



Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales
Grado en Comunicación Internacional

Trabajo Fin de Grado

**How States and the Media
Build Strategic
Narratives:**

**The Case of the Israeli-Palestinian
Conflict in Western Media**

Estudiante: Vega Pérez Castro

Director/a: Prof. Daniel Lewis Wuebben

Madrid, Abril, 2023

“The media is a veritable war zone when it comes to storytelling.

Every day the big stories battle for attention on television and radio, in newspapers and magazines, and on the Internet.”

(Fog, et al., 2010, p. 206)

How States and the Media Build Strategic Narratives: The Case of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in Western Media

Abstract: This thesis examines the construction of strategic narratives carried out by states, parties in conflict and international media outlets with the aim of justifying their actions. In the current context of violence between Israel and Hamas, it is crucial to understand how parties in conflicts and media outlets may influence the understanding of the conflict and how the coverage effected public opinion. The strategies, messages, wording, and frameworks used by Israeli and Palestinian authorities as well as the role played by international media outlets to create and spread these messages are analyzed. The study further focuses on how different media frame certain messages or events to suit their political stance and media bias present in various international media when covering the events that have taken place after the October 7, 2023, Hamas attack.

Keywords: Palestine, Israel, Framing, Storytelling, Western Media, Hamas, media bias.

Resumen: El presente trabajo de investigación examina la construcción de narrativas estratégicas por parte de los estados, las partes en conflicto y los medios de comunicación internacionales con el fin de explicar sus acciones y cómo estas narrativas resuenan en los medios de comunicación occidentales. Debido al actual contexto de violencia entre Hamás e Israel, es crucial comprender cómo los actores y los medios de comunicación pueden llegar a influir en la comprensión del conflicto y cómo su forma de cubrirlo tiene un efecto en la percepción pública del mismo. En este trabajo, se analizan las estrategias, los mensajes, la elección de palabras y el *framing* utilizados por las autoridades israelíes y palestinas, al igual que el papel que juegan los medios de comunicación a la hora de difundir y crear estos mensajes. Igualmente, este estudio analiza cómo los medios enmarcan determinados mensajes o eventos para adaptarlos a su postura política al igual que la existencia de *media bias* o sesgo mediático presente en diversos medios internacionales a la hora de cubrir los eventos que han tenido lugar tras el ataque de Hamas del 7 de octubre de 2023.

Palabras clave: Palestina, Israel, Framing, Storytelling, medios de comunicación occidentales, Hamas, sesgo mediático.

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purposes and motives	3
2. State of the Art	3
2.1 The Palestinian “Question”	3
2.2 Global Language Dictionary.....	4
2.3 Orientalism.....	5
2.4 Language matters: armed conflict, apartheid, or genocide?	6
2.4.1 Armed conflict.....	6
2.4.2 Apartheid.....	7
2.4.3 Genocide.....	7
2.4.4 Language matters	8
3.1 Media bias	9
3.2 Framing theory: News and political framing.....	10
3.3 Storytelling: how to build stories	12
3.3.1 Strategic Narratives	13
4. Hypothesis and research questions	14
5. Methodology.....	15
5.1 Sampling: News sources (Key events).....	16
5.2 Coding.....	18
5.2.1 Categories.....	18
6. Results and analysis.....	22
6.1 BBC UK News.....	22
6.1.1 Orientalist discourse.....	23
6.1.2 Palestinians suffering	24
6.1.3 Hostages	24
6.1.4 Civilians and use of passive voice.....	25
6.1.5 Missing context	26
6.1.6 Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations.....	28
6.1.7 Israeli-centric messages.....	28
6.1.8 Language bias.....	30
6.2 Al-Jazeera.....	31
6.2.1 Orientalist discourse.....	31
6.2.2 Palestinians suffering	32
6.2.3 Hostages	32
6.2.4 Civilians and use of passive voice.....	33
6.2.5 Missing context	34
6.2.6 Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations.....	35
6.2.7 Israeli-centric messages.....	36
6.2.8 Language bias.....	38
6.3 The New York Times.....	40
6.3.1 Orientalist discourse.....	40
6.3.2 Palestinians suffering	40
6.3.3 Hostages	41
6.3.4 Civilians and use of passive voice.....	41
6.3.5 Missing context	42
6.3.6 Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations.....	44
6.3.7 Israeli-centric messages.....	45
6.3.8 Language bias.....	48
7. Discussion	49

8. Conclusion	52
9. References	56
9. Annexes	64
9.1 Interview with Sarah Babiker on November 20, 2023. (Transcript in English, own translation)	64
9.2 Excerpt of the interview with Dr. Gretchen King conducted on March 14, 2024.	65

1. Introduction

Media play a crucial role in conflicts and war, both in providing information to the public and influencing how the audiences perceive a conflict. The media is a major source from which civilians acquire information and serve both as a supplement and substitute for first-hand experiences of conflict and war (Rai, 2000). For this matter, information - and how it is presented – is the main influence of public opinion (Chaevich & Shirshikov, 2021). Nonetheless, as journalists may act both as catalyst for conflicts or its peacemakers, it is crucial that accurate and unbiased information is presented to the audiences (Chaevich & Shirshikov, 2021). However, the involvement of media in international conflicts and wars is never unbiased; it is always ideological. Big media outlets with their standards of equilibrium and objectivity tend to institutionalize some forms of bias (Carruthers, 2011). What is more, how they frame conflicts influences what the public perceives the conflict to be about (Carruthers, 2011).

For Puddephatt (2006), the media can take an active role in a conflict. This may lead to an increase in violence – if media outlets are biased when covering an issue (Almahallawi & Zauddin, 2018) - or, if they take a more distant position, contribute to an alleviation of violence, and facilitate conflict resolution. Staying out of the conflict does not necessarily mean not reporting on the conflict, but rather reducing the sharing of graphic images perpetuated against one group, reporting from an objective point of view, providing context and background information on why the conflict has reached a certain point, and citing information from all the parties involved. Nonetheless, objectivity when reporting on conflicts is difficult since the role of the media is tightly related to a set of factors. For example, international media play directly how governments implement policies (Puddephatt, 2006), since the coverage of conflicts and wars can shape how the public perceives the conflict and what they expect from it.

Notwithstanding, the involvement of media in wars and conflict is not new. The usage of media during the First World War and Second World War shows how by retaining information wars can be won (Zauddin & Almahallawi, 2018). Furthermore, the Vietnam War is an example of how wars can be lost despite military superiority because of the mobilization of public opinion against the atrocities of war. In addition, new technologies and the current globalized scene have altered how wars are covered. These changes have brought about consequences for how the general public interprets the events

that take place in wars and the legitimacy of military actions. (Mercier, 2005). For this matter, it is crucial to analyze the coverage of the current crisis between Israel and Hamas to detect bias in how international media outlets report on the subject, which can have an effect in how the public opinion perceives the conflict. This is an important topic since it is not only relevant how the media report on the current crisis, but also to how they talk about previous wars and conflicts (Carruthers, 2011) and how they analyze the relation that exists between them and the current context.

Nonetheless, missing context is one of the key issues when media outlets report on current developments in Gaza and Israel. To report on the current events happening in Gaza, the occupied West Bank, and Israel, the media should go back to events that occurred 75 years ago - when Israel proclaimed its independence - to understand the scale of the actual conflict and provide sufficient background information to the audience. For example, to report on Palestine and Israel is crucial to explain what the al-Nakba was, what it symbolized, and why it is taken as the starting point of the Israeli-Palestinian crisis. In addition, language, and the representation of each of the “parties in conflict” must be accurate to not fall into bias. Notwithstanding, according to Said’s Orientalist doctrine, the representation of Palestinians in the West – who are either seen as terrorists or refugees – is not free of bias and it is far from the truth (Said, 1980). Furthermore, this Orientalist discourse is further pushed forward in Israel’s strategic narratives. For this matter, if a media outlet shares Israeli-centric messages, it would also be falling into biased reporting.

Therefore, to analyze if a piece of news or media outlet is biased towards Israel or Palestine, it is crucial to explore the following elements:

- Are previous events - like the *al-Nakba* or the Yom Kippur War - and developments – like the refugees' crisis, famine, or Human Rights violations - cited and explained?
- Is the representation of Palestinians and their suffering accurate or, conversely, is it influenced by the Orientalist discourse – picturing Palestinians as either refugees or terrorists?
- Are the events reported on using language bias?

- Are Palestinian voices and peoples are cited in the articles or, instead, Israeli-centric messages prevail when reporting on Gaza and Palestinians?
- Are specific elements of the Israeli Project Dictionary reproduced and followed by the media outlets?

This thesis will, consequently, provide relevant background information to understand the current relations between Israel and Palestine, and analyze how three media outlets – *BBC UK*, *The New York Times*, and *Al-Jazeera* – vary in their coverage of Israel and Palestine, and if any of them is free of bias.

1.1 Purposes and motives

Considering the present context, this thesis aims to analyze the frames used by the media when reporting on Israel and Palestine after October 7, 2024, when Hamas launched a transversal attack against Israel. Therefore, the ground for this present research lies in how international newspapers – namely *The New York Times*, *BBC UK*, and *Al Jazeera* – report on the current events and how the positions of Israel, Palestine, and the global community change over time.

2. State of the Art

2.1 The Palestinian “Question”

Palestine has sometimes been referred to as a “question,” which implies several different things. Palestine is one of the most “thorny international problem of postwar life.” (Said, 1980, p. 4) Said (1980, p. 4) explains that referring to Palestine as “the Question of Palestine” implies that it is an “intractable and insistent problem” and further suggests that is an “uncertain, questionable, unstable” matter. Therefore, relating “the question of” to Palestine, implies that the existence of Palestine is a debated topic. According to Lentin (2008, p. 11), Palestine is not a state, but rather a “territory, a national entity, perhaps a state-in-becoming” that is holds a special place in political imagination which is debated more than any other current issue because of the “the central position of ‘the Jews’ in the post-Holocaust West,” the territory is the Holy land of the three monotheistic religions and because Palestine is regarded as an unfinished matter of the colonial period. Furthermore, Palestine is a contested topic because “there is no country called Palestine” (Williams & Ball, 2014, p. 127). For Said (1980, p. 5), Palestine only exists as a

“memory,” an “idea,” an “a political and human experience, and an act of sustained popular will.”

2.2 Global Language Dictionary

The Israel Project (TIP) was founded in 2003 and it described itself as a “non-partisan American educational organization that works to provide facts about Israel intentions to press, policy makers and the public” (The Israel Project, n.d.a). According to its website, it was not affiliated with any government, and it was not an organization designed to lobby. On the contrary, it was created to “inform, provide facts, access to experts and keen analysis” (The Israel Project, n.d.b).

In 2009, this organization launched the Global Language Dictionary, which was a private document marked with “not for distribution or publication” that ended up being leaked by the American newspaper *Newsweek* (Newsweek Staff, 2010). The Global Language Dictionary was written by Dr. Frank Luntz, and it is a manual on how to effectively communicate on Israel and “sell the American public on the idea that Israel has the right to maintain or even expand Jewish settlements in the West Bank” (Newsweek Staff, 2010).

The Global Language Dictionary includes lists of “words that work” and “words that don’t work,” exemplified by speeches given by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and other Israeli politicians and leaders, and how they address the issues to convey a positive message (Luntz, 2009). The 117-page dictionary includes several different chapters where different topics and issues are dealt with. For example, some of the chapters present in this report are The right of return = The right of ronfiscation, Gaza: Israel’s right to self-defense and defensible borders, and Talking about Arab Israelis (Luntz, 2009).

In his dictionary, Luntz (2009) gives out three main recommendations to any advocate for Israel: be positive and use active terms, talk about ethnic cleansing, and turn the issue away from the expansion of settlements and territory by talking about an achievable peace against terror or terrorism. As Jhally (2016) explains in the documentary *The Occupation of the American Mind*, “‘terror, not territory’ – summarize the basis of the propaganda campaign in the U.S.”

2.3 Orientalism

Said coined the term Orientalism to describe the way that the West, especially European countries, has of dealing with the “Orient,” which is based on “European Western experience” (Said, 1979, p. 1). Said describes that the “Orient” is Europe’s cultural rival and its persistent image of the Other (Said, 1979). Furthermore, Europe - and the West in general - has defined itself as the opposite idea and personality of the “Orient” (Said, 1979). Therefore, for the West, Orientalism is a “corporate institution for dealing with the Orient” and so, it is a Western way of controlling, reorganizing, and ruling over the Orient (Said, 1979, p. 3). Orientalism shapes how the West talks, describes, writes, research and acts upon the “Orient,” since it “perpetuate views of Middle Eastern people as inferior, subservient, and in need of saving” which results in racist stereotypes that “justifies Western colonialism and imperialism” (Hibri, 2023). For Said (1980, p. 3), the “romance of the Orient” perpetuated by the West in time of colonization was succeeded by “the problems of dealing with the Orient.”

The Middle East, despite being a region full of complexities and conflicts, is usually just perceived as a “the Arab-Israeli conflict (dispute, problem, struggle, etc.)” and Orientalism has strongly affected how the West perceives Palestinians, since, in Said’s words, they have been known “only as refugees, or as extremists, or as terrorists” (Said, 1980, p. xiv - 5). Palestinians are reduced to being refugees, who live in camps, defend communism, “tend to procreate like rabbits” and are mere political instruments used by Arab states to achieve their goals (Said, 1980, p. 6). On the other hand, Orientalism favors Zionist claims and objectives since Palestine are also described as “nomads who neglected the land before 1948” and what was to become Israel needed rebuilding (Said, 2001, p. 3). For King and Jegić (2024, p.4), “both the Zionist colonial narrative and the dominant media representations of Palestine depend on the exploitation of Orientalist structures and framings” in which the distortion of Islam plays a crucial role.

