



“Law and Order” vs. “Injustice and Defiance”: *Al Jazeera* and *CNN* Framing of the 2017 Temple Mount/*Al Aqsa* Mosque Crisis

Amer Qasem

*PhD Candidate, School of Communication
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia*

Prof. Dr. Adnan Bin Hussein

*Professor, School of Communication
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia*

Doi: 10.2478/mjss-2018-0002

Abstract

This study compares between the performance of the U.S. and Arab mainstream media following the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The textual coverage of the CNN and Al Jazeera of the 2017 Al Aqsa Mosque/Temple Mount Crisis is under examination through operationalizing Wolfsfeld's (1997b) meta-frames. A set of reasoning and framing devices have been employed to identify the labelling of involved actors and committed actions, the degree of reliance and personalization of news sources, the victimization of casualties and the legitimization of violence. This study concludes that the Law and Order frame, which is communicated with the Israeli perspective is dominated in the related CNN coverage. On the other hand, the Injustice and Defiance frame that represents the Palestinian perspective has chiefly appeared in Al Jazeera related coverage. In the CNN, the Israeli actors and actions have been almost labelled positively in contrast with the Palestinian actors and actions that have been labelled in a negative manner. The degree of personalization and reliance on Israeli news sources is notably greater than the Palestinian ones. Likewise, the Israeli casualties have been remarkably victimized and individualized more than their counterparts. Moreover, the Israeli violence and killing have been legitimized, whereas the Palestinian similar actions have been criminalized. Almost the opposite has been found in Al Jazeera related coverage.

Keywords: *Media performance, Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Al Jazeera CNN coverage, operationalizing frames*

1. Introduction

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict is deemed one of the most international political issues that still gaining media and public attention notwithstanding its early emergence. Recently, the conflict witnessed a new vehement wave of events called the 2017 Al Aqsa Mosque/Temple Mount Crisis. On July 14, 2017, three Palestinians clashed with Israeli Border Police in the complex of Al Aqsa Mosque (AKA the Temple Mount by the Israelis) in East Jerusalem shooting two officers to death. As a consequence, the Israeli authorities placed metal detectors at the gates of mosque, which is considered unprecedented security step in that area, particularly. The Palestinians went on protesting relentlessly against these Israeli restrictions. In this connection, the Jerusalem Islamic Waqf (Islamic Religious Endowments) urged the Muslim protestors to pray outside Al Aqsa Mosque as a way of demonstration. After the clashes between the Palestinians and the Israeli authorities intensified, the Israeli cabinet voted to use surveillance cameras instead of the metal detectors. However, the protest continued until July 27, 2017, when the Israeli authorities decided to remove

the cameras, too. In the next day, the Palestinian Muslims returned to pray inside the mosque marking an end to this crisis that left 11 dead and more than 100 wounded.

The public allocates overwhelming reliance on the mainstream media in order to collect and perceive information regarding international issues. Accordingly, these media outlets play a key role in shaping the concerned public opinion through its treatment of the related news coverage. In the early 1970s, the concept of framing has emerged as a method of constructing and controlling the social events (see Goffman, 1974). This concept has presented a chance to study the media content and exercise.

Framing is hybrid (Deprez and Raeymaeckers, 2010b). It could be employed on particular domains with different highlighting over the course of time (p. 3). This very characteristic of framing allows to investigate preexisting frames concerning a running issue. Further, framing is not limited merely to study the content. It could be communicated with the audience scrutinizing the individuals processing of media messages (see De Vreese, 2005).

Ideally, the media have to be objective and fair in its representation of what occurs on the international level (Dunsky, 2009, p. 6). However, this empirical study is directed to comparatively examine the framing process in the Arab and United States' (U.S.) mainstream media networks during their coverage of the 2017 Al Aqsa/Temple Mount crisis. Keeping in mind the fact that the United States maintains strong, beneficial and mutual relationship with Israel, are their mainstream media coverage of this crisis going to be biased in favor of Israel? In the opposite direction, are the Arab mainstream media inclined to frame the same events in favor of the Palestinian standpoint?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Media Frames and Meta-frames in Political Conflicts

