequence of a pervasive social mechanisation that erects walls between individuals and maintains a distance from the world. Additionally, Wodak (2008a, 2009b) emphasises the significance of language in relation to unfavourable depictions and stereotypical assumptions of the "Other." "the vocal presentation of a certain opinion or notion directed at a social group or a person as a member of that group," she explains, is what she means by the term "stereotype." In most cases, the stereotype can be understood as an aspect of general knowledge that is extensively disseminated within a particular community. It assumes the form of a judgement that attributes or rejects, in a manner that is simplistic, generalising, and emotionally biassed, particular characteristics or patterns of behaviour to a given group of people.

Indeed, stereotypes play a significant role in the construction of "the Other" through discursive practises. The media and politicians purposefully exploit them to establish in-groups and out-groups, as well as good and negative perceptions of 'Self' and 'Other,' respectively (Richardson and Wodak, 2009). The dominant narrative in the media consistently casts migrants in a negative light and exploits them as a convenient scapegoat. Researchers recently examined the discursive

construction of the migrant 'Other' as part of a project on the reporting of migrants and asylum-seekers in the British press (Baker et al., 2008). They found that, despite some qualitative differences between the newspapers studied, the media, through negative connotations and fallacious argumentation, represent and stigmatise migrants as the archetypical 'Other,' and as a result, reproduce prejudices and legitimise institutional racism. This

Both the study that was referenced above and the research that Wodak has conducted on political rhetoric (2004, 2009a, 2011, and 2015) illustrate that the use of representation and stereotyping as strategies for the construction of out-groups is not unique to the field of media studies. Additionally, discourse analysis and social studies will be covered in this class. In addition to this, stereotyping is a game that involves getting to know the 'Other,' but not everyone plays by the same rules.

The social and political elites, also known as the upper social classes, are responsible for dictating these norms through an unpredictable game of ideology, power, and knowledge. This has led to the formation of a common conscience while simultaneously reinforcing people's perceived disparities. Constructing the social component of representation is another one of this game's goals.

In other words, the study that came before shows that the social construction of representation is dependent on the dominance relationships that exist between those who do the representing and those who are represented. Gramsci argues that it is first and foremost a question of power, and that hegemony comes second. Therefore, dominating elites or intellectuals participate in the discursive production of in-groups and out-groups, convey their beliefs about the 'Other' to their readers or audiences, and hope that the majority of their audience accepts these ideas as (hegemonic) knowledge. Both the idea of hegemony and the portrayal of Palestinians as terrorists

by Western media outlets are aspects of hegemonic knowledge, which will be investigated in the

chapter that comes after this one.

Chapter Four

4. Media Representations: How the New York Times Represents Israel-Palestine Conflict

To explore how the Western media represents a Middle Eastern conflict, this research narrowed its domain and focused solely on the 11-Day Gaza Crisis in May 2021 that lasted from 10th May to 21st May 2021. The New York Times was chosen for this analysis because of its importance mentioned in chapter 1 of this dissertation. As this research analyzed all the news articles and editorials published during the 11 days, the analysis reveals that the NYT's coverage of the attack on Gaza in May 2021 conflated multiple topics, revealing a relatively nuanced treatment of the Israeli aggression on Gaza in May 2021, which primarily served Israel's justifications and interests at the expense of Palestinian narrative and rights. The criticism of Israel's attacks was generally phrased in a careful and restrained manner that lacked the context of Israel's military occupation, colonisation, and siege. In addition, the coverage by this prominent media outlet appeared to be sensitive to Palestinian grievances by highlighting the impact of Israel's attacks and devastation. On the other hand, the Palestinian armed resistance was primarily seen as an equal force that inflicted comparable amounts of destruction, fear, and death among Israelis. This perception persisted for the majority of the conflict. The Israeli bombings and airstrikes were portrayed as a response to the rocket fire by Palestinian factions; as a result, Israel's choice to bomb Gaza was made to appear legitimate. In the paragraphs that follow, I will conduct an analysis of the underlying themes and language manifestations of Israel's attack against Gaza.

Figure 1 illustrates the data extracted to analyse the articles published during the 11-Day Gaza Crisis.

No.	Data Extraction			
1.	**Data set**	71 news articles and 17 opinion articles on Israel and Palestine in the New York Times published between 10 May 2021 to 21 May 2021		
2.	**Relevant data extraction**	Number of articles	88 in total (specifically on Israel-Palestine)	Out of the 27 authors of news articles in The New York Times, 20 are based outside of Middle East and in the West, 3 in Israel, 2 in Egypt, 1 in Jordan and 1 in Palestine. The leading two authors, Isabel Kershner and Patrick Kingsley, have published 19 articles out of 71 in total, and have contributed in more than 10 articles as either co-authors or reporters. One article was written anonymously by the New York Times.
				Out of the 13 opinion authors, 7 are based in the United States and belonged to the right-wing ideology, 2 in Israel, 2 in Palestine, and 2 other authors are US politicians, Bernie Sanders and Jerrod L. Nadler. Sanders is a socialist while Nadler is a conservative politician.
		Keyword search	Israel, Palestine, Israel-Palestine Conflict	
3.	**Period covered**	10 May 2021 to 21 May 2021		
4.	**Source**	The New York Times Archives		

Figure 1: This is the data extracted manually for this research

4.1. The Illusion of Equal Representation: Israel's 'Clash' with Hamas

Both the New York Times and the BBC report on the situation as though it were an ongoing conflict between Israel and Hamas, with Hamas being referred to as a "Islamist militant organisation." This constant framing of the events as a conflict between Israel and Hamas is a prominent motif in both of these news organisations' coverage. This was evident by the focus placed on the employment of arms by both sides against the opposing side, as well as the reporting of the effects of the fight on both sides, which meant that the victims on both sides received equal coverage and emotional portrayal of their plights during the conflict. The destruction and devastation caused by Israel's assault on Gaza, as well as the enormous number of Palestinian deaths and injuries, were contrasted with the rocket strikes on Israeli-held territory carried out by the Palestinian resistance, as well as the relatively fewer Israeli casualties that were sustained. This portrays death and damage on both sides as the terrible and inescapable cost of war, which reduces Israel's guilt for the wanton destruction and carnage it imposed on the Palestinian people in Gaza and casts death and destruction as an inevitable consequence of battle. This pattern of reporting shields Israel from moral criticism and condemnation, allowing it to continue inflicting substantially more suffering and death on innocent Palestinians without fear of repercussions. Let's have a look at some passages from the New York Times, keeping in mind that due to space constraints, we won't be able to investigate each and every occurrence of this problem.