Orientalism, therefore, is a framework used by the West to describe the Orient and picture it as the Other. Moreover, it allows the West to justify its actions and make sense of the “Orient,” including the Middle East, through a western perspective, without making deep considerations about the complex situation of the region. This leads to a problem of representation, since there is a misconception of the Orient, picturing the peoples of the

region as only related to “Muslim oil, Muslim fanaticism, Muslim blackmail” (Said, 1980, p.7).

2.4 Language matters: armed conflict, apartheid, or genocide?

2.4.1 Armed conflict

According to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and armed conflict exists when there is “armed confrontation between the armed forces of States,” leading to an international armed conflict, or when these hostilities occur “between governmental authorities and organized armed groups or between such groups within a State,” resulting in a non-international armed conflict (International Committee of the Red Cross, n.d., p.4). Nonetheless, it is important to distinguish between tensions or riots and non-international conflicts. To reach a conflict there needs to be a certain level of intensity in the hostilities and, secondly, the non-governmental groups involved must reach a level of organization of their armed forces to be considered as parties to the conflict (International Committee of the Red Cross, 2008). The case of Israel and Palestine may fall within this definition of non-international conflict since Palestine is not recognized as a state by Israel and Hamas may be considered a non-governmental group.

In the current context in Gaza, hospitals, schools, universities, houses, and UN shelters have been attacked by Israeli forces (Gritten & Pelham, 2024). Furthermore, according to OXFAM International (2024) estimates Israel military forces are killing around 250 Palestinians a day and many more are suffering from hunger and diseases. For this matter, it cannot be said that Israel is respecting some of the basic principles of International Humanitarian Law or war laws and, therefore, the current situation in Gaza may not fall anymore within the category of conflict. Furthermore, presenting the current situation in Gaza as a conflict may “completely occlude the power imbalance between the Israelis, who field one of the most advanced armies in the world, and Palestinians, who are often armed with nothing more than rocks and rockets” (Siddiqui & Zaheer, 2018, p. 4). By employing the term conflict to refer to Israel and Palestine, the media, researchers, and politicians are somehow equating the two parties involved as two equal sides when this is not the case. For this matter, other terms may be more appropriate.

2.4.2 Apartheid

Apartheid is defined on article II of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid and the definition reads as follows:

The term "the crime of apartheid", which shall include similar policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination as practiced in southern Africa, shall apply to... inhuman acts committed for the purpose of establishing and maintaining domination by one racial group of persons over any other racial group of persons and systematically oppressing them. (UN General Assembly, International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, 1973)

Even if the term apartheid was first associated with the South African case, it now “represents a species of crime against humanity under customary international law” (UN-ESCWA, 2017, p. 1). Therefore, on 2017, the United Nations United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UN-ESCWA) conducted research to analyze whether Israeli was constituted as an apartheid regime. The report concluded that the “strategic fragmentation of the Palestinian people is the principal method by which Israel imposes an apartheid regime.” (UN-ESCWA, 2017, p. 3). Furthermore, the report found that the four domains previously stated constitute one regime “developed for the purpose of ensuring the enduring domination over non-Jews,” and, therefore, “Israel is guilty of imposing an apartheid regime on the Palestinian people,” which is a crime against humanity (UN-ESCWA, 2017, p. 6 - 53).

2.4.3 Genocide

Genocide is defined by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 as the acts “committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group,” including the killing of members of the group, causing them serious “bodily or mental harm, “deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part,” enforcing policies meant to stop births within the group; and forcibly moving group members' children to another group (UN General Assembly Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948). Craig Mokhiber (2023), former Director of the New York Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

and, therefore, one of the highest experts on Human Rights violations in the world, wrote in his resignation letter back on October 28th that what is currently happening is a “text-book case of genocide.” Furthermore, on November 2nd a group of UN expert issued a press release stating that that Palestinians are “at grave risk of genocide” (United Nations Human Rights, 2023). Following this press release, in December 2023, South Africa filled an application to the International Court of Justice against Israel concerning “alleged violations by Israel of its obligations under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (the “Genocide Convention”) in relation to Palestinians in the Gaza Strip” (International Court of Justice, 2023, p. 1).

2.4.4 Language matters

To bomb for 45 days such a small and populated territory, to force the displacement of one million six hundred thousand people from a population of two million three hundred thousand... If that is not ethnic cleansing and genocide, we do not know what can be [a genocide]. (S. Babiker, personal communication, November 20, 2023)

In an interview I personally conducted to Sarah Babiker, the coordinator of Africa and the Arab world in *El Salto Diario*,¹ an independent and horizontal Spanish newspaper, I asked her about the language media outlet use when reporting on Israel and Palestine and why it was important for the media to use terms like “genocide” or “ethnic cleansing” and not others like conflict or war, which are the terms that are usually seen in the mainstream media. Babiker answered that it is important “to call a spade a spade” (S. Babiker, personal communication, November 20, 2023). She explained that what is making this last chapter of the “Israeli colonizing enterprise” possible, is that Israeli politicians and supporters have “no timidity or second reading in what they claim,” especially when “ministers and relevant figures from the Israeli government say, ‘we must end all,’ ‘Gaza is going to be ours,’ ‘how beautiful Gaza is’” (S. Babiker, personal communication, November 20, 2023). Furthermore, Sarah Babiker believes that it is important that words like genocide and ethnic cleansing are repeated by the media, so they enter collective imaginary but without normalizing them, so the term genocide does not become part of the realpolitik (S. Babiker, personal communication, November 20, 2023).

¹ *El Salto Diario* usually talks about “ethnic cleansing or genocide” on their coverage of the current events in Palestine.

3. Theoretical framework

3.1 Media bias

Journalism is usually described as an unbiased practice, nonetheless, broad research describes media as biased. Fowler (1991, p. 2) explains that the “question of impartiality” of journalists has come under challenge from different research institutions. News are socially constructed, so the frequency with which events are reported on is not a direct reflection of their importance, but a “operation of a complex and artificial set of criteria for selection” (Fowler, 1991, p. 2). After this selection process, the news selected fall under a process of transformation, being both processes “guided by reference, generally unconscious, to ideas and beliefs” (Fowler, 1991, p. 2).

Bias can be defined in general terms as “the prejudice or preconceived notion against a person, group or thing,” which leads to stereotyping (Morrissette et al., 2017). For Morrissette, McKeon, Louie, Luther, and Fagen (2017) media bias can be defined as “the unjust favoritism and reporting of a certain ideas or standpoint,” and this phenomenon can also affect the likelihood that a story or event must be reported on (Baron, 2006). Baron (2006, p. 2) describes that this bias can have two main sources: bias can reflect the interest or preferences of the owner or the corporations who control a media outlet, or, on the other side, media bias could also have “demand-side explanation,” since audiences have the power to demand for specific contentment or news. To this point, Entman (2007) distinguishes between three different meanings of the term *bias* related to media. Entman (2007, p. 163) highlights *distortion bias*, which describes news that “distorts or falsifies reality,” *content bias*, used to describes news that focus on one side in a political conflict and do not provide the same attention to other sides, and *decision-making bias*, that refers to the motivations of journalist who produce this bias content. Research signals that these three diverse types of bias that Entman described, can be found in how international media cover the events that have taken place between Israel and Palestine.

As King and Jegić (2024, p. 5) point out in their research Copyediting Palestine: Media Bias in Journalism Style Guides, there is a “clear discrepancy” in how Israelis and Palestinians are portrayed in anglophone media, “both in quantity and quality.” In addition, there is an absence of Palestinian voices in Palestinian voices in Western media

while Israeli representatives hold a privilege access to them, some key terms that would better describe the situation of Palestinians, such as occupation or settler-colonialism, are omitted, and there is a misrepresentation of the dominant colonial system that Palestinians suffer due to the framing techniques and language used when reporting about Israel and Palestine. This leads to the euphemizing of the colonial war into conflict (King & Jegić, 2024).

In addition, there is abundant research that further points out this media bias. Zanuiddin and Almahallawi (2018) highlighted that while media outlets in the Arab world would support Palestinian people and underwent their issues, Western media would do the same but for Israelis, providing them a privilege position in the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian encounters. Caballero (2010, p. iv - 63) demonstrated that western media outlets would present Israel in a “favorable light”, while supporting the Israeli narrative and demonizing the Palestinians, who were usually represented as terrorists during the Operation Cast Lead. Also, Bhowmik and Fisher (2023) research further points out that the coverage carried out by CNN during a 12-day conflict between Israel and Palestine prioritized an Israeli perspective and would highlight Israeli and US representatives' statements. Siddiqui and Zaheer (2018, p. 13) sentiment analysis of fifty years of headlines further proved this dominance of Israeli voices in media reports, which was especially visible in the use of phrases like “Israel says.” Moreover, research by Attar and King (2023, p. 14) about the coverage done by British, Australian, and Canadian print media during the *Intifadas* shows an important lack of context when reporting on Palestinians issues, since “there was also no mention of the increase in illegal arrests, house demolitions, torturing and beating of Palestinian adults and children,” Israelis were portrayed as victims and Palestinians as antisemites and terrorists.

3.2 Framing theory: News and political framing

Framing is a theory that studies how news stories and speeches are designed to encourage narratives and aid comprehension of current events. It was first popularized in the 20th century by Goffman. Frames help people make sense of messages and, at their finest, they help people understand society (Goffman, 1974). Goffman (1974) explained *frame in thought* or *individual frame*, since it refers to how individuals understand certain events and what elements they perceive to be the most prominence or salience. (Chong and Druckman, 2007). These *individual frames* were also referred to as *audience frames* by

Entman (1993, p. 53), which are “mentally stored clusters of ideas that guide individuals’ processing of information.” The other way the term “frame” is usually used to, refers to *frame in communication* or *media frame*, which is the definition most important for this research. *Frame in communication* or *media frame* refers to how the media or a speaker uses images, words or styles when reporting on an issue, and as Chong and Druckman (2007, p. 100) describe, “the chosen frame reveals what the speaker sees as relevant to the topic at hand.” *Media frames* are “a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events” and so, the frame “suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue” (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987, p. 143). Furthermore, Scheufele (2000, p. 307 - 308) identifies several processes within framing: (a) *frame building*, which focuses on how journalist, speakers, and the media frame an issue due to, for example, social norms and values or organizational pressures; (b) *frame setting*, which describes how frames in communication may impact audience or individual frames; and (c) *individual-level effects of frames*, which concerns how individual frames in thought can lead to behaviors and attitudes. Therefore, how an event or piece of news is framed has different effects on the audience that receives it.

Entman (1993), a widely cited researcher on the field of framing, says frames allow the media or a speaker to emphasize or highlight some messages in a text to give them more important or *salience*, which he defines as “making a piece of information more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences” (Entman, 1993, p. 53). Nevertheless, he also emphasizes that exclusion of some words or aspects of an event can also define what framing is about: “Most frames are defined by what they omit as well as include, and the omissions of potential problem definitions, explanations, evaluations, and recommendations may be as critical as the inclusions in guiding the audience” (Entman, 1993, p. 54). Furthermore, in addition to these processes proposed by Scheufele, Entman (1993, p. 52 - 53), describes that there are four different locations in the communication process where frames can be found: (a) *communicators*, who decide consciously or unconsciously what to say; (b) the *text*, which contains frames that are manifested “by the presence or absence of certain key- words, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences;” (c) the *receiver frames*, which guide their thinking and conclusions; and (d) the *culture*, which is the “stock of commonly invoked frames” or, in other words, “the empirically demonstrable set of common frames exhibited in the discourse and thinking of most people in a social grouping.” For Entman, in all these

locations, information is carefully selected and highlighted, which leads to the construction of arguments about problems and what causes them. Entman is building on the evidence presented by Scheufele: how pieces of news are presented has a direct connection with how audiences think and act.

One of the main studies on how the Israel-Palestinian conflict is framed by the media was presented by Siddiqui and Zaheer (2018). In their article *50 Years of Occupation A Sentiment and N-Gram Analysis of U.S. Mainstream Media Coverage of the Israeli Occupation of Palestine*, these researchers point out that U.S. media's coverage "favors Israel by providing greater access to Israeli officials, focusing on Israeli narratives both in terms of the quantity of coverage as well as the overall sentiment, as conveyed by headlines" (Siddiqui and Zaheer, 2018, p. 15). Furthermore, the media make no distinction between Israel as "an occupier" and the Palestinians as "a victim of military occupation." (Siddiqui and Zaheer, 2018, p. 4). According to Siddiqui and Zaheer (2018, p. 15), there is a "systemic problem in coverage, rather than a result of deliberate planned bias."

3.3 Storytelling: how to build stories

Storytelling is all about building stories. Although people usually relate stories with "play" (Rutledge, 2016, p. 1), stories hold power (Senehi, 2002). Stories can be fictional, but they may also relate to real events and there is where their power lies. Even if stories and storytelling can usually be seen as unthreatening, stories can be used to explore inter-group conflict and are successful methods since they bring emotions to the table, making the audience connect better with the message that the speaker or media want to convey (Horsley, 2007).

Geoffrey Roberts (2006, p. 703 - 704) when describing the relation between International Relations, History, and narratives, explains that a narrative is "imply the practice of telling stories about connected sequences of human action," but that the essence of storytelling is "is not only to explain the action in question but to enhance and extend understanding, comprehension and experience." In a sense, narratives organize elements of an event to help the audience make sense of it. As Miskimmon, O'Loughlin, and Roselle (2012, p. 4) point out "a narrative entails an initial situation or order, a problem that disrupts that order, and a resolution that re-establishes order, though that order may be slightly altered

from the initial situation.” Narratives make sense of event thanks to their structure and how elements are tied together.