Media frames are defined as rules of choosing, underlining and displaying implicit details about important events, therefore, they constitute a recurrent forms of cognition, interpretation and presentation of inclusion and exclusion (Gitlin, 1980, pp. 6-7). In other words, studying the media frames reveals the media partiality and biasness towards given issues. Moody-Hall (2002) contends that media frames are formulated by economic interests, prevailing ideologies, government's power and journalistic standards. Particularly, communication scholars have extensively studied media frames and framing in connection with the political conflicts (Iyengar and Simon, 1993; Wolfsfeld, 1997b; Kempf, 2003; Aiken, 2003; Wolfsfeld et al., 2008). In their article titled "*News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion*," Iyengar and Simon (1993) conclude that in reporting conflicts, political crises and wars, two meta-frames are mostly predominant through the related media content: "episodic;" and "thematic" frames. The first is communicated with less contextualization of the implications and historical background of the conflict being reported, vice versa the "thematic" frame. In this respect, they have found that in promoting military choices, the mainstream media will be inclined towards using more "episodic" frames (p. 381). Supporting this argument, Wolfsfeld (1997b, p. 41) emphasizes that the need to produce a political feedback within a given culture is the key component that chiefly contributes to the structuring of media frames in conflicts' coverage.

By the same token, Kempf (2003) argues that two meta-frames are inherently competing through reporting conflicts: "escalation-oriented (war)" frame versus "de-escalation-oriented (peace)" frame. These frames are possible to be identified by analyzing the behavior of foes, evaluating their actions and scrutinizing the representation of their casualties within the related media content (Maurer and Kempf, 2011, p. 2). Likewise, Aikens (2003) has deduced five major frames from media content related to September 11 events. Firstly, "conflict frame" that includes any violent (crime, war... etc.) or non-violent (political debates, court sessions... etc.) disagreement between two sides. Secondly, "human interest" frame, which is concerned about highlighting the human side through focusing on feature stories in conflicts. Thirdly, "economic and general consequences" frame that refers to all consequences (i.e. political, geopolitical and economic) that ensue from a given conflict. Fourthly, "morality" frame, which is dealing with representing a given conflict within the context of religious principles and moral values. Lastly, "attribution and responsibility" frame that is related to the content of blaming, victimization, attribution and responsibility of actors and actions

(see also Silke, 2007, pp. 69-73).

In the same context, Wolfsfeld et al. (2008) argue that politicians exert remarkable efforts to consolidate media frames that suit the status quo. They indicate to another set of meta-frames dominates the media content of crises' casualties, namely: "victims" mode; and "defensive" mode (p. 402). Within the first mode, the content has emotional appeals and devoting more prominence and personalization to "our victims," whether civilians, military or war prisoners, besides focusing on ethnic solidarity stories. On the other hand, the "defensive" mode is mainly communicated with the official actions practiced against the foes especially that cause civilian losses. The enemies are demonized in this mode, their losses are statistically reported with depersonalization, as the related coverage try to provide justifications of its government's violence (p. 403). In essence, these meta-frames enhance the mobilization of the concerned audience (public) during wartimes and political crises.

2.2 Framing the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict as one of the longest political dilemmas in the modern history has especially received extensive attention of media scholars. Several empirical research have been devoted to examine the media frames, framing process and its effects regarding the conflict (Gamson, 1992; Wolfsfeld, 1997a; 1997b; Wu et al., 2002; Zelizer et al., 2002; Ross, 2003; Stawicki, 2009; Deprez and Raeymaeckers, 2010a; 2010b; 2011). Gamson (1992, pp. 54-56) has extracted five major frames inherently rooted in the content of media coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict: the "feuding neighbors" is the first frame. It is referred to the coverage of constant and repetitive cycle of devastation and revenge that subsequently leaves bystanders as true victims. Secondly, the "strategic interest," which is recognizable through the superpower and combatants' common interests apart from clarifying the injustice allegations. Then, the "Arab intransigence" frame that depicts the Israelis as victims and the Arabs, including the Palestinians, as the bigots who seek tirelessly the devastation of Israel. Contrariwise, the "Israeli expansionism" represents the Arabs as victims of the greediness of Zionism and the West support of Israel. Finally, the "dual liberation" frame that identifies justice as compromising to gain self-determination and peace.