The purposeful portrayal of Israel's aggression on Gaza as a conflict between Israel and Hamas, with Hamas being held responsible for its missile fire and attacks on Israel, is demonstrated by extract 1 from a story published in the New York Times. This extract demonstrates the purposeful portrayal of Israel's aggression on Gaza. It is important to note that the situation is being referred to as a "war" and a "campaign against Hamas," and not as a premeditated attack on the Palestinian

people that is now under occupation and under siege. This interpretation of the events is intended to place blame on Hamas and the Palestinian people, while at the same time painting Israel in a favourable light by portraying them as being in a difficult position, having responded to Hamas' strikes and with civilians caught in the crossfire. Hamas, the'militant organisation' that governs the Gaza Strip, is portrayed as the instigator of the 'conflict' by firing thousands of rockets at Israeli cities, and is consequently held responsible for the bloodshed, while Israel is shown as responding to the rocket assault. Hamas is portrayed as the instigator of the 'conflict' by firing thousands of rockets at Israeli cities. Even though the Israeli bombing of Palestinian civilian sites is brought to light in this article, the focus is placed on Israel's view that the strike was not intentional and that Hamas' military goals were the ones that were meant to be hit.

Extract 1

"**The Toll of Eight Days of Conflict in Gaza and Israel**

The violence has intensified over the past eight days as diplomatic efforts have stalled and **Israel has scaled up its bombing campaign against Hamas.**

The war is being fought on multiple fronts. According to the Israeli Air Force, Hamas, **the militant group** *that rules the Gaza Strip,* **has fired more than 3,300 rockets toward Israeli cities and towns, killing at least 10 people***. Israeli forces and settlers have killed 20 Palestinians during unrest in the West Bank, a Palestinian human rights group said. And a wave of mob attacks hit at least one mixed Arab-Jewish city in Israel.*

But the worst devastation is in Gaza, a densely packed coastal enclave of about two million people. **Israeli forces** *have struck homes, refugee camps, medical facilities and other buildings.*

Israeli officials have said the assault is aimed at destroying Hamas's ability to make and launch missiles and a network of underground tunnels used by Hamas to move people and equipment. *But the strikes have killed at least 212 people, including at least 61 children, according to local health authorities, drawing international condemnation (NYT, 17 May 2021)."*

The excerpt constructs Israel's actions as being directed against Hamas, as in "Israel has increased its bombing campaign against Hamas," and as the report indicates that Hamas' rocket fire, and not Israeli occupation strikes and civilian deaths, are primarily problematized and portrayed as the cause of the conflict in the excerpt as well as in the report as a whole. The use of Israeli references to refer to Hamas' "3,300 rockets," the designation of Hamas as a "militant group," and the stated objective of the Israeli military of "destroying Hamas' ability to manufacture and launch missiles and a network of underground tunnels used by Hamas" appear to paint a negative picture of Hamas and overstate its power, while portraying Israel as acting in self-defense. In addition, the use of Israeli references to refer to Hamas' "3, This construction of events is compatible with the Israeli narrative and version of events, without challenging this construction or mentioning Palestinian sources that provide counterarguments or rebuttals to Israel's claims, the events have been constructed in such a way that they are compatible with Israel's narrative and version of events. According to no more sources listed in the article, 90% of these rockets were intercepted by Israel's Iron Dome anti-missile defence system, and many missiles either did not reach Israeli-held territory or fell in open areas. Iron Dome is an anti-missile defence system (CNN, May 18, 2021; Washington Post, May 12, 2021).

This rendered a significant proportion of these rockets ineffectual, which was proven by the number of Israelis who were killed or injured as a result. It is important to note that the fact that the bulk of fatalities and injuries have occurred on the Palestinian side in this text does not necessarily alter this one-sided presentation of the situation in which Hamas and, by extension, the Palestinians are blamed for starting the "war." The lexical allusions that have been given to Israelis and Palestinians are an illustration of the favourable structure of events in favour of Israel. It's possible that official collective terms like "Israel," "Israeli Air Force," "Israeli forces," "strikes,"

"stepped up," "campaign," and "onslaught" give the Israelis' behaviour a veneer of legitimacy. This explanation for Israel's behaviour is uncomplicated, particularly when contrasted with portrayals of Palestinians that use phrases such as "the militant group," "fire missiles," and "an underground tunnel network."

In this sense, constant references in the news coverage to Hamas as a "Islamist militant group" would add to a picture that delegitimizes Hamas as a "terrorist group" that targets innocent Israelis and destabilises the entire area. It is possible that the reader will get the conclusion that Israel is a victim that is being attacked from all sides; hence, any response from Israel can be considered as justifiable and as an act of self-defense. Therefore, the choice of terminology and voices reveals that Israeli explanations and constructions of events are prominently featured, whereas Palestinian explanations are generally omitted or presented in a manner that does not alter the NYT's interpretive framework for events. This is because Israeli explanations and constructions of events are more politically expedient than Palestinian explanations and constructions of events. To put it another way, it is in Israel's best interest to present the country as the victim of Palestinian aggression and bloodshed.

It has been reported by the New York Times that Hamas was the party that initiated the 'war' and prompted Israel's reaction; this absolves Israel of any culpability or responsibility for the conflict. Because of this, it is clear that the New York Times manipulates through the way that it describes the situation and the terminology that it uses. The assumptions, attitudes, assessments, and language representations associated with the events and ideas communicated by the New York Times are unique to those events and ideas. Israel's aggression is portrayed as a war against Hamas that elicits the Israeli-validated response, and not against the Palestinians, which is undoubtedly how Israel desired its aggression to be perceived. The analysis of the depiction of the Gaza War of

2021 points in every direction to this theme of putting Hamas on equal footing with Israel. In other words, Hamas is depicted as having the same level of power as Israel.

This gives the impression that Israel is a victim that is being attacked from all directions, and as a result, any response is regarded to be an act of self-defense.

4.2. The Illusion of Objectivity: Both Suffered

According to the statistical study, the New York Times gave equal priority to reporting on both the repercussions of the violence on both sides as well as the victims of the conflict on both sides. Even though Israelis were murdered and some damage was inflicted by Palestinian rockets, the Israeli occupation's utilisation of large-scale military action did significantly more harm to the Palestinians in Gaza, both in terms of the damage and the number of deaths and injuries. If you were to use the phrase 'victims on both sides,' it would certainly obscure Israel's responsibility for the high Palestinian death toll and damage in Gaza, in addition to the contexts of its occupation, blockade, and violations of international law and human rights. The findings in no way addressed the Palestinian people's inherent right to exercise their own right to self-defense.

Take a look at the passage that is following as a sample of this supposedly fair portrayal of the activities that the group participates in.