As Fog, Budtz, Munch, and Blanchette (2001, p. 206) point out, the media are “driven by the logic of storytelling,” so “rational arguments often fight a losing battle against emotionally based stories.” In conflicts, therefore, the parts involved need to have solid stories and storytelling techniques to be able to convey their messages and what they want to achieve. For this matter, strategic narratives play a crucial role in how events are framed and told.

3.3.1 Strategic Narratives

Communication is crucial in international relations, conflicts and how states and parties in conflict explain their positions, wants, and needs. In this communication process, strategic narratives play a crucial role in how states and parties present themselves. Strategic narratives are a tool used by states and political actors to change the environment in which they act while spreading their influence and presenting their values, interest and wants in the international arena. (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin, & Roselle, 2013). Therefore, these narratives are about the states themselves and about the international system (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin, & Roselle, 2012). Strategic narratives are also future oriented and dynamic, since they may change overtime and focus on finding a change in the future, they describe the place the state wants to hold in the world politics, are directed both for domestic and international actors and are created shaped by the state understanding of historical events and its participation on them cited (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin & Roselle, 2012).

As mentioned, strategic narratives have both an internal and an external dimension. Notwithstanding, for an external strategic narrative to have an effect in the international system, it must resonate with local political myths (Schmitt, 2018). External strategic narratives work when there is some similarity with their content and the content of the national political myths, and when “the structure of the strategic narrative has to contribute to the narrative aspect of the myth” (Schmitt, 2018, p. 6). The latter characteristic refers to the “strategic narrative’s capability to fit within, and eventually actualize the structure of a local political myth” (Schmitt, 2018, p. 6). Therefore, taking

into consideration the “actors-events-plot-time-setting-space structure” is crucial to understand how political myths and strategic narratives collide (Schmitt, 2018, p. 6).

In the case of Israel, one of its main strategic narratives is framed within the counterterrorism narrative. Israel usually portrays its actions against Hamas and Palestinians as a way of fighting against terrorism. Furthermore, most of Israeli strategic narratives, fall within the definition of Orientalism provided by Said (1979). The Global Language Dictionary of The Israeli Project further shows how language is used by Israel to create its messages and convey a strategic narrative. All these narratives, based on Orientalism and counterterrorism, resonate with the political myths of the West, making it easier for Israel to find support beyond its borders in some of the most powerful states in the world.

4. Hypothesis and research questions

This thesis hypothesizes that *Al-Jazeera* will take a more positive stance towards the October 7th attacks and Palestinians in general. These media outlets will report more than *The New York Times* and *BBC UK* on human rights violations, refugees, and the humanitarian crisis in Gaza. Furthermore, *Al-Jazeera* will likely incorporate facts and context about previous events between Israel and Palestine – previous military actions carried out by Israel, al-Nakba, or refugee crisis, for example. Lastly, even if Israeli voices and orientalist approaches are likely to still prevail in these newspapers, this thesis hypothesizes that *Al-Jazeera* will be the newspaper out of these three that will incorporate more Palestinian voices. Being a Qatari state funded media outlet, *Al Jazeera* would be less likely to portrait Palestinian as terrorist and Israel as the ones suffering and occupation.

Conversely, *BBC UK* and *The New York Times* are more likely to show an unfavorable view of Palestinians. The USA is one of the main allies of Israel, and so is likely that *The New York Times* will not portrait Israel nor the American support for the war as something as negative. *BBC UK*, as a conservative British media outlet, will also show bias towards Palestinians. Both media outlets will likely follow the orientalist discourse and picture Palestinians mainly as terrorist, and Israeli voices will prevail in their coverages. Moreover, there will be no references of previous events in their pieces of news.

However, this thesis further hypothesizes that there will be a shift in the tone on the media over these last months; while *BBC UK* and *The New York Times* took a more pro-Israeli stance on October 7, 2023, this thesis hypothesizes that these media outlets are slowly shifting their frame since it is not so easy to portray Israel as the victim of the last attacks or events in Gaza. This, however, does not mean that these media outlets have drastically changed how they report on the events, but they will likely incorporate more Palestinian voices in the last articles and will hold Israel accountable for the actions they carry out, not picturing them as self-defense anymore.

The hypothesis and research question can, therefore, be encapsulated in the following premises:

H1: *Al Jazeera* is more likely to frame Palestinians in a positive light and Israel as the occupier, while *BBC UK* and *NYTimes* are more likely to follow the Orientalist framework and replicate certain elements and structures of the Israeli Project dictionary.

H2: Israeli voices prevail in all these media, but *Al-Jazeera* is more likely than *BBC UK* and *NYTimes* to incorporate Palestinian voices when reporting.

H3: There has been a shift in the tone of the media over the last months and they are not framing Israeli actions as self-defense strategies anymore.

RQ1: How do *BBC UK*, *Al-Jazeera* and *The New York Times* frame the current Palestinian-Israeli crisis in their coverage and how do these frames vary based on their political stance?

RQ2: Do these newspapers follow the orientalist discourse framework or repeat specific elements of the Israel Project dictionary?

RQ3: Are there any references to previous events - like the *al-Nakba* - or there is missing context when reporting on Israel and Palestine?

5. Methodology

Considering the objectives and research questions of this thesis, the present research proposes a two-step systematic process. First, an article selection of the three international media outlets selected – *The New York Times*, *BBC*, and *Al Jazeera* - will be carried out.

The articles will be selected based on the events they cover, ensuring that some common grounds can be found between the pieces of news. Secondly, a process of coding will be executed, since this approach will allow to identify a set of elements present in the different text, enabling the comparison between them. The categories for the coding will be established taking into consideration the proposed framework and relevant concepts found in this thesis, like Orientalism.

5.1 Sampling: News sources (Key events)

The sample data for this analysis has been collected through the own online archives of the three newspapers. Due to the relevance of the current events in Gaza and Israel, the three newspapers have one section dedicated exclusively for the events that have taken place after October 7, 2023. In the case of *Al-Jazeera* this section is called *Israel War on Gaza*, while in *The New York Times* is called *Israel-Hamas News*. *BBC UK* has called this section *Israel-Gaza War*. However, unlike the other two newspapers, the *BBC UK* does not have all the news of the events that took place after October 7, 2023, in this section, so the sample of news has also been drawn from other sections such as *Middle East, Israel & the Palestinians, Gaza, Palestinian Territories, and the Palestinian Territories*. *The New York Times* has a search bar inside the section, so it is easier to find the articles of the events chosen for the analysis. The articles in this section, however, are only available for subscribers, which makes the access to news restricted to most of the audience. On the other hand, *BBC UK* and *Al-Jazeera* articles on Israel and Hamas are not subscription-only.

The pieces of news were chosen based on the events they cover. For the analysis, opinion articles or summaries of events that took place on a specific date were avoided, since these would make the results less specific. Since this research wants to analyze how these newspapers report differently on the same issues and events, the sample of articles selected deals with the same events. The starting point is October 7, 2023, and the last article selected dates to March 15, 2024. The events – like the Al-Ahli Arab Hospital Attack, or the Gaza aid convoy attack - were chosen based on how much they resonated in the international scene and whether there were controversies around how the parties involved acted. The list of events and dates chosen can be found hereunder.

Event	Date	BBC UK	NYTimes	Al Jazeera
Hammas attack. (1)²	October 7, 2023	Israel attack: PM says Israel at war after 250 killed in attack from Gaza	‘We Are at War,’ Netanyahu Says After Hamas Attacks Israel	Israel retaliation kills 230 Palestinians after Hamas operation
Al-Ahli Arab Hospital attack. (2)	October 17, 2023	London doctor in Gaza says hospital ceiling fell in after blast	A Sudden Blast, Then Carnage in a Hospital Courtyard	Hundreds killed in Israeli air raid on Gaza hospital
Ground invasion begins. (3)	October 27, 2023	Gaza sees heaviest night of Israeli bombardment since start of war	Israel Intensifies Gaza Strikes and Says It Is Expanding Ground Activity	Israel intensifies Gaza bombardment as internet and phone ...
First hostages released and ceasefire. (4)	November 24, 2023	Israel-Gaza: Families' relief as hostages released	First Captives Freed in Tense Gaza Truce Between Israel and Hamas	Hammas releases 24 hostages from Gaza on first day of Israel truce
South Africa ICJ case. (5)	December 29, 2023	South Africa files ICJ case accusing Israel of 'genocidal acts'	South Africa accuses Israel of genocide in a U.N. court.	South Africa files case at ICJ accusing Israel of 'genocidal acts' in Gaza
Israel attack in Beirut: Hamas leader. (6)	January 24, 2024	Hamas deputy leader killed in Beirut blast	Top Hamas Official Is Killed in Lebanon as Fears Grow of a Wider War	Senior Hamas official Saleh al-Arouri killed in Beirut suburb
Gaza aid convoy attack. (7)	February 29, 2024	More than 100 killed in crowd near Gaza aid convoy	As Hungry Gazans Crowd an Aid Convoy, a Crush of Bodies, Israeli Gunshots, and a Deadly Toll	‘Cold-blooded massacre’: Israeli forces kill over 104 aid seekers in Gaza
Rafah aid center attack. (8)	March 15, 2024	Gaza war: UNRWA says Rafah aid centre hit by Israeli forces	Israeli forces make a lethal strike on a U.N. aid warehouse in Rafah.	‘Death trap’: Israeli forces kill six in new attack on Gaza aid ...

² These numbers will be used in the analysis to help the reader identify which article is being cited. They will be included after the citations.

5.2 Coding

The approach selected to carry out the discursive analysis of the pieces of news selected is the coding method. This procedure allows to create a set of categories, themes and elements that may be found in the texts, allowing to structure the data, simplifying the analysis, and allowing to detect patterns relevant for the hypothesis and research questions proposed for this thesis. For this matter, taking into consideration the proposed framework and relevant concepts, a set of codes have been established to find excerpts from the pieces of news selected that may fit those groups. The categories established can be found hereunder.³

5.2.1 Categories

1) Orientalist discourse (Palestinians as terrorists, as refugees or antisemitic): Bias when reporting on Palestinians and Gaza can be easily seen when the media use elements of the orientalist discourse.

On the one hand, orientalism can be seen when the media use words as “terrorists”, “(Palestinian) militants,” or describe Hamas only as a terrorist organization and Israeli actions as “counterterrorism.” Describing Hamas as the groups that “controls” or “rules Gaza” and not the political party that won the 2006 elections in Gaza might also be considered as bias. Words like “govern” or “government” would decrease this bias. In the same way, using phrases like “Hamas authorities” or “Hamas-run” will decrease the credibility of the sources cited. There is a significant difference between using “Gaza authorities” and “Hamas authorities” to describe the same bodies. In the same way, referring to Hamas as a “group” is a form of bias.

Furthermore, there is also bias when Palestinians are considered “prisoners” and Israelis are considered “hostages,” since Palestinians, including children, have been arrested and judged since October 7, 2023, and have been subjected to torture (Rosas, 2023).⁴ On the other hand, Orientalism can also be seen when Palestinians are only considered as

³ For the sake of simplicity, when carrying out the analysis, just some examples will be cited for the sake of simplicity.

⁴ According to Addameer (2024), which is the Prisoner Support and Human Rights Association, after the October 7, 2023, Hamas attack, more than 8,425 Palestinians have been arrested in Gaza, including around 540 children.

helpless “refugees,” since this stance erases their identity and victimizes them. Furthermore, describing Palestinians, Hamas and the attacks committed by Hamas as “antisemitic” would also fall into this orientalist discourse framework. For example, citing the 1988 Hamas charter may be considered a form of bias.

2) Palestinians Suffering: It is also important to know if the suffering of Palestinians is also covered in the news selected. If in the news selected the media outlets are mentioning more time Hamas than the Palestinian civilians, their deaths, and the human rights violations they are suffering, the media might be bias.

3) Hostages: Hostage-taking has been one of the key points in the strategic narrative created by Israel to position itself as the victims of human right abuses. For this matter, it is important to analyze how the media frame the hostage crisis. Three sub-categories have been established:

- a) **Negative perception of Israel unwilling to negotiate:** To understand whether newspapers are biased, it should be analyzed how often is Israel portrait as “unwilling to negotiate” or “unwillingness to free prisoners” and to “reach a ceasefire.”
- b) **Negative perception of Hamas:** Pieces of news will also be biased if Hamas militants are portrait as “animals” who have not taken care of the hostages. This negative perception of Hamas can also be seen if media outlets repeatedly emphasize the fact that Hamas made civilians and members of the Israeli military hostages even months after the event occurred. On the other hand, Hamas would be portrait in a more favorable light is the people they took into Gaza were not referred to as “hostages,” but as “captives.”
- c) **Prisoners vs. Hostages:** News are also bias if they do not describe why Palestinians are held prisoners in Israel or if there is no reference to the military trials and tortures they have been and are subjected to but will cover and report on the hostage taking carried out by Hamas. Words like “detainee” or “prisoner” would be used for Palestinians, and “hostages” for Israeli. In the same way, any person under 18 should be called a “child.”⁵ Nonetheless, if media use words like

⁵ According to the UN General Assembly Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989, a child is a “every human being below the age of eighteen years.” (UN General Assembly, Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989)

“teenagers” or “minors” to describe either Palestinians or Israelis under 18, the media would present some form of bias.