Similarly, Wu et al. (2002) have deduced four frames from the coverage of U.S. mainstream newspapers of the conflict during 1998. The frames were as follows: the "peace process;" "Israel security;" "Palestinian independence;" and "Israel religious fundamentalism." The first frame was the most dominant one as that period has witnessed calm and calls for peace relatively (pp. 10-11). However, during the first year of the second Palestinian uprising (Intifada), the U.S. mainstream media have shown proclivity towards framing the conflict differently (Zelizer et al., 2002). Three frames have been found through the related coverage, namely: "simple competition;" "moral struggle;" and "fatalism" (pp. 291-292). The first frame represents the eruption phase of the uprising, where the related press reporting were inclined towards portraying a balanced conflict. As for the "moral struggle" frame, it was mainly communicated with the labelling of "good" and "bad" actions for both sides. The third frame was an indication to the consequences and ramifications of the uprising. Studying the same period, Stawicki (2009) investigated the framing process in three U.S. daily newspapers during their coverage of the second Palestinian uprising. While there have been tendencies towards framing the visit of the Former Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, to Al Aqsa Mosque (which is considered the spark that flamed the uprising) as "Israeli quest for security," the massacre that occurred against the Palestinians resultantly has been framed as "Israeli as military strong bullies" (p. 67).

Keeping in mind the aforementioned media frames, Wolfsfeld (1997b) has developed two meta-frames applicable particularly on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict: the "law and order" (L&O); and "the injustice and defiance" (I&D). The latter is representing the Palestinian point of view, whereas the L&O frame is communicated with the Israeli perspective of the conflict. Employing Wolfsfeld's (1997b) meta-frames on the media content that deal with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict may lead to significant findings in terms of performance, biasness and objectivity detection of media (see Deprez and Raeymaeckers, 2010b).

3. Methodology

This descriptive study seeks to examine then compare between the performance of U.S. and Arab mainstream media networks following their coverage of the 2017 Al Aqsa/Temple Mount Crisis. Hence, it is not directed to identify new media frames within the conflict. Instead, it is operationalizing Wolfsfeld's (1997b) meta-frames in order to compare the textual content of selected media networks. In other words, it analyzes the content of the aforementioned meta-frames. In conducting framing analysis, it is worth noting Entman's (1993, p. 52) definition that includes an illustration of framing as a way of identifying a problem along with its causes, consequences, evaluations and recommendations (see also Matthes and Kohring, 2008). By way of explanation, these details provide the informational content (*reasoning devices*) of a given frame (Dan, 2011). Another part called the *framing devices* (or condensational symbols) is also a major component of a frame (p. 85). It could be detected through identifying the lexical choices (i.e. catchphrases, depictions, metaphors...etc.) or exemplars and visual elements. Both reasoning and framing devices are signposts to identify an entire frame or meta-frame within texts (Deprez and Raeymaeckers, 2010b, p. 4).

3.1 The Reasoning Devices of L&O and I&D

As stated earlier, the reasoning devices of media frames compose of problem definition, causal interpretations, moral judgments and remedies. In the selected case study, the 2017 Al-Aqsa/Temple Mount Crisis, these reasoning devices are clarified in Table 1, where both "law and order" (L&O: Israeli oriented) and "injustice and defiance" (I&D: Palestinian oriented) meta-frames are operationalized. In this sense, the textual content analysis of concerned media networks is steered by these informational devices.

Table 1. Reasoning Devices of the L&O and I&D Meta-frames regarding Media Coverage of the 2017 Al Aqsa/Temple Mount Crisis

Reasoning Devices	Law & Order Frame	Injustice and Defiance Frame
Definition of Problem	How to deal with the Palestinians, who are violently breaking the law and terrorizing the Israeli public. The 2017 Temple Mount Crisis represents unjustified riotous events conducted by Palestinians.	How to put an end to the Israeli control over the Islamic edifices in the Old City of Jerusalem. The 2017 Al Aqsa Crisis represents a Palestinian uprising to protect the Al Aqsa Mosque from unjustified Israeli surveillance and restore the right to pray freely inside it.
Causal Interpretations	The Palestinians rejection to abide by the law is the origin of the problem. The Palestinians initiate the problem and they are responsible for the escalation, casualties and negative situations	The Israeli occupation of Jerusalem is the origin of crisis. The Israelis initiate the problem and they are responsible for the escalation, casualties and negative situations.
Moral Evaluations	Strictly impose order and restore peace to East Jerusalem as a part of maintaining the security of Israel state. Distrust the Palestinians. Israel is the only Jewish state in the world that is located in the middle of terroristic environment.	Praying inside Al Aqsa Mosque is a right for every Muslim. Jerusalem is the occupied capital of historical Palestine. Distrust the Israelis, who are representing the West and the Zionism.
Treatment Recommendations	On the long run: keep controlling the security of Jerusalem city as a part of Israel. On the short run: installing checkpoints, metal detection machines and surveillance cameras; suppressing the Palestinian protests.	On the long run: expelling the Israeli occupation from the holy city. On the short run: protesting and rejecting the new Israeli searching and surveillance measurements; organize supporting marches locally, regionally and internationally.