Extract 2

> **"The violence rocking Gaza, Israel and the West Bank has left scores dead**
>
> *After another night of intense bombardment by Israeli forces, Palestinians and Israelis on Friday surveyed a landscape marred by* **violence** *that has spread from the West Bank to Israel to Gaza and back to the West Bank, leaving scores dead, mostly Palestinians.*
>
> *Most of the death and destruction have occurred in Gaza, the already impoverished territory controlled by the* **militant Palestinian group** *Hamas, where officials said more than 120 people had died, including 31 children, scores of buildings were destroyed, and electricity water was running critically short.*
>
> *More than* **2,000 rockets have been fired at Israel from Gaza** *this week, and eight Israelis, including a soldier, have been killed, Israeli officials said on Friday (NYT, 14 May 2021)."*

It is essential to pay attention to the controlled and calculated rhetoric that avoids naming Israel as the authoritative authority responsible for the wanton destruction, vast abuses of human rights, and murders of Palestinians, particularly in Gaza. The scenario is portrayed as a horrific one in which casualties are sustained on both sides of the conflict. The description of Israel's massive attacks and destruction as "a landscape marred by violence" seems to treat "Palestinians and Israelis" equally as victims of the situation, and it fails to assign blame to the Israeli occupation state for, among other things, its attacks in Gaza, expulsions, settler attacks, and storming of Islamic sites. This is problematic because it seems to imply that "Palestinians and Israelis" are victims of the situation in the same way. Additionally, the last phrase of this text highlights the Palestinian resistance's role in rocket firing by pointing out that "more than 2,000 missiles" prompt Israeli strikes. This clause does this by stating that "more than 2,000 rockets" provoke Israeli attacks.

It is important to keep in mind that citing the number of rockets that have been shot seems to emphasise the violent Palestinian attacks and portray Israel as a victim, which justifies the reactions that Israel has given. This is especially clear when the Palestinian entity is characterised as "the violent Palestinian group Hamas," which is a pejorative way of referring to the Palestinian movement. It is noteworthy that the reporter did not reveal the fact that the majority of these rockets either landed in open areas or were stopped by the Iron Dome air defence system in Israel. Officials in Israel claim that the Iron Dome was successful in stopping ninety percent of the missiles, and the Israeli population has access to bunkers and safe rooms that are properly protected from any threats. This is made abundantly clear by the fact that the conflict resulted in the deaths of only eight Israelis. This is in stark contrast to the Palestinian side, which lacks the military capability to intercept Israeli missiles, where the vast majority of airstrikes hit their targeted targets without being intercepted, and where many Gazans do not have access to safe rooms or shelters. On the Israeli side, the vast majority of airstrikes hit their targeted targets without being intercepted. Many Palestinians tried to find safety at schools run by the United Nations, but these buildings were also targeted by the Israeli military. Due to the lack of a buffer zone in Gaza, this also provides evidence of the enormous number of Palestinian civilians that were killed as a result of the attacks.

One might observe a process in which the news coverage selectively emphasises certain behaviours while downplaying others, thus highlighting those aspects of the situation that are favourable to Israeli interests and justifications. One can experience this process for oneself by reading or watching the news. The use of transitivity in this section puts a significant amount of attention on activities committed by Palestinians while significantly downplaying those committed by Israelis.

The use of the middle voice (Note 2) in phrases like "have occurred" and "have died," the nominalization (Note 3) of the word "violence," and the passive structure of the phrase "were destroyed," as opposed to an active clause structure, leave Israeli responsibility for the deaths and destruction unexplained or at the very least disguised. Imagine if the event had been written about using the active clause pattern to emphasise Israel's actions: "Israel killed 120 civilians, including 31 children, wrecked dozens of buildings, and inflicted significant death and destruction in Gaza." [This] would have brought more attention to Israel's actions. (cf. Fowler, 1991; Fairclough, 1992; van Leeuwen, 1996).

"the potential entity to be influenced by the action has been muffled," as a result (Lukin, Butt, & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 66). To put it another way, the usage of these verbs creates the appearance that Israeli acts are less harsh than they would be if laden verbs such as "killed," "occupied," "attacked," "inflicted," and "bombarded" were employed instead. In contrast to the background of Israel's damaging operations, explicit allusions are made to Gaza's rocket firing and the number of Israeli dead. To demonstrate that such decisions are not arbitrary but rather ideologically driven in allocating weight to specific arguments in order to achieve particular ideological consequences, only the barest minimum of argumentation is required in this situation. Because Hamas fires rockets into Israel, such language characteristics construct a broad discourse that is consistent with the Israeli assumption that they only target Hamas and not all Palestinians. This is because Israel believes that Hamas is the only Palestinian group they are targeting.

The Israeli government has a vital national obligation to respond to the terror carried out by Hamas; however, this response should not be carried out in the manner of a brutal occupying power that attacks defenceless civilians and targets a national resistance that fights for the freedom, independence, and self-determination of its people.

4.3. The Illusion of Equal Victimization: Reporting Children

During the 11 days of intense missile strikes on Gaza in May 2021, 68 Palestinian children were killed in Gaza, 1 Israeli Jewish child was killed, and 1 Palestinian child living in Israel itself was murdered. The treatment of Palestinian and Israeli children murdered during this time demonstrates the NYT's pretence of objectivity. It is consistent with an interpretation of events along the lines of "there are deaths on both sides" and "this is the horrible cost of war" to say that the coverage of the children who were murdered during Israel's assault is consistent with this interpretation. To provide an illustration, despite the fact that no one condones the killing of children, it is an attempt to downplay the horrendous crimes committed against Palestinian children to merely label the deaths of these children as "war casualties" without linking their deaths to the Israeli occupation. They were slaughtered at a rate of 67 Palestinian children for every 2 Israeli children, and one of the Palestinian children who was slaughtered was an Israeli-resident child. The difference between the number of victims and perpetrators should have been reflected in the New York Times' coverage of the victims and their deaths; however, as will be shown in the following section, this was not the case.

Even though the New York Times went to great lengths to report on the Palestinian children who had been killed during the battle, including providing images, ages, and names of those children, the newspaper was careful not to attribute direct responsibility and accountability to the Israeli occupation forces. The article that was published on May 26 by the New York Times about the Palestinian children who had been killed in this war is an example of this construction. The article included the faces, names, ages, and emotional responses of many of the children's parents or guardians in an effort to humanise the Palestinian children who had been killed by the Israeli

military during their assault on Gaza. For example, this was mentioned in the preface to the primary report on the children who had been slain in the conflict in May of 2021:

Extract 3

"When asked to describe how they felt, many [Palestinian] parents answered with a simple "It's God's will," their voice often reduced to a whisper, the words conveying resignation.