4) Civilians and use of passive voice: Another form of bias may be seen when talking about civilian deaths. If an article uses the passive voice when reporting on Palestinian deaths, it would be bias since it does not acknowledge who caused these deaths. Therefore, it is important to analyze whether the passive voice is used the same when reporting on Israeli and Palestinian civilians who have been killed since October 7. In addition, it is also important to explore whether the pieces of news focus on Israeli deaths or Palestinian deaths. Which data is given first describes the importance given by the media outlets to each group. Also, describing Palestinians are people who “die” and Israelis as people who “have been killed” is another form of bias.

5) Missing context: Media outlets should provide context so the audience can understand why the events have unfolded in this way. Furthermore, by providing context the audience can also properly understand the situation that Palestinians are going through in Gaza. Several subcategories have been established to detect missing context bias.

a) Historical context: For a piece of news not to be biased, it should report on previous events like the *al-Nakba*, Operation Cast Lead or previous clashes between Israel and Palestine, so the audiences understand why the events have unfolded in this way. If previous events are not mentioned, the attack perpetrated by Hamas on October 7, 2023, would be portrait as a deliberate and unfounded action. In the same way, portraying Hamas only as a terrorist organization but not explaining that this political party won the 2006 parliamentary elections in Gaza is another form of missing context bias. Lastly, not calling Gaza “Palestine”, but rather “Palestinian territories” is another form of bias.

b) Current context: Piece of news are less likely to be bias if they describe current events that are taking place and that are directly or indirectly linked to the attacks. For example, explaining that there are “protests” in the West Bank or the Middle East in support for Palestine or that there are clashes in the West bank, helps the audience understand the magnitude of the events. Explain what international bodies and contention, or groups are also accounted as explaining the current context. Further examples include explaining what Hezbollah is, that there are no supplies for the hospitals of Gaza to continue working or that the aid

organizations have been unable to continue with the delivery of aid to Palestinians in the Strip.

c) Refugee camps: Furthermore, not explaining why there are Palestinian refugee camps in Gaza and why Palestinians are refugees in what is supposed to be their own territory would also fall into this missing context framework.

d) Settler-colonial practices: In the same way, not reporting on Zionism and settler colonial practices carried out by Israel would also be considered as missing context. Moreover, there is missing context when there is no reference to why Palestinians are prisoners in Israel or not referring to Gaza as a “siege” territory, that has a separation “wall” and where there are settlements. Furthermore, erasing the identity of Palestinians should also be consider a settler-colonial practice. By not acknowledging that a person is “Palestinians”, media outlets are erasing their identity and stigmatizing the group. Lastly, when referring to the West Bank, it is important to recognize it as the “occupied West Bank” not to fall in bias.

6) Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations: To measure how bias these media outlets are when reporting on Human Right violations, it is crucial to analyze how often they cite international conventions and international law, like the International Humanitarian Law (IHL), the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, among other international laws. Furthermore, references to “genocide” and “apartheid” allegations and reporting on the attacks committed towards hospitals, UN shelters, schools, civilian houses, and the killing of civilians are also crucial report in an unbiased way, since these acts account as violations of International Humanitarian law. Lastly, media should also report on the killing of Palestinian civilians and update the number of deaths since October 7, 2023.

7) Israeli-centric discourse: The media are also bias if they cite more often Israeli voices than Palestinian voices since they would only feature a one-sided narrative. Phrases like “Israel officials say”, “Israeli government explains” or citing Israeli government officials but not Palestinian officials represents this bias. In general, incorporating the messages of Israeli officials without critically addressing them or questioning their intend should be considered an example of Israeli-centric Message. Furthermore, not incorporating Palestinian civilians' opinions, thoughts and experiences but including Israel civilian voices is another form of bias. In addition, implying that “Israel has the right to defend itself” or that “Israel is only responding to attacks” but denying Palestinian right to

resistance or return would also fall into this framework. In addition, stating that other states or organizations that support Palestine or that call for a ceasefire, are cooperating with Hamas should also be considered an example.

Israeli-centric messages also include blaming Hamas and Palestinian for current developments, explaining that Israel is only defending itself or that it did not attack before. Moreover, blaming Hamas for what Palestinians are going through and stating that Hamas is a “terrorist organization” and that Israel is only carrying out a “counterterrorism operation” is also an example of Israeli-centric message.

8) Language bias: Analyzing the choice of words is important to detect bias. Do these newspapers use words like “conflict” or “war” when covering the events, or they describe it as “genocide”? In the same way, do these media outlets use the word “child” to describe both Palestinian “prisoners” and Israeli “hostages”? In the same way, referring to the Israeli citizens that were taken into Gaza as “captives,” would also imply bias.

Employing words like “incident,” “operation,” to describe an “attack” also account for media bias, since these words can be considered euphemisms. There is also a different framing strategy when members of Hamas are described as “Palestinian fighters” or as “Palestinian militants.” “Fighters” is a more positive word, while “militants” has a more violent conception.

6. Results and analysis

6.1 BBC UK News

The UK-based media outlet has been under scrutiny because of its coverage of Gaza and the recent events between Palestine and Israel. Eight journalists employed by the corporation signed a letter addressed to Al-Jazeera accusing the media outlet of “double standard in how civilians are seen” (Safdar, 2023). These journalists further pointed out that the British media has failed to critically engage with Israel’s messages failing to provide a truthful account of the events and failing to assist the public in comprehending the human right violations that are taking place in Gaza (Safdar, 2023) In addition, the letter further explain that the media outlet has not provided enough background information of the history of Palestine and Israeli occupation and its coverage as dehumanized Palestinian civilians. (Safdar, 2023)

6.1.1 Orientalist discourse

The pieces of news chosen have several examples of orientalist discourse. As describes by the journalist who wrote the letter to *Al Jazeera* explaining by the *BBC* is biased in its coverage of Gaza and Palestinians, the *BBC* does not accurately describe Palestinians. As it will be highlighted hereunder, the suffering of Palestinians is barely covered. Instead, the *BBC* focuses on Hamas. The word “Hamas” is mentioned seventy-seven times throughout the pieces of News, while “Palestine” is only mentioned twice. Furthermore, members of Hamas are called “Palestinian militants” [1⁶ - (Knell et al., 2023)] as an attempt to discredit Palestinians as a whole, as “Hamas” is believed to not be interested in peace (Luntz, 2009). Employing “militant” is one of the advice that Luntz (2009) included in its Global Language dictionary. As he explained “militant Islam” is the “best term to describe the terrorist movement” (Luntz, 2009).

Furthermore, Hamas is not directly pictured as “animals”, but they are pictured Hamas as “evil.” More explicitly, in the second article selected, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu (qtd. in Gritten, 2023) (3) is quoted stating that Hamas is “that stronghold of evil,” which also aligns with Luntz’s explanations in the Global Language dictionary. In addition, the *BBC* employs phrases like “Hamas-run health ministry” or “Hamas-run authorities” [3 – (Gritten, 2023); 5 - (De Simone & Davies, 2023); 6 – (Berg & Baker, 2024); 8 - (Gritten, 2024)]. This is especially notorious when the *BBC* is stating how many Palestinian victims there are. Employing “Hamas-run” is a way of further discrediting this data, since “Hamas” is considered a terrorist group. This, in fact, will also be pointed out on several occasions. In article 3 and 7, the authors state “Hamas - which Israel, the United Kingdom and other powers class as a terrorist group” and “Hamas - which is proscribed as a terrorist organization by Israel, the UK and others” [3 – (Gritten, 2023); 7 – (Adams & Gritten, 2024)]. In further articles Israeli messages in which is stated that “Hamas” is a “terrorist organization” are also cited [4 – (Wright, 2023); 5 - (De Simone & Davies, 2023)].

⁶ The number after the citation indicates the article this quote is coming from to help the reader identify the article is being cited. The number 1, therefore, references the article that covers the October 7, 2023, attack; number 2 is related to the article that covers the Al-Ahli Arab Hospital attack and so on up to number 8 which is related to the news article that Rafah aid center attack.

6.1.2 Palestinians suffering

In the articles selected, the authors of the *BBC UK* barely describe the suffering Palestinians are going through and there are no direct references to the humanitarian crisis. To tackle these topics, the authors of these articles would cite UN experts and representatives of other organization, and some Palestinian voices, but the latter will not be common in most of the articles selected. In article 4, the UN is cited to warn about the “humanitarian catastrophe that is unfolding,” and Mr. William Schomburg, head of the International Committee of the Red Cross, is also cited to explain that Palestinians “fear that the only place safe for them is on a hospital floor,” and that doctors are working non-stop, even if they are mourning the loss of a loved one (Wright, 2023). In article 7, a senior UN aid official is cited to explain that one quarter of the Gaza Strip population is suffering from food insecurity. In this same article, the authors addressed ten children who had died from dehydration and malnutrition, which can be considered as describing the suffering of Palestinians (Adams & Gritten, 2024).

Nonetheless, there is a detailed portrait of the hostages released by Hamas. In the article “Israel-Gaza: Families' relief as hostages released”, the authors present the hostages proving their names, ages and where they are from, and explain the experiences the hostages underwent when they were held by Hamas (Wright, 2023). For example, in this article it is explained that Margalit Moses, 78, a cancer survivor, was released by Hamas after she was kidnapped from Kibbutz Nir Oz (Wright, 2023).

6.1.3 Hostages

The hostage taking performed by Hamas on October 7, 2023, is mentioned in seven out of the eight articles selected for this study - the only article in which the hostage taking is not mentioned is “London doctor in Gaza says hospital ceiling fell in after blast.” [2 – (Rufo, 2023)] Overall, the word “hostages” is said 17 times throughout the articles. In the articles selected, there is no reference to Israel being unwilling to negotiate a ceasefire in exchange for the hostages. In the same way, Hamas are not portrayed as “animals” for the hostage taking. Notwithstanding, the constant repetition of the hostage taking performed by Hamas through the articles – even in articles written five months after the assault – sheds light on the bias of the *BBC* when reporting on the events.

Regarding to the word choice, the *BBC* will only employ the word “hostage” for Israelis and not for Palestinians who are held on Israeli prisons. Nonetheless, the *BBC* does state that, according to human rights organizations, “the number of Palestinians held without change in Israeli Jails has shot up since the 7 October attacks” [4 – (Wright, 2023)]. Palestinians are referred to as “detainees.” Furthermore, when referring to Israeli “hostages” under 18, the authors would use words like “child” or “children.” On the other hand, when referring to Palestinian “detainees” under 18, they are referred to as “teenage boys,” “minors,” or “16-year-old” [4 – (Wright, 2023)].

Lastly, it is important to mention that in article 3, in which the hostage released is explained in detail, the authors chose to give out information about all the Israeli “hostages,” including their name, age, origin, and the experiences they went through, and even how their relatives experienced this event. For example, Gritten (2023) quotes Kittiya Thuengsaeng, the girlfriend of one of the Thai hostages released by Hamas, Wichai Kalapat. On the other hand, Gritten (2023) briefly quotes Marah Bakeer, one of the Palestinian “detainees” released by Israel. Nonetheless, the journalist did not focus on her suffering when writing this piece of news as they have done with the “hostages.”

6.1.4 Civilians and use of passive voice

Several examples of the use of passive voice to describe the death of Palestinian civilians have been found in the news selected. In article 1, it is stated that “Palestinians were shot dead” and examples of Palestinians who “have been killed” can be found in several other articles [1 – (Knell et al., 2023); 5 - (De Simone & Davies, 2023); 6 – (Berg & Baker, 2024); 7 – (Adams & Gitten, 2024); 8 - (Gritten, 2024)]. Furthermore, it is also worth to mention that in article 7 it is stated that “Palestinians are said to have been killed,” which cause the reader to doubt of the truth of that statement. In the last piece of news, it is explicitly stated that “ Hamas gunmen attacked [...], killing about 1,200 people” and shortly after it is stated that “more than 31,200 people have been killed in Gaza” (Adams & Gitten, 2024). By comparing this two statements side by side, it can be concluded that in the former Hamas is put as the actor of the killings, while in the latter the use of passive voice makes it more difficult to find the subject of these killings. It is also important to mention that the word “people” instead of “Palestinians” is used to describe Palestinians killed in Gaza. Notwithstanding, both when referring to Palestinians and Israelis, the

words “died” and “killed” are used, so there is no concluding data on the usage of these words only for one of the groups.

Regarding the stating of Israelis and Palestinians deaths, some remarkable framings are worth sharing. The hostage taking and the data of Israelis killed in the October 7, 2023, attacks perpetrated by Hamas is mentioned in seven out of the eight pieces of news selected and his data is mentioned before the number of deaths of Palestinians in six out of the seven articles. In addition, when the numbers of Palestinians dead or wounded are stated, phrases like “medics say” [1 – (Knell et al., 2023)], “authorities in Gaza say” [2 – (Rufo, 2023)] or “Gaza's Hamas-run health ministry says” [3 – (Gritten, 2023)] are used. On the other hand, when stating the deaths or killing of Israelis no such phrases are used; the deaths are stated, without citing any officials. Some examples include: “Hamas gunmen attacked southern Israel on 7 October, killing about 1,200 people and taking 253 others as hostages,” found in article 8 (Gritten, 2024) or “waves of Hamas gunmen invaded Israel [...] killing about 1,200 people, mostly civilians, and taking around 240 to Gaza as hostages” in article 6 (Berg & Baker, 2024). This framing technique used will discredit the data given of Palestinian killed while emphasizing the killing of Israelis. This discrediting is especially notorious when the phrase “Hamas-run health ministry,” is used since, as “Hamas” are portrait as “terrorist” so their data may not be considered accurate by the public.