3.2 The Framing Devices of L&O and I&D

Based on the literature review, the framing devices are elements have to be identified and

examined through detecting the choices of lexical terms, metaphors and stereotypes. In the Law and Order (L&O) and Injustice and Defiance's (I&D) meta-frames, these choices for both the Palestinians and Israelis in the Arab and U.S. mainstream media during the crisis coverage are under scrutiny. Thus, a content analysis of the related textual data of news bulletins has to be conducted in terms of the following framing devices:

- Labelling actors and actions: In L&O frame, the Palestinians (individuals, leaders and groups) and their related actions have a negative label conversely to the Israelis. On the other hand, I&D frame labels the Israelis and their related actions negatively and the Palestinians and their related actions positively.
- News sourcing: In L&O frame, the Israeli sources are personalized through stating one or more of personalization elements (i.e. name, position, age or age category, background...etc.). Further, the reliance on Israeli sources is dominant. Vice versa to the Palestinians. The opposite is taking place in I&D frame, where the Palestinians are personalized with greater dependency on their sources and the Israelis are depersonalized with less appearance of their sources.
- Casualties victimization: In L&O frame, the Israeli casualties (dead and/or injured) are more personalized and portrayed as victims, whereas the Palestinian casualties are less victimized and less personalized. Vice versa in I&D frame.
- Killing legitimization: In L&O frame, the Israeli actions of hostility and killing against the Palestinians are legitimized, unlike the Palestinian actions of hostility and killing, which are criminalized. Vice versa in I&D frame.

In this connection, *Al Jazeera* and the *CNN* have been selected as Arab and U.S. mainstream media representatives, respectively. Both networks enjoy high viewership rates and provide 24-hour news coverage. The study period extends from July 14, 2017 (the date of starting the 2017 Al Aqsa Mosque/Temple Mount Crisis) through July 28, 2017 (the date of first Friday praying inside the mosque after the crisis arguably ended). A total of 49 news items (*Al Jazeera*= 40; *CNN*= 9) have been collected from EBSCO Host Database searching the words "PALESTINE;" "PALESTINIANS;" "ISRAEL;" and "ISRAELIS." A deductive analysis of meta-frames is employed through using media packages or list of frames, which is defined by Tankard (2001) as "the keywords and common language that would help identify a particular frame" (p. 99). Resultantly, the link between media frames and frame sponsors will be clarified (Deprez and Raeymackaekers, 2010b, pp. 6-7).

4. Analysis and Findings

Overall, the data show that *Al Jazeera* has greater attention to the crisis than the *CNN* through the volume of news items allocated within the related news bulletins. A percentage of 81.6% and 18.4% for *Al Jazeera* and *CNN*, respectively. Moreover, the intensity of *Al Jazeera* coverage demonstrates consistent and regular reporting of the crisis distributed over the 15-day period almost equally. On the other hand, the *CNN* coverage reveals an episodic and clustered reporting focusing on specific events within the crisis.

The following subsections demonstrate the results of operationalizing the L&O and I&D meta-frames on the aforementioned data. Generally, significant findings have been concluded regarding the labelling of both sides (Palestinian and Israeli) actors and actions, degree of news sourcing reliance, casualties' portrayal and violence legitimization. The Injustice and Defiance (I&D) frame is dominated in *Al Jazeera* concerned reporting contrary to the *CNN* coverage, where the Law and Order (L&O) frame is strongly recurrent.

4.1 Labelling Actors and Actions

In analyzing this variable, the focus was directed to the Palestinian and Israeli actors and their accompanied actions in both networks excluding other actors that may appear through the texts. The Palestinian actors and actions have been mostly labelled positively in *Al Jazeera* coverage, oppositely to the Israelis, who have been labelled negatively.

By identifying the lexical choices, the Palestinian actors in *Al Jazeera* have a clear inclination towards representing them as oppressed people, peaceful worshippers, who reject violence and decry the Israeli restrictions practiced against them. Further, they rarely attack the Israelis, and that is as a result of deliberate provocation. Usually, the Palestinians hunker down in their houses and fear the increasing Israeli incursion. Thus, they are peacefully protesting to demand their freedom of practicing prayers. Their leadership encourages the demonstrations opposing more Israeli control of the occupied Old City of Jerusalem. Their resistance may lead to another uprising (Intifada) unless the new Israeli control and surveillance measurements are removed. As a consequence, the Palestinian leadership is freezing the contacts with the occupied authorities vowing to continue the demonstrations. Finally, the Palestinians achieved their victory and drew a scene of euphoria and celebration.