They said their children had wanted to be doctors, artists and leaders. "I'm in disbelief," said Saad Asaliyah, a taxi driver from Jabaliya, who lost his 10-year-old daughter. "I try to calm myself by saying it was God's will for her to go." (May 26, 2021)"

The New York Times consistently refrained from condemning Israel for the intentional killings of these children or for violating international law and human rights, despite reporting at length on the emotional experiences of Palestinian parents whose children were killed in Israel's conflict and providing extensive coverage of the emotional reactions of these parents.

The same report gives precedence to the Israeli perspective, which contextualises Israel's actions as self-defense and assigns blame to Hamas for the deaths of the Palestinian children for inciting Israel into bombarding the densely populated areas of Gaza and subtly using the civilians, including children, as a 'human shield,' which is a common accusation made by the Israeli army against the Palestinian resistance; however, the reporter goes beyond this perspective. The same report gives precedence to the Israeli perspective, which contextual

Extract 4

"Israel blames Hamas for the high civilian death toll in Gaza because the group fires rockets and conducts military operations from civilian areas. Israel's critics cite the death toll as evidence that Israel's strikes were indiscriminate and disproportionate (NYT, 26 May 2021)"

Other alternative justifications that could have implicated Israel in the death of these children were excluded from the research. These arguments included international law and international humanitarian law, both of which ban the use of lethal force in densely populated civilian areas. The research makes absolutely no mention of the use of Israeli military force against Palestinians in any way, shape, or form. The reporter shifted the focus from Israel's violation of international law to Israel's assertion that Hamas was to blame, while downplaying Israel's counterclaims of disproportionality and indiscriminate assaults. This was done in order to bring more attention to Israel's assertion that Hamas was to blame. In a similar vein, the report included the story of an Israeli boy who was killed by shrapnel from a stray Hamas rocket. It was intriguing that the reporter stated that the child's mother claimed her son once told his friends, "Not all Arabs are bad, and 'I said they don't want to kill us... I eventually convinced them," and it was stated that the child was killed by shrapnel from a stray Hamas rocket (NYT, 26 May 2021).

This has a complex relationship to the larger contexts of how information is produced and received. It entails not only the construction of a hegemonic picture of the situation in which Hamas activities are perceived as unjustifiably engaging in violence against Israel, but it also entails the assignment of causal agency, accountability, and blame primarily to Palestinians. This is because the hegemonic picture is built in such a way that Hamas activities are perceived as unjustifiably

engaging in violence against Israel. De-emphasizing Israeli activities, on the other hand, may be deemed rhetorically necessary because it may serve the purpose of sparing Israeli actions and policies from the same criticism and moral judgement as those of the Palestinians, and because it diverts attention from Israel's illegal occupation of Palestinian territory and suffocating siege of Palestinian territory.

In a similar vein, it is essential to investigate the manner in which the New York Times frames the problem in its news headlines. They frequently referred to the events as a "fight" between "Israel" and "Hamas," as well as "violence" and "war" between the two parties. This arrangement is in line with the worldview of the New York Times, and it advances Israel's interests and strengthens its position. The ongoing portrayal of Israel's aggression against Gaza as a fight between Hamas or Gaza and Israel, notably by the New York Times, provides the idea that both sides are of comparable power. This is especially true given that Israel has been the aggressor in this conflict. It's possible that this gives the impression that Gaza is a comparable sovereign state.

Despite the fact that Israel has been besieging the Gaza Strip since 2007 and has fought multiple wars against the small enclave over the past 15 years, this dominant pattern of representation gives the impression that this war is against Hamas and fails to portray Israel as an occupying power as defined by international law. This portrayal is consistent with what Philo and Berry (2011) revealed in their research, namely that the Israeli war was portrayed as being aimed solely at Hamas, which is exactly how Israel expected it to be understood. This portrayal is also congruent with what Philo and Berry (2011) revealed in their research regarding how Israel expected the war to be understood. In other words, constructing the situation as a battle against Hamas, which is consistently described as a "militant Palestinian Islamist group controlling Gaza," lends credence to Israel's justifications while ignoring Palestinian representation that emphasises the contexts of

Israel's occupation, invasion, and belligerence against the Palestinians in Gaza, which are what motivate Israel's actions in the region. This favours Israel's justifications and ignores Palestinian representation that emphasises the contexts of Israel's occupation,

In a similar vein, the frequent use of the expressions "violence" and "Israel-Gaza war" to characterise the Israeli assault on Gaza obscures the fact that it is an assault by an occupying authority against a subpopulation. This is due to the fact that these phrases are used frequently. This facade of neutrality disregards the facts on the ground and the unprecedented violence that the occupation is inflicting upon the Palestinians who live in Gaza, as is proven by the headlines that have been appearing in the New York Times. In other words, the lexical references that were utilised by the New York Times in order to characterise the situation are congruent with the justifications and explanations that Israel provides for its actions and policies against the Palestinian people. It does not take into account the historical or political context, and as a result, it offers a more concise comprehension of the behaviour of the two competing parties.

The New York Times gave the impression that all sides of the conflict were equally powerful and suffered comparable losses throughout the conflict. That is to say, the Palestinian resistance was able to do the same level of destruction in Israeli cities as the Israeli attacks on Gaza. There is an insufficient amount of documentation regarding the breadth of human rights crimes committed against Palestinians. These violations include the targeting of children, women, paramedics, and journalists. References to Palestinian casualties are also minimised. This pattern of narrative provides Israel with a shield against moral examination and condemnation for the atrocities it has committed against Palestinian individuals and infrastructure in the constrained Gaza Strip.

4.4. Marginalising Dissent: Absence of Legal and Historical Context

A historiography of the decades-long Palestinian-Israeli conflict must be included in any media coverage of the events taking place on the ground, as this ensures that readers have a comprehensive understanding of the actions of both sides and a broader comprehension of the structural causes and origins of this long-running conflict. Readers' grasp of the roles and actions of the various parties in the conflict is likely to be limited or even misled in the lack of contextualization of the ongoing Israeli offensive. This increases the likelihood that readers will be misled. The investigation has a bias toward giving priority to one particular contextualization of occurrences over others.

In particular, the Israeli account was given more weight and importance than the Palestinian account was given. In general, the New York Times favoured a representation of the situation in terms of conflicting Israeli and Palestinian narratives and claims over the land and holy sites over a historicalization of the events surrounding Israel's ethnic cleansing, colonisation, military occupation, and blockade. This was done in favour of a representation of the situation in terms of conflicting Israeli and Palestinian claims over the land and holy sites. Consider the following sentence, which was published in an article in the New York Times on May 20, and shows how the newspaper's coverage of the events obliterated the background of Israel's occupation and ethnic cleansing:

> *Extract 5*
>
> *"Even with the pause in fighting, the underlying causes of the conflict remain: the dispute over land rights in Jerusalem and the West Bank, religious tensions in the Old City of*

Jerusalem and the absence of a peace process to resolve the conflict. Gaza remains under

a punishing blockade by Israel and Egypt (NYT 20 May 2021)."