6.1.5 Missing context

In the articles selected, the *BBC UK* provides scant context about previous events between Israel and Palestine, Gaza, the West Bank or Palestinians, which makes these articles biased since the audience do not have enough information to build and informed opinion on the events that are currently taking place. In fact, one of the advice Luntz (2009) gives out in the Israel Project’s dictionary is “talk about the future, not the past.”

In the first article selected, “Israel attack: PM says Israel at war after 250 killed in attack from Gaza,” Knell, Berg and Gritten (2023) write “perimeter fence from Gaza” and “heavily fortified borders,” but the authors do not elaborate on why this border exists and why was it build by Israel. This will be seen again in the fourth article, “Israel-Gaza: Families’ relief as hostages released,” when Wright (2023) mentions the “Beituna Checkpoint” but do not elaborate on why there is a military checkpoint there.

Furthermore, in the first article selected, the authors only state that there had been “previous conflicts” between Israeli forces and “militants in Gaza” but do not explain the events that have taken place in the Strip [1 – (Knell et al., 2023)]. In the third article, Gritten (2023) writes that “1.4 million people have fled their homes,” but the author does not link these displacements to the Israeli attacks and bombardments over the Gaza Strip.

However, the most important example of missing context in the articles selected largely refers to erasing the context. In the rest of articles, the authors do not provide information about previous events, the military law that prevails over Gaza and the West Bank or the existing borders between Palestine and Israel. Nonetheless, in the fifth article “South Africa files ICJ case accusing Israel of 'genocidal acts,'” De Simone and Davies (2023) state that “the current war between Israel and Hamas was triggered by the 7 October Hamas attack on southern Israel.” This statement is problematic for several reasons. First, and since it is stated in the piece of news that covers the International Court of Justice case filed by South Africa, this statement undermines the credibility of the case presented by South Africa and the suffering of Palestinians. Second, it portrays the attack perpetuated by Hamas as something that come out of nowhere. Even if the attack was unexpected and caught Israeli Forces off guard, tensions between Israel and Palestine had been reoccurring for months before that. One of the most important examples of this occurred in April 2023 when Israeli forces attacked Palestinian worshippers at Al-Aqsa Mosque in occupied East Jerusalem.

Lastly, there is no explicit mention to “Palestine.” The word “Palestine” is only stated twice and only in one of the articles as it is part of a quote of Hamas leader used by the authors (Knell et al., 2023). When referring to Palestine, the authors would use “Gaza Strip”, “Gaza”, “Strip” or “West Bank.” The “West Bank” is mentioned 7 times throughout the articles and “Gaza” is mentioned 85 times. However, it is important to mention that the West Bank is referred to as the “occupied West Bank,” which is an important piece of context. Moreover, it is also worth mentioning that in the article “London Doctor in Gaza says hospital ceiling fell in after blast,” Rufo (2023) does not mention that these “London doctor,” Dr. Ghassan Abu-Sittah is Palestinian. This example is crucial since by not acknowledging his origin, the authors are completely erasing their identity.

6.1.6 Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations

In the articles selected several different examples of Human Rights Violations are described. Notwithstanding, it is not explicitly stated that they are Human Rights, Humanitarian, or International Law violations. Some examples of this include the attack to “a residential building in the Shabora,” [1 – (Knell et al., 2023)] which is a crime under War Laws; attacks on hospitals [2 – (Rufo, 2023)] and UN shelters [8 - (Gritten, 2024)]; or the killing of civilians. Furthermore, when most of these human rights violations are stated, it is done by citing international experts, not by directly explaining the situation. Some of the experts cited are Medecins Sans Frontieres [1 – (Knell et al., 2023)], Antonio Guterres [1 – (Knell et al., 2023)]; 3 – (Gritten, 2023); 7 – (Adams & Gritten, 2024)] and the United Nations or other agencies, like UNRWA [3 – (Gritten, 2023); 8 - (Gritten, 2024)], or the International Committee of the Red Cross or authorities from the organization [3 – (Gritten, 2023)], among others.

In addition, only one International Convention is cited in the articles selected. In article 4, the Genocide Convention is cited when describing the case filed by South Africa. In addition, the word “genocide” stated four times in this same article. [4 – (Wright, 2023)] Nevertheless, it is only stated because the authors are citing quotes form the case or South African authorities.

6.1.7 Israeli-centric messages

Israeli-centric messages and voices prevail in the articles selected. Israeli authorities or spokespeople are cited in all of the articles except for article 2, Israeli civilians are cited in at least two articles (1 and 4) and states that support Israel, such as the US, are cited in at two articles (1 and 7). Regarding Palestinians voices, Palestinian authorities are cited in four news articles out of the eight selected (1, 4, 6 and 7), but they are cited considerably less than Israeli voices. As a matter of comparison, in article 7, even if more Palestinians are cited, the quotes used of Israelis are considerably longer. While the quotes of Palestinians selected are only a couple words, Israeli quotes are longer and more precise. For example, one quote is “[The Palestinian] said Israeli soldiers had opened fire ‘and the aid lorry ran over the bodies.’” is one of the Palestinian quotes (Adams & Gritten, 2024). On the other hand, when citing the IDF chief spokesman, the quote reads as follows:

Some began violently pushing and even trampling other Gazans to death, looting the humanitarian supplies," said the IDF's chief spokesman, Rear Adm Daniel Hagari. "The unfortunate incident resulted in dozens of Gazans killed and injured." Israeli tanks, he said, "cautiously tried to disperse the mob with a few warning shots" but pulled back "when the hundreds became thousands and things got out of hand. (qtd. in Adams & Gritten, 2024).

Regarding Palestinian civilians, they are cited in three articles (article 2, 4 and 7) and states or authorities that support Palestine are cited in three articles (1 – Qatar, 5 – South Africa, and 6 - Hezbollah). As it was already mentioned, in article 2, the “London doctor” cited is Palestinian but it is not properly stated in the article (Rufo, 2023).

Moreover, Israeli-centric messages prevail both in the Israeli quotes selected and how the *BBC* approaches these statements; the *BBC* does not critically engage with Israel’s claims. For example, in article 6 where it is described the killing of Saleh al-Arouri, Hamas deputy leader, it is stated that “Netanyahu has previously vowed to eliminate Hamas's leaders, wherever they are,” but Berg and Baker (2024) would also quote Israeli government adviser Mark Regev stating that “whoever did it, it must be clear that this was not an attack on the Lebanese state”, taking out the blame from Israel and not critically considering if this statement is believable. Nonetheless, it is important to mention that in article 8, where the attack to the Rafah aid center is reported, Gritten (2024) does challenge Israeli narrative, when stating that in the statement created by the IDF to explain that they had killed “terrorist”, the IDF did not mention the attack to the UNRWA facility.

As seen in Luntz’s dictionary, stating that “Palestinian people are not the enemy” (Regev cited Luntz, 2009) is a way of conveying Israeli-centric messages and placing the focus of their operations in “destroying Hamas.” For example, in article 5, Mr. Haiat is cited stating that “the residents of the Gaza Strip are not the enemy” and that Israel only directs its “military efforts” against “the Hamas terrorist organization” (De Simone & Davies, 2023). Moreover, according to Luntz (2009) to convey Israeli centric messages, Israelis or its supporters should cite examples of how “Hamas is out of step even with its own people,” putting the blame of them rather than in Israel. This technique can be seen in article 5, when Lior Haiat is cited explaining that Hamas is “responsible for the suffering

of the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip by using them as human shields and stealing humanitarian aid from them” (De Simone & Davies, 2023).

Describing Hamas and Hezbollah as a “Iran-backed terrorist organization” is also an Israeli centric message touched on in Luntz’s dictionary (2009). In the article “Hamas deputy leader Saleh al-Arouri killed in Beirut blast,” Hamas and Hezbollah are described as “terrorist organizations” and Iran is cited and described as “a major supporter of both groups” (Berg & Baker, 2024). On the other hand, Berg, and Baker (2024) would state that Israel has denied its participation on the attack, further perpetuating its messages.

Moreover, Israeli centric messages are also perpetuated when authorities of Israel are cited stating that that UNRWA supports Hamas [8 - (Gritten, 2024)], or that South Africa is "cooperating with a terrorist organization that is calling for the destruction of the State of Israel." [5 - (De Simone & Davies, 2023)]. Luntz (2009) explains that to convey an Israeli-centric message it is important to describe that the UN has “consistently taken a one-sided, anti-Israel” position. By stating that UNRWA supports Hamas, Israel is discrediting the role of the biggest international organization and its organisms.

Lastly, one of the crucial-Israeli centric messages is to describe Hamas and Palestinians as terrorists and Israel actions as counterterrorism. Luntz (2009) describes that in that “Israel has a right to defend itself” and to gain support it is easier to include “the need to defend against terrorism.” Israeli authorities are cited on several occasion in the articles selected stating that Hamas is – or is considered by Israel - a “terrorist organization” [3 – (Gritten, 2023); 4 – (Wright, 2023); 5 - (De Simone & Davies, 2023); 6 – (Berg & Baker, 2024); 8 - (Gritten, 2024)] or they are “terrorist operatives” [1 – (Knell et al., 2023); 3 – (Gritten, 2023)] or “terrorists” [1 – (Knell et al., 2023); 4 – (Wright, 2023); 8 - (Gritten, 2024)]. Moreover, in article 1, US President Joe Biden is cited stating that Israel "has the right to defend itself and its people" (Knell et al., 2023). This statement gives full credibility to Israel claims.

6.1.8 Language bias

Language bias is also visible in the pieces of news selected. The authors of the *BBC* would usually use subtle words and euphemisms, especially when referring to Israeli attacks. Examples include employing “blast” [2 – (Rufo, 2023); 6 – (Berg & Baker, 2024)] or “explosion” [1 – (Knell et al., 2023); 2 – (Rufo, 2023); 3 – (Gritten, 2023)] to refer to

attacks, stating that “there was also violence” [3 – (Gritten, 2023)] to refer to clashes between Israeli officials and Palestinians in the occupied West Bank, deliberately choosing to use the word “war” [2 – (Rufo, 2023); 5 - (De Simone & Davies, 2023); 6 – (Berg & Baker, 2024); 7 – (Adams & Gitten, 2024); 8 - (Gritten, 2024)], which is stated seventy-two times throughout the articles selected, and describing the attack on aid convoys as an “incident” [7 – (Adams & Gitten, 2024)] Lastly, it is also important to restate the difference in the use of “children” to refer to Israelis under the age of 18, and “teenagers” or “minors” to refer to Palestinians.

6.2 Al-Jazeera

“*Al Jazeera* remains the predominant source that's broadcasting in both English and Arabic that still has journalists reporting on the ground in Gaza” explains Dr. Gretchen King (Personal communication, March 14, 2024). This fact makes *Al Jazeera* one of the sole international media agencies that does not need to rely on external information to cover the current events that are taking place in Gaza. In addition, Dr. King personal communication, March 14, 2024) points out that both in the English and Arabic sides of *Al Jazeera* there are Palestinians working, which “puts Palestinians in a better position towards self-representation.” Notwithstanding, even if this representation is likely to be better than in other media, it should be taken into consideration that it is still aligned with the “economic line and also the political line” of *Al Jazeera* (King, personal communication, March 14, 2024). Furthermore, due to its links with the Qatari government, *Al Jazeera* is considered “a form of state media” (King, personal communication, March 14, 2024). This fact is crucial to understand the coverage of the current events in Gaza due to the involvement of Qatar as a mediator between Hamas and Israel.

6.2.1 Orientalist discourse

In the pieces of news selected, no orientalist framework was found. The Health Ministry in Gaza is not described as the “Hamas-run” Health Ministry. Instead, it is called “Palestinian Health Ministry” or “Palestinian authorities” [2 – (Al Jazeera, 2023b)]. In addition, the word “terrorism” is not mentioned, and “terrorist” is only mentioned twice, but not in direct reference to Hamas. Instead, Hamas is referred to as a “group” that is “running the Gaza Strip” [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023a)] or as the “Palestinian armed group that

governs the territory” [3 – (Al Jazeera, 2023c)]. By employing “governs” Hamas is, therefore, pictured as a legitimate government. In addition, distinction between Hamas’s “politburo” and its military branch - the Qassam Brigades – is also established [6 – (Al Jazeera, 2024)]. Lastly, when citing Hamas’s top leaders when they talk about the attacks, *Al Jazeera* chooses quotes that emphasize the “resistance” of Palestinians against the settler-colonial practices [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023a); 6 – (Al Jazeera, 2024)].

6.2.2 Palestinians suffering

The suffering of Palestinians is addressed in most of the pieces of news selected. For example, in article 1, a Rafah resident is cited stating that Palestinians looking at a “tough night and that the situation in Gaza on October 7, 2023, was already not good. [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023a)] or in article 3, it is stated that Palestinians have “few options for seeking refuge” and that residents were “terrified and afraid”, among others. It is worth mentioning that in articles 7 and 8, the authors pay greater attention to the “hunger crisis” and “famine” that is isolating Gaza and how the population is suffering from “starvation” (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b) and attacks on aid convoys are described as a “massacre” (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a). Lastly, *Al Jazeera* (2023d) describes Israeli actions as “collective punishment” on Palestinians.

6.2.3 Hostages

The subject of hostages is barely touched on in the new pieces selected for this study. The word “hostage” appears three times and Israelis are described as “captives,” a word that is said eight times. Moreover, the word “children” is used both for Israelis and Palestinians, so there is no bias in this regard.