On the other hand, the Israelis have been labelled as killers and oppressors. They prevent the freedom of worship, detain Islamic leaders in a violent manner and practice collective punishment against the Palestinians. Their actions are dangerous and unprecedented inflating the situations critically. They are cold blooded murderers, invading holy sites and deploying their forces creating curfew and storming Al Aqsa Mosque with their troops. Their actions aim to prepare forcefully for policy shift represented in annexing East Jerusalem, tightening their grip and imposing sovereignty by stealth contravening the United Nations' articles. The Israelis are Zionist enemy plans to infringe the status quo and performing a political game. They claim their restrictions as legitimate security concerns, whereas expanding control is representing their hidden purpose. Finally, their reckless and destructive agenda that is based on discriminatory restrictions, ingrained racism and apartheid orientation lost against the faithful Palestinian will and the condemnation and denunciation of the international community.

Besides the sporadic reporting of events, the *CNN* has opted to highlight selected actions representing the Palestinian actors as terrorist spreading fear thus new Israeli security measurements are necessary. The Israeli police are doing their job, searching for evidence and had no choice but to neutralize the Palestinian assailants. They are provoked by the Palestinians, whom playing the game of cat-and-mouse.

In the same vein, The Israeli actions are temporarily performed to restore the law and order. The Israeli citizens are peaceful creatures celebrating their Shabbat dinner, whereas the Palestinians killing their sweet moments through gruesome actions. The Palestinians infiltrate the security fences that surround their settlement— without mentioning that it is an occupied territories since 1967—and commit brutal attacks praised by their leadership. The Israeli only mistake during this crisis is taking a unilateral move without consulting Jordan as a custodian of the Islamic edifices in the Old City of Jerusalem.

4.2 Reliance on News Sources

The second framing device applied to this study is the news sources reliance and personalization. Again, the findings demonstrate that I&D frame has strongly appeared in *Al Jazeera* coverage of the concerned crisis through its heavy reliance on Palestinian affiliated sources. In contrast, the *CNN* has shown more dependency on Israeli sources indicating to more employment of the Law and Order frame (see Table 2).

Table 2. *Al Jazeera* and *CNN* Degree of Reliance on News Sources during the Coverage of the 2017 Al Aqsa Mosque/Temple Mount Crisis

Network	Source Affiliation	Percent	Total
Al Jazeera	Palestinian	59.2%	100.0%
	Israeli	27.6%	
	Others	13.2%	
CNN	Palestinian	35.3%	100.0%
	Israeli	55.9%	
	Others	8.8%	

In reporting the concerned crisis, *Al Jazeera* has resorted to a percentage of 59.2% of Palestinian affiliated sources (including both officials and non-officials). As for the Israeli sources, the percentage decreased to 27.6%. A 13.2% refers to other regional and international sources, who were in the main condemning the Israeli hostilities and violation or mediating the crisis. However, the *CNN* has significantly shown less reliance on Palestinian news sources with a percentage of 35.3%. This dependency has increased to 55.9% with Israeli sources, whereas the other sources sharply declined to 8.8%.

In respect to the degree of personalizing the Palestinian and Israeli news sources particularly, similar pattern has been noticed through the concerned data. *Al Jazeera* tended to remarkably personalize the Palestinian news sources and depersonalize their Israeli counterparts, where such pattern has appeared in the *CNN* coverage, but in favor of the Israeli news sources (see Table 3).

Table 3. The Degree of Personalizing the Palestinian and Israeli News Sources in *Al Jazeera* and *CNN* Coverage of the 2017 Al Aqsa Mosque/Temple Mount Crisis

Network	Source Personalization	Percent	Total
Al Jazeera	Palestinian	67.5%	100.0%
	Israeli	23.5%	
CNN	Palestinian	35.7%	100.0%
	Israeli	64.3%	

Using one or more of personalizing elements (i.e. name, age, category of age, job position, background information), *Al Jazeera* has clearly tended to personalize the Palestinian news sources with a percentage of 67.5%. This percentage has been reduced to 23.5% in the corresponding Israeli news sources. The *CNN* was relatively following the same pattern in favor of the Israeli news sources personalizing them with a percentage of 64.3%, whereas the Palestinian counterparts have appeared with 35.7% of personalization.