It is important to note that the New York Times presented the underlying causes of the conflict as a 'dispute' between Palestinians and Israelis over land rights in Jerusalem and the West Bank, ignoring the historical events of Israel's occupation of the eastern side of Jerusalem after the 1967 war, and more recently favouring the Israeli assertion that the homes of the Palestinian families in Sheikh Jarrah's neighbourhood are subject to a legal case and to be expelled. In addition, the continuous Israeli efforts to Judaize Al-Aqsa Mosque and split it temporally and physically between Muslims and Jews are referred to as 'religious conflicts,' adopting Israeli claims and actions. Note moreover that the stifling and illegal embargo imposed on the Gaza Strip by the Israeli occupation state is designed as a "punitive blockade" by Israel and Egypt, which absolves Israel of entire responsibility for it.

The usage of the term 'punishing,' derived from the discipline of poor behaviour, would create the impression that Gazans deserved punishment for whatever they did. This is particularly true when Hamas and other Palestinian factions are regularly referred to negatively as "militant organisations." If the blockade was referred to as 'illegal,' 'suffocating,' 'inhumane,' or other terms that hold the Israeli occupation legally, ethically, and politically responsible for the siege, the reader would have a different understanding of the situation in Gaza. The historical references included in this excerpt highlight Israeli propaganda and explanations, whereas Palestinian explanations and international law that questioned the Israeli occupation's interpretation of events were not provided to counteract this perspective. The New York Times appears to pay little heed to alternative explanations that portray Palestinian acts as a political fight for self-determination. Philo and Berry (2004) highlight accurately that:

> "The absence of key elements of Palestinian history makes it difficult to understand their perspective. Their actions could appear without context and in consequence they may be seen as 'initiating' the trouble… the fact of the military occupation and its consequences is crucial to an understanding of the rationale of Palestinian actions."

Palestinian violence is highlighted and framed as an attack on Israelis, whilst Israeli violence is portrayed as revenge for Palestinian violence. This formulation uses the official Israeli terminology and explanations for Israeli military activities in Gaza. First, be aware that the Palestinian resistance in Gaza is referred to as "militant group" that have been "firing rockets into Israel since Monday night" and that "Israel has retaliated by striking targets."

Noteworthy are the linguistic options ascribed to the Palestinian side, since they frequently contain negative connotations and appraisals of Palestinian actors and actions. The Israeli side is referred to as the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), which lends a more formal and credible tone than the Palestinian side's designations. Alternately, the reader would have a different impression and interpretation of both sides' conduct if the Israeli side were referred to as the "Israeli occupation forces" or the "Israeli military."

The transitivity selections and participation roles provided to the Palestinian and Israeli sides, respectively, reveal the negative connotations connected with the Palestinian side. Note that the Palestinians are designated an active clause structure in 'militant groups...have been firing rockets into Israel,' with the Palestinians assuming the negative 'agent' role and 'action' process 'firing,' and a specified circumstance 'into Israel,' thus emphasising negative Palestinian authority. This is in stark contrast to the hued language associated with the Israeli side, such as the use of the word 'targets', which projects the Israeli army as a competent one hitting 'specific' entities, an expression

that conforms to the demonstration that Israel is only fighting Hamas and not the people of Gaza, in contrast to Hamas' targeting of "Israeli cities."

Note also the usage of the agentless passive structure '400 people have been harmed' and the middle voice 'dead,' which shifts the focus and leaves unclear the agent responsible for the deaths and injuries. This subjective formulation of events that places Israel in a defensive position with no choice but to respond to "1,500 rockets" stands in stark contrast to a formulation of events that assigns a negative active clause structure to Israel, such as "Israeli occupation forces killed 67 civilians and injured 400 others." It requires minimal argument to demonstrate that such choices are not arbitrary, but rather ideologically motivated, as the weighting of particular propositions creates particular ideological effects, generally in favour of Israelis and against Palestinians.

The differential portrayal of Palestinian and Israeli violence and victims is consistent with the examples provided by Herman and Chomsky (1988) in their "propaganda model" about the dichotomous handling of those victimised by friendly or hostile regimes by the American media. They demonstrate that abuses performed by friendly regimes are downplayed and receive minimal attention, whereas abuses committed by hostile regimes are extensively covered and couched in deeply emotional language by the United States media. They attribute this disparity in the treatment of deserving and undeserving victims to the fact that:

> "This bias is politically advantageous to U.S. policy-makers, for focusing on victims of enemy states shows those states to be wicked and deserving of U.S. hostility; while ignoring U.S. and client-state victims allows ongoing U.S. policies to proceed more easily, unburdened by the interference of concern over the politically inconvenient victims" (Herman and Chomsky, 1988)

Not the deeper political and historical settings of Israel's occupation, colonisation, colonial settlements, and stifling siege on Gaza, but Hamas' rocket fire was heavily problematized and presented as the cause of the 'conflict' in two important media outlets. This design of the Gaza war of 2021 emphasises that the Israeli war is a war against Hamas that elicits Israeli-validated responses, and not a war against the Palestinians; this is consistent with Israeli claims that it is engaged in a punitive campaign against Gaza's militants. Simultaneously, Palestinian explanations for their political and military actions are mostly ignored or relegated to the background.

In a similar vein, it is important to note that the NYT failed to highlight the international legal context of Israel's actions in occupied Jerusalem and Sheikh Jarrah, as well as Israel's attacks on Gaza, which included the targeting of homes and residential buildings, the indiscriminate killing of Palestinian civilians, including dozens of children, and the destruction of civilian infrastructure, in clear violation of international human rights law. During the study period, the New York Times did not mention any reports by human rights organisations or international legal references documenting these abuses.