The only references to the “hostages” or, rather, “captives,” can be found in articles 1, 2 and 4. For example, in article 1, it is stated that Israelis were “seized and taken into Gaza,” no taken as “hostages” (Al Jazeera, 2023a), and In article 2, the authors point out that 199 Israelis have been “taken as captives” (Al Jazeera, 2023b). In the headline of article 4, Israelis are referred to as “captives” – a word that is stated six times throughout the article (Al Jazeera, 2023d), while the word “hostages” is mentioned three times. Furthermore, in this piece of news, it is stated that 240 Israelis were “taken captive by the group October 7” and it is stated that the “captives” are civilians, soldiers, and foreigners, including Thai nationals (Al Jazeera, 2023d).

With regard to Palestinians in Israeli prisons, they are not only referred to as “prisoner”, but also as “woman and children detained in Israel jails” or “Palestinians held in Israeli prisons” (Al Jazeera, 2023d). Nonetheless, it is also explained that Palestinians think that Palestinians are being made “prisoners with little motives” and that are “victims of an Israeli occupation that sweeps them into prisons with little pretense of due process” (Al Jazeera, 2023d). Lastly, it is important to consider that article 4, where the event of the Hostage release by Hamas is described, focuses on Hamas releasing hostages, not on the hostages being freed (Al Jazeera, 2023d). Hamas is pictured as the active actor, despite citing Netanyahu saying that his government is committed to the return of all hostages.

6.2.4 Civilians and use of passive voice

In the articles selected, it is worth to mention that Israel is placed as the actor of the killings. Phrases like “Israel retaliation kills” (Al Jazeera, 2023a), “Israeli air raids that have killed” (Al Jazeera, 2023b), “Israel intensifies Gaza bombardment” (Al Jazeera, 2023c) or “Israeli forces have shot dead” (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b), among others, place focus on Israel as the perpetuator of the killings. Israel is described as the actor also when using passive when using the passive voice, since the phrase “by Israel” or “by Israeli forces” is included (Al Jazeera, 2023a). Furthermore, the authors focus on Palestinian deaths rather than Israeli deaths throughout the articles. It should be noted that this is the case even on article 1, when *Al Jazeera* is covering the Hamas attack.

Regarding to the numbers of Israelis killed since October 7, 2023, this data is only stated in three articles (2, 3 and 5) For example, In article 2, it is stated that “1,400 people, mostly civilians, were killed” (Al Jazeera, 2023b), In this example, it can be noticed the use of the passive voice, and the authors did not include “by Hamas,” so the perpetuator of the killing is to some extent invisible.

Regarding the deaths of Palestinians, the numbers are usually introduced with phrases like “health ministry says” [1 - (Al Jazeera, 2023a)], “Palestinian officials” [2 - (Al Jazeera, 2023b)], or “The Gaza Ministry of Health” [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)], among others, and not including “Hamas-run health ministry.” Nonetheless, but the use of passive voice is a common practice. Some examples include “500 people were killed” [2 - (Al Jazeera, 2023b)], “more than 30,000 are reported to have been killed” [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)]. In addition, data on Palestinian deaths is included only in articles

1, 2 4, 7 and 8; in articles 4 and 6 there is no data regarding the numbers of deaths of Palestinians or Israelis, so it can be concluded that this is not a recurring topic in all the pieces of news published by *Al Jazeera*.

6.2.5 Missing context

In the articles selected, the authors provide context or current events, past events, and settler-colonial practices. Nevertheless, the articles selected do not explain why there are refugee camps in Gaza, which makes them biased to some extent.

Regarding settler colonial practices, words like “besiege Palestinian enclave” [1 - (Al Jazeera, 2023a)], “occupation” [1 - (Al Jazeera, 2023a)], “Zionist occupiers” [4 - (Al Jazeera, 2024)], “Occupied West Bank [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)], among others, point to these practices.

In the articles selected, the author also gives specific data about the current events and provides context of events that may not be related to the event they are covering, but that help the audience understand the context. For example, in article 2, it is stated that “blamed the blast” at al-Ahli hospital on “a failed rocket launch by the Palestinian Islamic Jihad group” but that the group denied the responsibility, that “anti-Israel protest erupted in the occupied West Bank and several cities across the Middle East” or that Jordan cancelled a summit that was going to be held some days later with the president of the USA due to the hospital blast (Al Jazeera, 2023b)]. Another example can be found in article 4 when it is explained that “Israeli forces fired tear gas” at Palestinians that were waiting for the release of the “prisoners” in the occupied West Bank. (Al Jazeera, 2023d). More context is provided when the authors explain the economic agreement that Israel and Thailand have, since this explains why Thai nationals could be found among the hostages. In article 8 when the authors compare “average number of trucks that entered Gaza daily” before October 7, to the current number of trucks entering the Strip and how, according to UNRWA, Israeli has not allowed the organization “to deliver supplies to the north of the Strip since January 23” (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b).

In addition, the authors of the articles selected explain concepts, groups, and institutions, expanding the context provided to the audience. For example, Hezbollah is described, and it is further explained that Hezbollah and Israel had been “exchanging daily cross-border fire” since October 7. [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023a); 6 – (Al Jazeera, 2024)] Furthermore, in

“ Hamas releases 24 captives from Gaza as Israel truce comes into effect ” it is explained that Palestinians feel that their prisoners are “ victims of Israeli occupation, ” explaining a key component of settler-colonial practices. [4 – (Al Jazeera, 2023d)] Information on what the International Court of Justice is, how South Africa and Israel are both bounded by this court, why South Africa filed this case and why this case should be taken seriously is stated in article 5 (Al Jazeera, 2023e). In addition, it is pointed out that these practices not only occur in Gaza, but also in the West Bank (Al Jazeera, 2023e).

Regarding past context, in none of the pieces of news selected there are references to the al-Nakba, the 1967 War or other clashes between Israel and Palestine. However, several previous incidents are explained. For example, in article 1, where the October 7, 2023, attack and the retaliation that followed are explained, the authors point out that “ 274 Palestinians ” had been killed by Israeli forces before the October 7 attack and that 32 Israelis “ have been killed in previous Palestinian attacks ” [1 - (Al Jazeera, 2023a)].

6.2.6 Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations

In the articles selected, the authors make emphasis on the Human Rights violations that Palestinians are suffering. Nonetheless, even if Human Rights violations are described, most of the time it is not stated as such. International experts like Antonio Guterres, UNRWA representatives, WHO, however, are mentioned and cited to describe the situation of Palestinians and Human Rights violation taking place.

The main example of authors covering Human Right Violations can be found after article 5. In article 5, in which is described the International Court of Justice case filed by South Africa against Israel, the authors cite the South African case to convey why Israel actions can convey as Genocide (Al Jazeera, 2023e). Moreover, the UN convention against Genocide is cited and the authors further explain that a UN expert had already called on the international community to “ prevent genocide against the Palestinian people ”, since the actions of Israel can be considered a “ genocide in the making ” [5 - (Al Jazeera, 2023e)].

In article 6, the authors convey, by citing several representatives of Hamas and Hezbollah, and the Lebanese government, that the drone strike on Beirut was a violation of Lebanon’s sovereignty. Moreover, in article 7, the emphasis is put in how “ Israel has been delaying deliveries ” of aid to Palestinians and how the state has Israel acted in breach of

the ICJ order issued in January 26, that stated that Israel must ensure the delivery of goods [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)]. This article also points out to the attack of Israel to an aid convoy, which is a violation of War Law. Lastly, in article 8, authors make a great emphasis on how attacking aid centers is forbidden under international law. Juliette Touma, UNRWA spokeswoman, is cited stating that “UN facilities must be protected at all times as mandated by international law” (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b). Agnes Callamard, the secretary-general of Amnesty International, is also cited stressing that “Israel continues to violate international law in total impunity.” (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b). In addition, the authors point out that the famine-like conditions that Palestinians are suffering are a product of “engineered starvation” and “man-made disaster” which can account for causes of Genocide (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a).

6.2.7 Israeli-centric messages

Israeli-centric messages are not especially relevant in the articles selected. When citing messages of Israeli authorities, the authors of the articles tend to engage with these messages and provide proofs to support or rather deny their claims. In addition, towards the last pieces of news selected, Israeli authorities are less cited - in articles 2, 7 and 8, they are not cited at all.

In article 1, Netanyahu is cited stating that Israel is “at War” and that the “enemy will an unprecedented price” (Al Jazeera, 2023a). Notwithstanding, Mohammed Deif, senior Hamas military commander, is also cited explaining that the October 7 attack was an operation against “Israeli occupation” (Al Jazeera, 2023a). Several Palestinian voices can be seen in this first article. Two Rafah Residents, Salem al-Arouri, and Ismail Haniyeh, the leader of Hamas, are all cited to convey a broader Palestinian message. Words like “Arab brothers” and “intifadas,” which are common in Hamas and Palestinian speeches, are included. (Al Jazeera, 2023a).

In article 2, which explains the attack on hospital Al-Ahli, no Israeli representative is cited. It is only stated that Israel “blamed the blast at the hospital on a failed rocket launch by the Palestinian Islamic Jihad group,” but that the group denied its responsibility (Al Jazeera, 2023b). “Gaza authorities,” “The Ministry of Health in Gaza” and representatives of Jordan - President Mahmoud Abbas, - UN or the World Health Organization are cited

instead. By providing information from them, the authors of this articles and distancing themselves from Israeli-centric messages.

In “Israel intensifies Gaza bombardment as internet and phone services go down” Daniel Hegari is cited explaining that ground forces were “expanding their activity.” [3 - (Al Jazeera, 2023c)]. Employing euphemism like “activity” can account as Israeli-centric message since it an example of minimizing the complexity of the situation. Nonetheless, Israeli authorities are barely cited in this article and no prominent example of Israeli-centric message can be found. Regarding article 4, no Israeli voices are cited. Instead, the Prime Minister states that the government is committed to the return of all hostages (Al Jazeera, 2023d). This has become a recurring topic since October 7, 2023. Nonetheless, no real efforts have been done by Israel in order to negotiate another ceasefire to free the hostages. Therefore, this can account for an Israeli narrative that has risen since the Hamas attack.

In articles 5 and 6, Israeli narratives prevail, but they are debunked once aging by the authors. In “South Africa files case at ICJ accusing Israel of ‘genocidal acts’ in Gaza” it is stated that “Israel has rejected global calls for a ceasefire saying the war would not stop until the Hamas group, whose October 7 attack triggered the current phase of the conflict, was destroyed” [5 - (Al Jazeera, 2023e)]. In this sentence, it can be seen the Israeli negative of destroying the enemy – “until the Hamas group [...] was destroyed” –, blaming Hamas for triggering the conflict – “whose October 7 attack triggered the current phase of the conflict” -, and the rejection of the ceasefire. Nonetheless, the authors explain Hamas position and how it was triggered by “Israel’s 16-year-old blockade of Gaza” and the “expansion of settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories” [5 - (Al Jazeera, 2023e)].

In addition, Lior Haiat, Israel’s minister of foreign affairs, is cited stating that “residents of the Gaza Strip are not the enemy” and that Israel is “making every effort to limit harm to the non-involved and to allow humanitarian aid to enter the Gaza Strip” [5 - (Al Jazeera, 2023e)]. As Luntz (2009) explains, it is important to “differentiate between the Palestinian people and Hamas” to effectively convey Israeli narratives. Notwithstanding, in this article this narrative is debunked. Article 2 of the Genocide Convention is cited explaining why Israeli action may account for genocide. In addition, Marwan Bishara, *Al Jazeera’s* senior political analyst, further explains that leading Israeli officials have

declared the intent of committing a genocide in Gaza , “starting with Israeli President Herzog when he said there are ‘no innocents’ in Gaza, the defense minister who said Israel will impose collective punishment on the people of Gaza because they are ‘human animals’,” and including prime minister Netanyahu who has “also used a biblical analogy in a statement widely interpreted as a genocidal call” [5 - (Al Jazeera, 2023e)].

Mark Regev is cited in article 6 stating that Israel had not taken responsibility for the drone attack that killed Saleh al-Arouri in Beirut and, therefore, denying its involvement in the killing. Nonetheless, in the piece of news it is repeatedly stated that it was an “Israeli strike” [6 - (Al Jazeera, 2024)]. Furthermore, it is stated that “Netanyahu had threatened to kill al-Arouri long before Israel’s latest assault on the besieged Gaza Strip” [6 - (Al Jazeera, 2024)]. In this way, Israeli narrative is debunked.

In article 7, Israeli officials are not cited. Nonetheless, Israeli-centric messages are shared, engaged with, and debunked. Bernard Smith, and *Al Jazeera* reported on the strip is cited stating that the Israeli military “tried to pin the blame on the crowd” since “dozens were hurt as a consequence of being crushed and trampled when aid trucks arrived” [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)]. Nonetheless, the journalist explains that Israeli forces “responded by opening fire” and, to further debunk Israeli-Centric messages, the authors cite a doctor that explained that “the majority of the victims suffered gunshots” and “were hit by direct artillery shelling, drone missiles and gun firing” [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)]. By citing doctors who were taking care of the wounded and, therefore, engaging with Israeli’s messages, Israeli narrative is debunked.

6.2.8 Language bias

Language bias is present in the articles selected. Regarding to pro-Palestine bias, it is important to mention that when referring to the Hamas attack of October 7, 2023, it is referred to as an “operation” in the headline of the first article selected. Furthermore, when referring to this event as an “attack” it is said that it was an attack “inside” [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023b)] or “in” [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023a)] Israel, rather than “against” Israel.

In addition, members of Hamas are referred to as “fighters” not as “militants”, “terrorists” or “members.” “Fighters” [1 – (Al Jazeera, 2023a); 2 – (Al Jazeera, 2023b); 5 – (Al Jazeera, 2023e)] or “freedom fighters” [6 – (Al Jazeera, 2024)] is a more positively charged word than the other examples mentioned that help portrait Hamas members as

the victims rather than the ones that carried the October 7, 2023, attack. In the same way, Hamas is referred to as a “group” [2 – (Al Jazeera, 2023b); 3 – (Al Jazeera, 2023c)].