Further, the same square was dominant in individualizing the news sources in connection with positive or negative actions. In other words, *Al Jazeera* has shown an inclination towards personalizing the Palestinian news sources when they are representing positive actions, conversely to the Israeli news sources, who are mostly personalized in negative actions. The opposite direction is taking place in the *CNN* personalization of news sources during its coverage of the related crisis.

4.3 Victimization of Casualties

The representation of casualties is the third framing device employed to identify the operationalization of Law and Order (L&O) frame and Injustice and Defiance (I&D) frame within *Al Jazeera* and *CNN* reporting of the concerned crisis. The casualties represent both parties' (Palestinians and Israelis) human losses during the crisis, such as injured and fatalities. Overall, the Palestinian casualties have been largely individualized and victimized, contrariwise to the Israeli casualties through *Al Jazeera* textual coverage. On the other hand, opposite orientation has taken place within the *CNN* coverage (see Table 4).

Table 4. The Degree of Individualizing the Palestinian and Israeli Casualties in *Al Jazeera* and *CNN* Coverage of the 2017 Al Aqsa Mosque/Temple Mount Crisis

Network	Victim Individualization	Percent	Total
Al Jazeera	Palestinian	100.0%	100.0%
	Israeli	0.0%	
CNN	Palestinian	20.0%	100.0%
	Israeli	80.0%	

Al Jazeera has revealed a clear and complete bias towards individualizing the Palestinian casualties and entirely depersonalizing their Israeli corresponding injured and fatalities. On the other side, the *CNN* has followed almost the opposite direction. However, while the Palestinian casualties were slightly personalized (20.0%), the Israeli counterparts have appeared with an

80.0% of individualization. In the same vein, the lexical choices in both networks helped to represent the casualties as victims of oppression (for Palestinians) and victims of disobedience (for Israelis). The following are excerpts quoted from the related data showing two examples of highlighting situations and selecting specific lexical terms to present the casualties as victims:

Excerpt 1: *"This [Israeli] family was celebrating Shabbat dinner. That's when this Palestinian man was able to infiltrate this Israeli settlement and kill these three people, injuring one other person"* (CNN Newsroom, July 22, 2017)¹.

Excerpt 2: *"The [Palestinian] rallies started after Muslims Friday prayers... Israeli police kicking a man who was praying in the street"* (Al Jazeera, July 21, 2017)².

The lexical choice in Excerpt 1 quoted from the CNN victimize the Israeli fatalities as they were peacefully gathering on a holy Jewish Saturday. However, their joy was interrupted by a Palestinian man, who was able to elude from the security, and cruelly finish them. In this very instance, the lack of contextualization is clear. In fact, these Israeli settlements are illegal and stand on occupied Palestinian territories since 1967. In the second excerpt quoted from Al Jazeera, the clashes between protestors and police turned violent, which is common, but selecting particular situations like praying on the street indicates to the excessive and unjustified use of power against civilians. Thus, omitting context and raising emotional appeals through the text will lead resultantly to represent the casualties as victims.

4.4 Legitimization of Violence

The de/legitimization of violence and killing is the last framing device applied to the data under analysis. It refers to all the rhetorical choices used through the textual coverage of both Al Jazeera and CNN during their coverage of the crisis.

Overall, both networks have appeared biased towards one side in providing justifications for killing specifically or committing negative actions in general: Al Jazeera (in favour of the Palestinians); and the CNN (in favour of the Israelis). Omitting the agency is one of the patterns that appeared through data in reporting events that include violence and killing. Excerpts 3 and 4 provide instances for such structure that neglects the aggressor and focuses on the event itself:

Excerpt 3: *"Also, rubber bullets and stun grenades, protestors are clashing in Jerusalem with these new rules trying to keep young males away from holiest sites"* (CNN Newsroom, July 21, 2017)³.

Excerpt 4: *"Yoram Halevy, the Israeli police chief in Jerusalem, threatened Palestinians and urged them not to continue their protests on Friday. "If they try to disrupt the order, there will be casualties... do not try us. We know how to react vigorously"* (Al Jazeera, July 28, 2017)⁴.