4.5. The Politics of Sourcing News

In particular for a conflict that is determined just as much by public opinion and rallying support for one side as by events that take place on the ground, the inclusion of certain viewpoints, the exclusion and marginalisation of other viewpoints, and the functions that these perspectives serve implicate a method of instilling readers with specific beliefs and realities and orienting their subjectivities to interpret events in particular ways. This is especially true for a conflict that is determined just as much by public opinion and rallying support for one side as In order to improve the credibility of their reports and, at times, to give a dramatic and vivid live broadcast of the events as they are happening, journalists rely on numerous voices and news sources as an essential

component of news reporting. A reference, as stated by Bell (1991), "gives the piece the flavour of the newsmaker's own words." It was particularly noteworthy due to the fact that the New York Times primarily relied on Israeli sources, most of which were army spokespeople, to report on and interpret events as well as provide justifications for Israeli military activity. This highlighted Israeli rationales and perspectives, which made it particularly noteworthy. In addition, the New York Times did not provide an alternative interpretation of the violence that placed it within the context of Israeli military occupation, Palestinian rights, or the international law position. This would have been an effective way to refute Israeli viewpoints and counter their claims. In addition, Palestinian voices were primarily used to transmit firsthand accounts of what was happening on the ground, the emotional responses of ordinary Palestinians describing their sadness or astonishment, and the reports made by health authorities regarding the number of dead and injured.

This practise of utilising news sources in a way that emphasises Israeli reasons and explanations can be seen in the snippet that was just presented, and it is something that has been going on for quite some time. Note that the statement from the Israeli army was used to clarify and contextualise Israeli military activity as well as to substantiate the reporter's subjective depiction of events that was presented in the paragraph that came before this one. No Palestinian sources were utilised in order to contradict the accusations made by the Israeli army or to provide an alternative viewpoint on the event that took place. It was the exclusive responsibility of the representative of the Palestinian Ministry of Health to provide the number of Palestinians who had been killed or injured.

It is not possible to identify all of the news sources contained within the corpus of texts that was used for this study due to the limited amount of space available. Despite this, it is quite obvious

that a trend of selecting news sources that emphasise Israeli activities and justifications while hardly covering Palestinian acts and reasons is being followed.

In addition, there were fewer Palestinian sources, and the ones that were used were mostly for reporting events rather than analysing Palestinian replies or offering a counterargument to the one that was presented by Israel. With the extremely unfavourable exception of the broad reference'militants in Gaza,' Palestinian news sources were noticeably absent from the article. The fact that the sources that were quoted came from authoritative institutions in Israel lends credence to the formality, authenticity, and newsworthiness of the sources in question as well as the claims that they made. In addition, the Israeli sources were published first, which gave the impression that the Palestinian sources were less newsworthy than the Israeli sources. This impression was given because the Palestinian sources were published after the Israeli statements and explanations had been thoroughly established.

The tendency of the reporter to emphasise Israeli sources and statements is illustrative of the way in which he presents the events. This is because he appears to give greater weight to the official Israeli account of the events, and his comments appear to reinforce this account, as was shown in extract 4 above. According to Henry and Tator (2002), using quotations can be an effective language strategy for news producers who reference sources that legitimise a particular worldview with which they identify while legitimately appearing to convey what has been said. They argue that quotations can be an effective language strategy for news producers who reference sources that legitimise a particular worldview.

4.6. Positionality:

A person's perspective and posture in relation to an academic task, as well as the social and political context of that task, are both included in positionality. The individual's world view, often known as "where the researcher is coming from," is comprised of ontological and epistemological assumptions, in addition to assumptions concerning human nature and behaviour (beliefs about how we interact with and relate to our environment). A person's political leanings, religious beliefs, gender, sexual orientation, historical and geographical location, ethnicity, race, social class, and status, (dis)abilities, and other factors, among others, can have an effect on these factors.

As a direct result of this, the positionality and subjectivities of the writers with regard to the Israel-Palestine conflict have been investigated during the course of this study.

Here are two prominent writers from The New York Times who have written extensively on the subject of the conflict: The names Patricia Kingsley and Isabel Kershner come to mind. As a journalist for The New York Times based in Jerusalem, Isabel Kershner covers Israeli and Palestinian politics and society in addition to the ongoing conflict between Israel and Palestine. Due to the fact that she formerly worked for the publication The Jerusalem Report, she has been reporting on both the Israeli and Palestinian sides of the conflict since the year 1990. Both Hebrew and Arabic come naturally to her. Her son was a member of the Israel Defense Forces, and her father worked for the Israeli regime as a communication strategist (IDF). She also published an article written by her husband, former IDF soldier Hirsh Goodman, in which he refuted the "claims" made by Human Rights Watch on the IDF's treatment of Palestinians as persecutors. On the other hand, Patrick Kingsley is the chief of the bureau in Jerusalem, where he is responsible for covering both Israel and the occupied territories. He is currently pursuing his Hebrew education and resides in Berlin. The assertion made by Amnesty International that Israel is an apartheid state

was debunked by him. An analysis of his writings reveals that the author frequently refers to Palestinians as "some Palestinians" and almost largely, if not totally, cites Israeli sources and government officials.

Furthermore, out of the 27 authors of news articles in The New York Times, 20 are based outside of Middle East and in the West, 3 in Israel, 2 in Egypt, 1 in Jordan and 1 in Palestine. The leading two authors, Isabel Kershner and Patrick Kingsley, have published 19 articles out of 71 in total, and have contributed in more than 10 articles as either co-authors or reporters. One article was written anonymously by the New York Times. And, out of the 13 opinion authors, 7 are based in the United States and belonged to the right-wing ideology, 2 in Israel, 2 in Palestine, and 2 other authors are US politicians, Bernie Sanders and Jerrod L. Nadler. Sanders is a socialist while Nadler is a conservative politician.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

It has been determined that the New York Times constructed the scenario for ideological motives since several powerful themes have emerged, and their linguistic manifestations have been recognised. Specifically, the concept of equivalence emerges as a result of the analysis as a result of the New York Times' consistent portrayal of the Israeli assault on Gaza as a conflict between Israel and Hamas with victims on both sides, while ignoring the vastly greater number of Palestinian civilians killed and destruction caused by the Israeli attack. This portrayal of the Israeli assault on Gaza as a conflict between Israel and Hamas with victims on both sides emerges as a result of the analysis. Also, despite the fact that the New York Times seems to have paid equal attention to Palestinian and Israeli casualties, which may give the impression of objectivity, this has the effect of diminishing Israel's moral, legal, and political responsibility for the wanton destruction and deaths it inflicted on the Palestinian people in Gaza. The destruction and deaths were caused by Israel's offensive on the Gaza Strip.

The findings of this study are consistent with those of previous research that found a pattern of Israeli-centric bias in the news media in both the United States and the United Kingdom. By framing the situation as the terrible and unavoidable cost of war, this journalistic technique protects Israel from moral criticism and condemnation for its horrendous atrocities committed against innocent Palestinians. Israel is shielded from moral criticism and condemnation for its horrendous atrocities. In most cases, the backdrop of Israel's occupation, siege, brutalities and violations, colonialism, and ethnic cleansing was ignored by the reporting, which presented the conflict as one over territory and religious sites. The textual manifestations, in particular the lexical references to Israelis and Palestinians, the choices of transitivity, and the quotation patterns employed by the

two media outlets, indicate that the New York Times favoured Israeli rationales and perspectives over Palestinian perspectives and international legal perspectives on Israeli actions. This is particularly evident in the lexical references to Israelis and Palestinians, as well as the choices of transitivity and the quotation patterns.