In the articles selected, it is common to see words that are specially emotionally charged and descriptive language of the situation Palestinians are going through, which can position the audience against Israel. Employing adverbs and adjectives also helps build this bias. This is especially relevant when the authors describe Palestinian suffering. Words like “death trap” or “massacre” may contribute to this bias. [8 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b)]. Even if they describe the situation of Palestinians, these words are enormously emotionally charged.

Regarding the use of euphemisms, the authors use them when referring to attacks or bombing. “Explosions lit up the sky” [3 - (Al Jazeera, 2023c)], “operation” [1 - (Al Jazeera, 2023a)], or “reduced entire neighbourhoods in Gaza to rubble” [2 - (Al Jazeera, 2023b)], represent this kind of bias. Furthermore, when referring to “hostages” as people “taken as captives,” the authors are also employing euphemisms [4 - (Al Jazeera, 2023d)]. On the other hand, it should be considered that the authors of the articles selected do not use euphemisms when covering Palestinian suffering, which is crucial, so the audience understand the current situation. “Famine” [8 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b)], “genocidal war” [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)], “systematic attacks on hungry people” [7 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024a)], “weapon of war” [8 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b)], “collective punishment” [5 - (Al Jazeera, 2023e)], and “engineered starvation” [8 - (Al Jazeera Staff, 2024b)], are just some examples. In the same way, the fighting is framed as “resistance” [6 - (Al Jazeera, 2024)].

Lastly, three additional remarks should be made. Firstly, the word “children” is used both for Israelis and Palestinians, so there is no bias in the use of this word. Secondly, Gaza and the West Bank are referred to as “occupied territories” and not as “Palestine” [4 - (Al Jazeera, 2023d)]. Thirdly, on article 5, the current situation in Gaza is described as “Israel War on Gaza” the preposition “on” is important, since it tries to emphasize the believe that Israel is the one “having the War” and so it is not a “war” between two equal parties (Al Jazeera, 2023e).

6.3 The New York Times

Despite the fact that the American media outlet does not have journalists in Gaza due to the restrictions imposed by Israel, *The New York Times* explains that it works closely with journalist and agencies in the Strip and is in touch with residents and authorities both inside Gaza and Israel, and abroad. Notwithstanding, Research has shown that NYTimes is biased in its representation of Palestinians in the current context and that it “heavily favoured Israel.” (Johnson & Ali, 2024) *The New York Times*, as one of the main media agencies in the United States follows, plays a crucial role in how the audience perceives and understand the conflict. For this matter, it is crucial to understand to what extent it is biased.

6.3.1 Orientalist discourse

Orientalist discourse is not prominent in the articles selected. Members of Hamas are referred to as “fighters,” “militants,” “commanders” or “members” but never as “terrorists.” In fact, the word terrorist is used 5 times, three of which is citing Israeli officials and twice to state that Hamas is considered a “terrorist organization” by the USA in articles 1 and 6 (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023; Hubbard et al., 2024). Moreover, the “health ministry” in Gaza is not describes as “Hamas-run.”

In article 1, however, it is stated that Hamas is a “Iran-backed militant Group that controls the Gaza strip” rather than “governs” Gaza and that Hamas “seized control of Gaza in 2007 from more moderate Palestinian factions.” (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023) This statement can be problematic since Hamas won the election in Gaza in 2007.

6.3.2 Palestinians suffering

The topic of Palestinians suffering is slightly touched on the pieces of news selected and most of the times it is related to the absence of “food, water fuel and medicine” [3 – (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023)], how “hunger is widespread, turning into famine” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)] and that Palestinians are becoming “increasingly desperate for food” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)]. Notwithstanding, the biggest example of the suffering of Palestinians comes in article 2.

In this article, Storytelling is used to convey the suffering of Palestinians. The article starts explaining the experience on Sameh al-Jaroosha, a Palestinian child who had fled

his house with his family and found refuge in Al-Ahli hospital which was attacked by Israel on October 17, 2023. His story is used as the leading thread of the article and helps the audience understand the magnitude of the attack. It is also explained that, just like Sameh and his family, other Palestinians sought refuge in the hospital because they felt it would be the only place safe (Abdulrahim et al., 2023). The suffering of Palestinians is further explained when it is stated that half of Gaza's population have fled their homes since "the Israeli bombardment began." (Abdulrahim et al., 2023) By employing storytelling, the authors manage to make the audience visualize the chaotic scenes and help them empathize with Palestinians as a whole.

6.3.3 Hostages

The topic of "hostages" or "captives" and Palestinians "prisoners" is not a recurring topic in the pieces of news selected and it is mainly discussed in the article "First Captives Freed in Tense Gaza Truce Between Israel and Hamas." Nonetheless, it should be highlighted that in this article, the cease-fire or truce established between Israel and Hamas is the conducting thread of the article, which differs from the articles of the *BBC* and *Al-Jazeera* that cover the same event. Therefore, article 4 of *The New York Times* provides more context to what the "cease-fire deal" implied, including the delivery of aid trucks in Gaza, and that the talks to release Thai Nationals was "kept separate from the ones on Israeli and dual-nationality hostages" (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the word "hostages" is used to describe Israelis only on articles 4 and 7, while in article 1 it is stated that "multiple Israelis had been abducted" (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023). On the other hand, Palestinians held in Israeli prisons are both referred to as "prisoners" [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023)] and "imprisoned Palestinians" [4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023)]. Regarding the use of "children" or "minors" to refer to people under 18 years, the word "children" is only used to describe Israelis, while Palestinians are described as "minors" or "teenagers" [4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023)]. Lastly, it is worth mentioning that in article 3, it is stated that the Israeli government had so far "shown no openness to a cease-fire."

6.3.4 Civilians and use of passive voice

In the articles selected, there are few mentions to the numbers of civilians killed since October 7, 2023. Nonetheless, there are some conclusions worth mentioning.

The number of Israelis killed is mentioned in seven out of the eight articles selected. The word “dead” is used twice in these mentions, “kill” is used in five and passive voice is used once. Furthermore, the numbers of Israeli deaths are always stated including “reported by officials” [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023)], or “according to Israeli officials” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)], among others, therefore, receiving the same treatment as the numbers of Palestinians killed.

Regarding Palestinian civilians, the use of passive voice is more common, since it is used seven out of the ten times that data of Palestinians killed is introduced. The construction “had/have been killed” is used five times through articles 1, 2, 7 and 8, while “were killed” is used twice in article 2. Regarding the use of “die” and “kill”, the word “died” is employed twice, in articles 1 and 5, both in active form, while “kill” is used seven times and only once is used in active form - “has killed” in article 3. [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023); 3 – (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023); 5 - (Carl, 2023)] When stating this data, it is common that the information is said by “Palestinians officials” [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023)], “Gazan health authorities” [5 - (Carl, 2023)] or “United Nations estimates” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)].

In addition, is important to mention that the *NYTimes* provide context of previous clashes and the dead of Palestinians and Israelis in these events. In article 1, the authors share data of Palestinians and Israelis who had “been killed” before the October 7 attack. (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023) Lastly, it should be considered that in article 8, the authors also provide data of UNRWA works killed since the October 7 attack. This data is stated employing the passive voice - “have been killed”. (Patil, 2024)

6.3.5 Missing context

In the articles selected, several key dates are mentioned, and historical context is provided. Some examples of events mentioned include: the Arab Israeli war of 1967, the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the *second intifada*, and previous attacks and clashes between Israel and Hamas in article 1 (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023), or the background information provided in article 6 related to Mr. al-Aurori activities within Hamas, how Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran reacted to his killing, how Israel trains its soldiers to identify Hamas members - Israel created a card deck with Hamas leaders or the creation of Jabaliya’s refugee camp (Hubbard et al., 2024) More historical context is provided in this article

when it is stated that Hamas “seized control of Gaza in 2007 from more moderate Palestinian factions” (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023). Notwithstanding, this statement is problematic since Hamas did not “seize control,” the group won the 2007 Parliamentary elections in Gaza.

Regarding current context and how other actors react, broad context is provided. Therefore, for the sake of simplicity, just some prominent examples will be provided. In article 1, the authors explain that Israel was trying to “seal a landmark peace deal with Saudi Arabia” when the attack occurred (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023), while in article 2, the authors provide context of the numbers of displaced people and how the hospital attacked was warned to evacuate. In article 4 background information on the age, nationality and gender of the hostages released by Hamas is provided, along with how the Palestinians prisoners were received or how the deal was negotiated (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023). In article 7 and 8, a great deal of context is provided to describe the humanitarian situation in Gaza including, for example, how UNRWA funding has been suspended. (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024) or how food supplies are running out, among others important pieces of context. (Patil, 2024).

While *NYTimes* provides context on historical and current events, regarding settler colonial practices, the information provided is limited. For example, the occupied West Bank is called “West Bank” in the articles selected. In addition, in article 1 it is acknowledged that Israel and the Gaza Strip has a heavily fortified border “with walls and other fortifications” and that the Strip was placed “under a blockade” in 2007, which it is stated again in article 3. [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023); 3 – (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023)] In addition, there is no mention or explanation to why there are refugee camps in the Gaza Strip. The “siege” that Israel has imposed on Gaza and the lack of fuel, water, food, or electricity is also described in several of the articles [2 – (Abdulrahim et al., 2023); 3 – (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023); 4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023); 7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)].

Lastly, it is crucial to highlight that *NYTimes* states whether the footage has been verified not - “unverified video footage” [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023)] and provided the accounts of both sides - “officials from both sides offering different accounts” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)] or “neither side’s account could be independently verified” [2 – (Abdulrahim et al., 2023)] - , and whether a part, usually Israel or Israeli officials, do

not want to comment on a matter. For example, in article 6 it is stated that “the Israeli government would not comment on the death of Saleh al-Arouri” (Hubbard et al., 2024). Furthermore, in article 7, there is an important section, which is not part of the article itself, where it is stated how the Times covers the “war.” (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024) In this section, it is explained that journalists are not allowed to enter the Strip, but that the Times works with journalists in the strip, talks with residents and verifies the footage. In addition, if a video or image is not real or is edited, they state it, as can be seen in article 7, where it is stated that “the Israeli military released a drone video, which it edited.” (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)

6.3.6 Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations

As seen in the *BBC* and *Al Jazeera*, in the pieces of news selected of *The New York Times*, Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations are stated and they are not described as such. Some examples include the attacks against hospitals stated in article 2 and 4, the attacks perpetrated in buildings, mosques, and markets stated in article 3, and the killing or injuring of medical workers stated in article 6 [2 – (Abdulrahim et al., 2023); 3 – (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023); 4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023); 6 – (Hubbard et al., 2024)]

Nevertheless, in article 7 it is twice stated that “lawlessness” prevails in Gaza due to the Israeli intervention in the strip (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). Furthermore, in article 8, the attacks against aid facilities and the killing of aid workers are described, but it is not stated that it is a violation of War Law. In this article, however, Mr. Lazzarini, head of UNRWA, is cited stating that: attacks against UN facilities are commonplace, “in blatant disregard to IHL” (Patil, 2024). Furthermore, it is stated Volker Türk, the U.N.’s high commissioner for human rights has denounced the actions of Israel in the HRC. (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)

Article 5 is the only one in which the term “genocide” is used, since it covers the case filed by South Africa before the International Court of Justice (Carl, 2023). In addition, in this same article, the authors point out that “allegations of war crimes” by Israel and Palestinians groups in the “territories occupied by Israel in 1967” are under “investigation at the International Criminal Court” (Carl, 2023). Notwithstanding, it is specified that this court does not have jurisdiction over Israel, since it is not a member of the ICC.

Lastly, the United Nations, Human Rights organizations, representatives of several institutions – like Lazzarini, head of UNRWA -, or the World Food Program are cited throughout the articles selected to convey the relevance of the events that are taking place in Gaza.

6.3.7 Israeli-centric messages

Israeli-centric messages are reproduced in the articles selected. Nonetheless, since accounts from both sides and international actors are taken into consideration and cited, most of the Israeli narratives are debunked. This is especially noticeable in the last articles selected, since the harsh humanitarian conditions that Palestinians are suffering make it difficult to justify and perpetuate Israeli narratives.

“We are at war, and we will win it” is cited Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel in article 1, conveying Israeli narrative that Israel is at “war” against Hamas (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023). Nonetheless, Muhammad Deif, the leader of Hamas’s military wing, is also cited explaining that Hamas aim is to put an end to “the time of their rampaging without accountability” (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023). Both accounts are cited and explained, which is important for the audience to understand both positions. Notwithstanding, Israeli-centric message is also conveyed when Biden is cited stating that “Israel has a right to defend itself and its people,” which is an element introduced by Luntz (2009) in the Israeli Project dictionary.

In article 2, several Palestinian voices, especially journalist in the strip and civilians, are cited, while barely any Israeli voices are present (Abdulrahim et al., 2023). In it, it is stated that while Palestinian officials blamed the attack on Israel, Israel blamed it on the Palestinian faction Islamic Jihad in Gaza. Nonetheless, the authors state that “neither side’s account could be independently verified” (Abdulrahim et al., 2023). This is incredibly important since both accounts are stated, allowing the audience to judge the event as a whole and so Israeli narrative is not freely perpetuated. To further discredit this Israeli narrative, the Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem, which runs the Ahli hospital, is cited explaining that the Israeli military warned them to “evacuate its wards on Saturday, Sunday and Monday” (Abdulrahim et al., 2023). The Israeli military confirmed these calls, but it attributed to “a wider effort to encourage residents and community leaders in northern Gaza to flee southward” (Abdulrahim et al., 2023). This account is further

discredited when towards the end of the article it is stated that “two Israeli projectiles hit the same hospital that was struck on Tuesday night,” since it is explained that it had happen multiple times and that Israel had already attacked hospitals. (Abdulrahim et al., 2023).