In Excerpt 3 quoted from the CNN data, the protestors are clashing with the Israeli police in Jerusalem protesting the new Israeli security measurements. However, the weapons stated in the excerpt are Israeli and usually used by the Israeli forces. The agency has been excluded. On the other hand, Al Jazeera has followed opposite orientation in reporting the Israeli violent actions. Firstly, there was a tendency towards identifying the Israeli assailants (see Excerpt 4). The agency is activated and personalized releasing threats. Such way of delegitimization has not been noticed through the CNN coverage against the Israelis. Further, it is worthy to state that the lexical choice may provide violence legitimization, too. The following is Al Jazeera version of Excerpt 1:

Excerpt 5: *"A few days later, three Israeli settlers were stabbed and killed by a Palestinian in the illegal settlement of Halamish in the occupied West Bank"* (Al Jazeera, July 28, 2017)⁵.

Using the words "illegal" and "occupied," besides depersonalizing the assailants provide a justification of the stabbing action or even killing consequently. That indicates to the illegal existence of the fatalities at the location of incident. The same event has been reported in the CNN,

¹ CNN Newsroom, July 22, 2017. Item: 32U2612091320NRR.

² Al Jazeera Network, July 21, 2017. Item: 2W62323732225.

³ CNN Newsroom, July 21, 2017. Item: 32U2680434974NRR

⁴ Al Jazeera Network, July 28, 2017. Item: 2W62330840354.

⁵ Al Jazeera Network, July 28, 2017. Item: 2W61073775371.

where the contextualization was limited to merely mentioning the place as Israeli settlement, which delegitimizes committing such negative action.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The media constitute a key role in contributing to the success or failure of social movements, by framing their causes and ideologies (Ismail, 2008). Also, through their practices, the mainstream media help significantly in shaping the public opinion towards international issues. Subsequently, the states' foreign policy of support or opposition will be determined. Two meta-frames have been operationalized through the textual coverage of U.S. and Arab media networks to examine their performance regarding new crisis (2017) within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The Law and Order frame (representing the Israeli perspective) has dominantly appeared in the *CNN* related coverage, whereas the Injustice and Defiance frame (representing the Palestinian perspective) has strongly manifested in *Al Jazeera* coverage of the same crisis.

The findings indicate to latent bias in both networks' performance. This partiality towards one side over another has been identified through employing a set of framing and reasoning devices adopted from the framework of Wolfsfeld (1997b) and Deprez & Raeymaeckers (2010b) in the related texts. By the same token, Roy (2010: 25) has concluded that September 11 events—through the U.S. media—have increasingly promoted misconceptions about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict permitting opposed fanatical views to float on the surface. This leads to the fact that the governments control the flow of information more properly during crises under the title of “national security” (Wolfsfeld, 1997b). At this level, the mainstream media take the mantle of mobilizing the public opinion towards the direction of the leading powers' compass.

In other words, the United States' public opinion is strongly connected with the U.S. official policy of international affairs. A Gallup poll, on February 3-7, 2016, demonstrates that the views of American public opinion towards Israel remains 'firmly positive' (Gallup, February 29, 2016). The poll shows 62% of the Americans sympathize with Israel, whereas only 15% commiserate with the Palestinians. Despite the disproportionate distribution of power between Israel and the Palestinians, the U.S. government's policy towards the conflict is still Israeli biased.

Several scholars have pointed out to the colored treatment of U.S. media in favor of Israeli supporting the findings of this study (First, 1998; Zelizer, 2002; Viser, 2003; Ross, 2003; Korn, 2004; Downey et al., 2006; Rinnawi, 2007; Aziz, 2007; Elmasry, 2009; Ismail, 2010). On the other hand, there are studies concluded that the U.S. media outlets were biased in favor of the Palestinians depicting their uprisings as struggle against the Israeli occupation (see Muravichik, 2003), or showing balance in reporting both sides (Wu et al., 2002). Such distinction motivates to examine the U.S. and Arab mainstream media through a comparative lens to stand on their treatments regarding new crisis within this conflict. The performance of Arab mainstream media is not balanced, too. It almost consolidates counter narrative of the U.S. media version of story. However, this study induces to further scrutinize the media performance through critical perspective to highlight misrepresentations and expose social inequalities.