The ideology of persons in authority positions is reflected in any speech that is presented in the media. The opinions, assumptions, attitudes, and language expressions of those who work in the news media are deeply ingrained in the way that they report on events and ideas.

Studies conducted by Media Research (such as Bishop and Jaworski, 2003; Martin Rojo and van Dijk, 1997; Teo, 2000) have shown that the news media have a substantial impact on the maintenance of power asymmetries between various sociopolitical groupings. This research analyses the ways in which reporters justify, contextualise, and legitimise acts and attitudes as they cover events, as well as the ways in which they impact the cognition and knowledge of target audiences when reporting on military events. In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to challenge the commonly held belief that the concept of "objectivity" plays an important role in the news media. It is critical to have the understanding that journalists are not autonomous from the political and professional milieu in which they operate. This argues that the news coverage of every event is inextricably influenced by the cultural values, social practises, and ideological convictions of the journalists, as well as by the cultural and institutional environments in which they operate. According to what White (2006) says:

> "Contrary to any claims to 'objectivity' on the part of the media industry, news reporting is a mode of rhetoric in the broadest sense of the word – a value laden, ideologically determined discourse with a clear potential to influence the media audience's assumptions and beliefs about the way the world is and the way it ought to be."

The study demonstrates that the New York Times misrepresents the Israel-Palestine conflict as a result of its hegemonic influence, which results in a decontextualized and negative depiction of the Palestinian resistance. This misrepresentation is the result of the New York Times's hegemonic influence. Under the umbrella term of Islamist militancy, Hamas was considered to be synonymous with the entire Palestinian resistance movement. The Palestinian point of view is consistently ignored by the Times, which effectively strips them of any agency. This also demonstrates the theoretical foundations of this research, which state that language is used as a strategic action in which one party is dominant in communication and disseminates the knowledge it wishes to disseminate via middle-class intellectuals such as the media, thereby exercising their hegemonic power.

According to the findings of this study's analysis, both the New York Times and the British Broadcasting Corporation were extremely selective in the way that they constructed events and players, as well as in their patterns of exclusion and inclusion, over-reporting and under-reporting, and they consistently maintained a particular ideological image of the Gaza war. This was the case despite the fact that both organisations were required to report on the conflict. Therefore, the emancipatory promise of this study can be realised by sensitising readers to hegemonic and manipulative uses of language that may be overtly expressed or implicitly assumed in the influential discourses of The New York Times and other media. This promise can be realised by sensitising readers to hegemonic and manipulative uses of language that may be overtly expressed or implicitly assumed in The New York Times and other media. Vaughan (1995) does an excellent job of demonstrating this argument.

"It is important for ordinary citizens to empower themselves through education to analyse language used to explain war, to realize when they are being manipulated, to see the entwining of language choices and political/social issues, in order to make better choices"

In the end, the purpose of the study is to equip readers with the analytic tools and resources they need to examine critically the discourses of influential news media and other discourses that are similar to the way they think about, interpret, and perceive highly sensitive events, particularly the question of Palestine. This is done in the hopes that it will influence how readers think about, interpret, and perceive highly sensitive events.

Bibliography

Ackerman, S. (2001). Al-Aqsa Intifada and the US media. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *30*(2), 61-74.

Ahmed, A. (2021). ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT: THE WORLD'S MOST INTRACTABLE CONFLICT. *Available at SSRN 3965270*.

Altheide, D. L. (1984). Media hegemony: A failure of perspective. *Public opinion quarterly*, *48*(2), 476-490.

Amer, W. M., & Amer, M. M. (2011). US Media Coverage of the Situation in Jerusalem: A Discourse Analysis Study.

Amer, M. M. (2008). The Linguistics of Representation: The New York Times' Discourse on the Second Palestinian Intifada. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne, Australia.

Amer, M. M. (2012). The discourse of homeland: the construction of Palestinian national identity in Palestinian secularist and Islamist discourses. Critical Discourse Studies, 9(2), 117−131. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.656374

Anadolu Agency. (2021, May 21). Israel's 2021 aggression on Gaza: A timeline. Retrieved from https://trim.ng/kzHCw

Bagdikian, B. H. (2004). The new media monopoly (Rev. ed.). Beacon Press: Boston.

Bates, T. R. (1975). Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *36*(2), 351-366.

Beinin, J., & Hajjar, L. (2014). Palestine, Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict. *Middle east research and information project*.

Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state. *Journal of communication*, *40*(2), 103-127.

Bell, A. (1991). The language of news media. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bishop, H., & Jaworski, A. (2003). 'We beat 'em': Nationalism and the hegemony of homogeneity in the British press reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000. Discourse & Society, 14(3), 243−271. https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265030143001

Blommaert, J. (2005). Discourse: A critical introduction. New York: Cambridge University press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610295

Chandler, D. (2000). *Marxist media theory*. Daniel Chandler.

Coser, L. A. (1998). *The functions of social conflict* (Vol. 9). Routledge.

Cotter, C. (2003). Discourse and media. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds), The handbook of discourse analysis (pp. 416−436). MA: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631205968.2003.00022.x

Eggins, S. (2004). An introduction to systemic functional linguistics (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.

Encycoploedia Britannica. (2021). British Broadcasting Corporation: British corporation. Retrieved March 15, 2022, from https://www.britannica.com/topic/British-Broadcasting-Corporation

Economist, T. (2020). *Donald Trump gives Israel the green light to annex occupied lands*. Retrieved 03-12-2021 from

Evans, M. R. (2002). Hegemony and discourse: Negotiating cultural relationships through media production. *Journalism*, *3*(3), 309-329.

Fowler, R. (1991). Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press. London: Routledge.

Friel, M., & Falk, R. (2004). The record of the paper: How the New York Times misreports US foreign policy. NY: Verso.

Filipiak, M. (2017). Strategic actions according to Jürgen Habermas - some critical remarks from the transcendental-pragmatic procedure viewpoint. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, *59*(1), 39-52. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/linpo-2017-0004

Finkelstein, N. (1991). Israel and Iraq: A double standard. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *20*(2), 43-56.

Firdous, T. (2009). *Al Jazeera English Presenting a non-Western viewpoint and contesting Western media dominance during the Gaza crisis* Hawaii Pacific University].

Friedman, R. I. (1987). Selling Israel to America. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *16*(4), 169-179.

Ghareeb, E., Jennings, P., Koven, R., McCartney, J., Eggerstrom, L., & Robinson, M. (1975). The American media and the Palestine problem. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *5*(1/2), 127-149.

Golding, P., & Murdock, G. (2018). Ideology and the mass media: the question of determination. In *Ideology and cultural production* (pp. 198-224). Routledge.

Gramsci, A. (2005). The intellectuals. *Contemporary sociological thought. Themes and theories*, 49-58.

Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*, *2*, 13-74.

Hallward, M. (2011). Pursuing" Peace" in Israel/Palestine. *Journal of Third World Studies*, *28*(1), 185-202.

[Record #716 is using a reference type undefined in this output style.]

Handley, R. L. (2009). The conflicting Israeli-terrorist image: Managing the Israeli–Palestinian narrative in the New York Times and Washington Post. *Journalism Practice*, *3*(3), 251-267.

Harms, G. The Palestine-Israel Conflict.

Hawkins, V. (2002). The other side of the CNN factor: the media and conflict. *Journalism Studies*, *3*(2), 225-240.

Howell, T., Stevenson, D., Aljibury, F., Gitlin, H., Wu, I.-P., Warrick, A., & Raats, P. (1980). Design and operation of trickle (drip) systems. *Design and operation of trickle (drip) systems.*, 663-717.

Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). Manufacturing consent: The political economy of mass media. New York: Pantheon Books.

Human Rights Watch. (August, 2021). Gaza: Israel's May Airstrikes on High-Rise: Apparently Unlawful Attacks Cause Major Lasting Harm. Retrieved March 15, 2022, from https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/08/23/gaza-israels-may-airstrikes-high-rises

Ismail, A. (2008). Mission statehood: portraits of the second Palestinian intifada in US news media. *Media, War & Conflict*, *1*(2), 177-201.

JEGIC, D. (2021, 03-12-2021). *Sheikh Jarrah: Western media outlets are whitewashing Israeli colonialism*. TRT World. Retrieved 10-05-2021 from

Krippendorff, K. (2018). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Sage publications.

Kræmer, A., Overgaard, A. C., Rutkovska, E., Zymberi, F., Maass, J. C., Petersen, J. A., & Lundstrøm, P. P. (2014). The Media's Representation of the Israel-Palestine Conflict.

Leuenberger, C. (2012). Mapping Israel/Palestine. Constructing National Territories across Different Online International Newspapers. *Bulletin du Centre de recherche français à Jérusalem*(23).

Ludwig, S., & de Ruyter, K. (2016). Decoding social media speak: developing a speech act theory research agenda. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.

Lukin, A., Matthiessen, C., & Butt, D. (2004). Reporting war: Grammar as 'covert operation'. Pacific Journalism Review, 10(1), 58−74. https://doi.org/10.24135/pjr.v10i1.779

Malkawi, R. (2001). The ideological stamp: Translation of political discourse in news media. https://doi.org/10.16194/j.cnki.31-1059/g4.2011.07.016

Martin Rojo, L., & Van Dijk, T. (1997). "There Was a Problem, and It Was Solved!": Legitimating the Expulsion of 'Illegal' Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse. Discourse & Society, 8(4), 523−566. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008004005

McDonald, P. J., & Sweeney, K. (2007). The Achilles' Heel of Liberal IR Theory?: Globalization and Conflict in the Pre-World War I Era. *World Politics*, *59*(3), 370-403.

Munayyer, Y. (2014). Crisis Moments: Shifting the Discourse. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *44*(1), 97-105.

Neal, L. S. (1995). The roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: 1882-1914. *Illinois Wesleyan University*, *27*.

Niemi, J. I. (2005). Jürgen Habermas's theory of communicative rationality: The foundational distinction between communicative and strategic action. *Social theory and practice*, *31*(4), 513-532.

Özarslan, Z. (2014). Introducing Two New Terms into the Literature of Hate Speech:"Hate Discourse" and "Hate Speech Act" Application of "speech act theory" into hate speech studies in the era of Web 2.0. *Galatasaray Üniversitesi İletişim Dergisi*(20), 53-75.

[Record #717 is using a reference type undefined in this output style.]

Orimogunje, A., Oluremi, C., Oyelekan, & Oyebimpe, C. (2016). Lexicalisation as a Tool for Ideological Expression in News. European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 4(6), 13−24.

Ozohu-Suleiman, Y. (2014). War journalism on Israel/ Palestine: Does contra-flow really make a difference? Media, War & Conflict, 7(1), 85−103. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635213516697

Philo, G., & Berry, M. (2004). Bad news from Israel. London: Pluto Press.

Philo, G., & Berry, M. (2011). More bad news from Israel. London: Pluto Press.

Pappe, I. (2004). *A history of modern Palestine: One land, two peoples*. Cambridge University Press.

Parker, H. N. (2011). Toward a definition of popular culture. *History and Theory*, *50*(2), 147-170.

Povilus, M. W. (2020). *Russian Grand Strategy: Cultivating National Will and Military Modernization* Northwestern University].

Safty, A. (1991). Language and propaganda: Challenges to media interpretations of the Palestine question. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 91-117.

Said, E. (1986). The burdens of interpretation and the question of Palestine. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *16*(1), 29-37.

Said, E. (1981). Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world. London: Vintage.

Smith, P. W. H. (1991). *Speech act theory, discourse structure and indirect speech* University of Leeds].

Spangler, E. (2019). *Understanding Israel/Palestine: Race, nation, and human rights in the conflict*. Brill.

Stallings, R. A. (1990). Media discourse and the social construction of risk. *Social problems*, *37*(1), 80-95.

Terry, J., & Mendenhall, G. (1974). 1973 US Press Coverage on the Middle East. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, *4*(1), 120-133.

Van Oord, L. (2008). The Making of Primitive Palestine: Intellectual Origins of the Palestine–Israel Conflict. *History and Anthropology*, *19*(3), 209-228.

Viser, M. (2003). Attempted Objectivity: An Analysis of the New York Timesand Ha'aretz and their Portrayals of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, *8*(4), 114-120.

Waxman, D., & Pressman, J. (2021). The Rocky Future of the US-Israeli Special Relationship. *The Washington Quarterly*, *44*(2), 75-93.

Zagorcic, S. (2015). *Truth: missing in action? An Appraisal Theory approach to two newspapers' portrayal of the Israel-Palestine conflict*

Zureik, E. (2019). Donald Trump's Punitive Politics and the Question of Palestine: A Gaze into his Psychological Makeup and Business Ethics. *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*, *18*(2), 139-162.