References

- Aiken, A. (2003). Framing analysis of the New York Times and Le Monde following the attacks of September 11. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, Florida.
- Aziz, M. (2007). An Analysis of print media coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict during the second Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 2006. Doctoral Dissertation, Clemson University, South Carolina.
- Dan, V. (2011). The added value of frames: On the differences with related concepts. In I. Trivundza, N. Carpentier, H. Nieminen, P. Prullmann-Venerfeldt, R. Kilborn, E. Sundin & T. Olsson (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on the European media sphere* (pp. 83-92). Ljubljana: Hermina Krajnc.
- Deprez, A., & Raeymaeckers, K. (2010a). Bias in the news? The representation of Palestinians and Israelis in the coverage of the First and Second Intifada. *International Communication Gazette*, 72(1), 91-109.
- Deprez, A., & Raeymaeckers, K. (2010b). Framing the first and second intifada: A longitudinal quantitative research design applied to the Flemish press. *European Journal of Communication*, 25(1), 3-23.
- Deprez, A. & Raeymaeckers, K. (2011). Bottlenecks in the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: The coverage of the first and second intifada in the Flemish press. *Media, War & Conflict*, 4(2), 185-202.

- Downey, J., Deacon, D., Golding, P., Oldfield, B., & Wring, D. (2006). The BBC's reporting of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Research report of Loughborough University Communications Research Centre. Loughborough University, Leicestershire.
- Dunsky, M. (2009). Pens and swords: How the American mainstream media report the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. New York: Columbia University Press.
- De Vreese, C. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal & Document Design*, 13(1), 51-62.
- Elmasry, M. (2009). Death in the Middle East: An analysis of how the New York Times and Chicago Tribune framed killings in the second Palestinian intifada. *Journal of Middle East Media*, 5(1), 1-46.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- First, A. (1998). Who is the enemy? The portrayal of Arabs in Israeli television news. *International Communication Gazette*, 60(3), 239-251.
- Gamson, W. (1992). Talking politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). The whole world is watching: Mass media in making and unmaking of the new left. California: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ismail, A. (2008). Mission statehood: portraits of the second Palestinian intifada in US news media. *Media, War & Conflict*, 1(2), 177-201.
- Ismail, A. (2010). When the "fortress crumbled": The Israel-Jenin story in US news media. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 3(1), 66-84.
- Iyengar, S., & Simon, A. (1993). News coverage of the Gulf crisis and public opinion: A study of agenda-setting, priming, and framing. *Communication Research*, 20(3), 365-383.
- Kempf, W. (2003). Constructive conflict coverage: A social psychological approach. Berlin: Regener.
- Korn, A. (2004). Reporting Palestinian casualties in the Israeli press: The case of Haaretz and the intifada. *Journalism studies*, 5(2), 247-262.
- Matthes, J., & Kohring, M. (2008). The content analysis of media frames: Toward improving reliability and validity. *Journal of Communication*, 58(2), 258-279.
- Moody-Hall, M. (2002). *British vs. US newspaper framing of Arabs in coverage of the Middle-Eastern conflict pre and post Sept. 11: A case study*. Paper presented at Conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Texas: Baylor University.
- Muravchik, J. (2003). Covering the intifada: How the media reported the Palestinian uprising. DC Washington: Washington Inst. for Near East Pol.
- Rinnawi, K. (2007). De-legitimization of media mechanisms Israeli press coverage of the Al Aqsa intifada. *International Communication Gazette*, 69(2), 149-178.
- Ross, S. (2003). Framing of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in thirteen months of New York Times editorials surrounding the attack of September 11, 2001. *Conflict & communication online*, 2(2), 1-11.
- Roy, S. (2010). Reflections on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in U.S. public discourse: Legitimizing dissent. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 39(2), 23-38.
- Silke, B. (2007). The framing of the coverage of the Gaza withdrawal by Israeli forces in the Cape Times, Mail & Guardian and Sunday Times from July 1, 2005 to September 12, 2005. Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch.
- Stawicki, M. (2009). Framing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: A study of frames used by three American newspapers. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.
- Tankard, J. W. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. Reese, O. Gandy & A. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 95-106). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Viser, M. (2003). Attempted objectivity: An analysis of the New York Times and Haaretz and their portrayals of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 8(4), 114-120.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (1997a). Fair weather friends: The varying role of the news media in the Arab-Israeli peace process. *Political Communication*, 14(1), 29-48.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (1997b). Media and political conflict: News from the Middle East. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfsfeld, G., Frosh, P., & Awabdy, M. (2008). Covering death in conflicts: Coverage of the second intifada on Israeli and Palestinian television. *Journal of Peace Research*, 45(3), 401-417.
- Wu, H., Sylvester, J., & Hamilton, J. (2002). Newspaper provides balance in Palestinian/Israeli reports. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 23(2-3), 6-17.
- Zelizer, B., Park, D., & Gudelunas, D. (2002). How bias shapes the news: Challenging the New York Times' status as a newspaper of record on the Middle East. *Journalism*, 3(3), 283-307.