In article 3, several Israel-centric messages are conveyed. The first of them is conveyed by a White House spokesman cited in the article, who stated that a cease-fire would “only benefit Hamas” (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023). This narrative is dangerous, since civilians need a cease-fire, and it would be the biggest beneficiaries. Secondly, Hagari is cited stating that Al-Shifa Hospital “was being used to shield Hamas’s headquarters beneath it” and so attacks against where targeting “terrorist infrastructure” (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023). Portraying Israeli actions as “counterterrorism” is one of the key elements of Luntz’s dictionary that allows Israel to legitimate these actions. Therefore, this narrative - which is especially dangerous since Israel is acting in breach of its international obligations -, has allowed Israel to “struck sites like apartment buildings, mosques and markets” and calling them legitimate targets (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023). Lastly, it is conveyed that, according to Western and Israeli officials, “Hamas has ample stockpiles” of food, medicine, and fuel “but refuses to put them to humanitarian uses” (Kingsley, Bergman, et al., 2023). Luntz (2009) explains that to convey Israeli centric messages, it is crucial to describe that “Hamas is out of step even with its own people” and put the putting the blame of them rather than in Israel. By explaining that Hamas refuses to share its allegedly “stockpiles” with Palestinians, Israel and its supporters are conveying this Israeli centric message described by Luntz.

In “South Africa accuses Israel of genocide in a U.N. court.”, several elements of the Israeli Project dictionary are perpetuated. Firstly, it is stated that “Israel has often said it is at war with Hamas, not the civilians of Gaza” [5 - (Carl, 2023)]. Luntz (2009) highlights that it is important to “differentiate between the Palestinian people and Hamas” and portrait only Hamas as the enemy (Israel willingness to “destroy Hamas” is also stated in articles 3 and 4). Secondly, Israel accused South Africa of cooperating with Hamas, which it describes “a terrorist organization that is calling for the destruction of the state of Israel” [5 - (Carl, 2023)]. Portraying Hamas as terrorist and Israeli actions as counterterrorism is one of the main elements of Luntz’s dictionary (2009). By relating South Africa to a “terrorist organization,” Israel is erasing the credibility of the case. Lastly, the Israeli government is cited explaining that “it has tried to limit the impact of the war on civilians”

and that the case “lacking a factual and a legal basis,” Israel is further pushing the narrative that this case is not legitimate, and Carl (2023) is perpetuating it.

In article 6 the Israeli narrative that states that Israel did not strike Beirut to kill Saleh al-Arouri is debunked. A U.S. official is cited explaining that Israel is expected to assassinate Hamas officials “for years” (Hubbard et al., 2024). Furthermore, in this article, as well as in some previous ones, the authors state that “Israel vowed to destroy the organization and eliminate its leadership” and even that this vow can even be consider a “game” since Israel created “a deck of playing cards”, where Mr. al-Arouri was the “joker,” to help its soldiers “identify Hamas leaders” (Hubbard et al., 2024). The authors of the article also provide context to previous assassinations of Israeli enemies outside its borders to further debunk Israeli narrative.

As in the previous article, authors debunk Israeli narratives several times in article 7, which is the one that covers the attack on an aid convoy in February 2024. Israel attributed the deaths of several civilian to a “stampede” and those Israeli forces only “fired warning shots” to stop civilians (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). Nevertheless, the authors state that “Israeli forces opened fire” and that “12 gunshot victims” were sent to the hospital (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). In addition, an Israeli military official is cited explaining that “people attempted to seize” the aid vehicles, which caused a stampede and so Israeli forces answered firing “warning shots” (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). Nevertheless, the authors of the article explain that the official did not provide a timeline nor elaborated on “whether any people were killed or injured in the shooting” (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). Israel further tried to convey its message by sharing a video of the aid convoy. Nonetheless, the *NYTimes* stated that the video was edited and cut, and that the people on the video are seen “crawling behind walls and appearing to take cover” (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). By explaining this, the authors are questioning Israeli narrative and debunking it.

Lastly, also in article 7, the narrative described by Lutz (2009) of United nations and how this organizations works against Israel is perpetuated. Volker Türk, the U.N.’s high commissioner for human rights, is cited describing what is occurring in Gaza as a “carnage” (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). In response, Meirav Eilon Shahar, Israel’s ambassador to the United Nations in Geneva, is cited stating that the UN ignores “Israel’s security concerns,” that Israeli’s approach to “terrorist groups that use civilians as human

shields was consistent with international law” and questioning if the Israeli victims of the October 7 attack do not matter to the United Nations (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024). By including this statement, *NYTimes* is perpetuating several narratives described by Luntz in his dictionary. Firstly, Hamas is picture as a wound for its own civilians. Secondly, it raises Israeli “security concerns,” describing Hamas a terrorist organization and Israeli actions as counterterrorism, and, lastly, it tries to reframe Israeli actions as “Israel defending itself from Oct. 7, 2023, attacks.

6.3.8 Language bias

Language bias is persistent in the articles selected. First and most importantly, the authors refer to the “occupied West Bank” as the “West bank” as seen, for example, in articles 1, 4, 5 and 6. Moreover, the current situation is referred to as “war;” a word that is cited in 6 of the eight articles (1, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8) As commented, employing this term is problematic since it equals the parties in conflict and place, they in the same level of force.

There is also language bias when Israeli “hostages” under 18 are referred to as “children” and Palestinian “prisoners” are considered “minors” or “teenagers” [4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023)]. Furthermore, “hostages” are also referred to as “captives,” which is not such a strong and negatively charged word as “hostages.” Therefore, *The New York Times* is falling in language bias when employing this word.

Members of Hamas are referred to as “fighters” [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023); 6 – (Hubbard et al., 2024)] - , “militants” [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023)] , “commanders” [6 – (Hubbard et al., 2024); 8 - (Patil, 2024)], or “members” [6 – (Hubbard et al., 2024)]. None of this word is consistently repeated throughout the pieces of news selected, but it is crucial to mention that the word “terrorist” is not directly used to refer to Hamas’s members. This word - which is stated in articles 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7, - is used, for example, to explain that Hamas is “listed as a terrorist group by the United States” in articles 1 and 6 [1 – (Kingsley & Kershner, 2023); 6 – (Hubbard et al., 2024)].

In the pieces of news selected, the authors tend to use euphemisms to refer to attacks. Some examples include phrases like “blast in Gaza” / “explosion” [2 – (Abdulrahim et al., 2023)] or “Israeli military intervention” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)]. Nonetheless, the authors also choose accurate words and phrases to describe the situation of Palestinians and the actions Israel is carrying out. Phrases like “siege” [3 – (Kingsley,

Bergman, et al., 2023); 4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023); 7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)], “bloodshed” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)] or “lethal strike” [8 - (Patil, 2024)] are employed to convey what Palestinians are suffering. To convey this message – and make the articles more visual - is common that the authors use adjectives and adverbs, like “painstaking negotiation” [4 – (Kingsley, Goldbaum et al., 2023)], “wounded Palestinians” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)], “starvation is rampant” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)], “desperation and spiraling lawlessness” [7 – (Yazbek & Boxerman, 2024)].

Lastly, it is important to consider that language bias is especially important in the headlines of two of the articles selected. The headline of article two reads “A Sudden Blast, Then Carnage in a Hospital Courtyard,” while the one on article seven states “As hungry Gazans crowd an aid convoy, a crush of bodies, Israeli gunshots and a deadly toll.” These two headlines are problematic since there is no real connection between the events listed, there is no mention of who the actor is and what the piece of news is about. These headlines are abstract and difficult for the reader to understand.

7. Discussion

Upon such an outline of the results obtained from the articles selected and coded, this thesis will further discuss the results found, to compare the framing strategies employed by these media outlets.

Orientalist discourse: Regarding elements of orientalist discourse, this is especially prominent in the *BBC* articles selected. Examples include considering Hamas terrorist or referring to the Gazan health ministry as “ Hamas-run.” In the articles of *The New York Times* and *Al Jazeera*, these elements are not prominent, but they are present. *The New York Times* does incorporate the word “terrorist” in its articles, and it explains that Hamas “seized control of Gaza,” when it won elections, instead. In addition, even if Palestinians are not portrait as antisemitic in the articles, they are only portrait as refugees, which is a big element of the orientalist discourse. There is no information on any of the articles selected of any of these media outlets of how life in Gaza before October 7 was, which is important to debunk the myth that Palestinians are only refugees.

Palestinians suffering: *Al Jazeera* is out of the three newspapers that covers the suffering of Palestinians the most in the events selected. *The New York times* does so but in less

extent than *Al Jazeera*, since the American newspaper mainly focuses on the shortage of basic commodities. The *BBC* barely considers the suffering of Palestinians and focuses on covering the events or going back to October 7 to restate the killings of Israeli civilians.

Hostages: Regarding the hostages framework, it is worth recalling that the *BBC* mentions the hostages in seven of the eight articles selected, which demonstrate the importance the media outlet gives to this event. In addition, in the article that covers the release of the hostages, a precise description of each hostage release is included. *Al Jazeera* and *NYTimes* do not reiterate this fact as often and their article that covered this event is simpler and do not provide as much information on the hostages as the one of the *BBC*, but rather cover the cease-fire deal or the prisoner release. In the case of the article of *The New York Times*, this media outlet provides information on the cease-fire deal and humanitarian aid, while *Al Jazeera* focuses on the release of prisoners and explaining why there were Thais among the hostages and in Israel as a whole.

Regarding the language used, Palestinians are referred to as “prisoners” in the three newspapers, but *Al Jazeera* also refer to them as people “detained in Israel jails.” Israelis, instead, are referred to as “hostages” in the *BBC*, “hostages” or “captives” in *The New York Times*, and mainly “captives” in *Al Jazeera*. “Children” is used both for Israelis and Palestinians in *Al Jazeera*. The *BBC* and *NYTimes* will use “children” for Israelis and “minors” or “teenagers” for Palestinians.

Civilians and the use of passive voice: In the case of *Al Jazeera*, Israel is placed as the actor of the killings, even when passive voice is introduced, and the data of Palestinians killed since October 7, 2023, is stated more often than that of Israelis killed. Lastly, when introducing this data, the authors include phrases like “health ministry say.”

In contrast, the *BBC* employs phrases like “ Hamas-run ministry says,” which reduces the credibility of the statements. In addition, the number of Israelis killed on October 7, 2023, is restated in seven of the eight articles, out of which six times is stated before the numbers of Palestinians killed, which is considerably higher. The use of passive voice is also common when referring to Palestinians killed.

Lastly, in *The New York Times*, the use of Passive voice is common to refer to Palestinians killed. As in *Al Jazeera*, when stating these numbers, the journalist cites “Gazan

authorities,” for example. Nonetheless, this practice is also done when sharing the numbers of Israelis killed, when phrases like “according to Israeli officials” are used.

Missing context: *BBC UK* is the media outlet out of the three that provides the least amount of context, both of current and historical events. Regarding settler colonial practices, it does acknowledge the occupation of the West Bank and the existence of walls and fortified borders around Gaza, but this topic is barely touched on. On the other hand, *Al Jazeera* provides context on current and historical events, settler colonial practices, and cites international leaders to provide a broader context. Nonetheless, it does not mention crucial historical events like previous wars. In contrast, *The New York Times* mentions the 1967 War, Yom Kippur War, among others. This media outlet also provides context on current events and acknowledges settler colonial practices, even if it does not elaborate much on the latter. *The New York Times* is, therefore, the media outlet that provides the most context out of the three.

None of these media outlets, however, provide information on why there are refugee camps in Gaza and only *The New York Times* mentions Jabaliya, one of these camps.

Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law violations: When covering Human Rights violations is common that these newspapers do not frame them as such. Notwithstanding, *Al Jazeera* provides greater context than the other two outlets when covering these violations, since it cites international conventions, experts and states that attacking aid centers is a crime. *The New York Times* also provides greater information than the *BBC*, especially in the last article, but it is not as prominent as in the case of *Al Jazeera*.

Israeli-centric messages: Israeli-centric messages and structures of The Israel Project dictionary are present in the three Newspapers. Notwithstanding, it should be recalled that citing Israel and Israeli-centric messages does not always make a piece of news biased. If these narratives are engaged with and proofs are provided to debunked it, a piece of news should not be considered bias. By including accounts from both sides, different voices and full context of the events, an Israeli-Centric message can be debunked. Therefore, media outlets should actively engage with the statements and provide both sides of the narrative, so audiences can build an informed opinion.

Taking this into consideration, in the articles selected of the *BBC* the authors do not engage with the Israeli-centric messages; these are reproduced, and Palestinian voices are less cited in comparison. In the case of *Al Jazeera*, these narratives are present but do not prevail. The authors engage with Israeli messages and cite Palestinians to counter them. Furthermore, towards the last articles selected Israeli voices are not cited. In the case of *NYTimes*, Israeli voices and messages prevail. Even if Israeli-centric messages are sometimes debunked and engaged with, this is still the main narrative present in the articles selected, favoring Israel over Palestine.

Language Bias: Language bias is present in the three newspapers. Employing euphemisms to refer to attacks is a widespread practice, and the word “war” is present in the articles selected of these three outlets. In addition, none of these outlets employ the word “Palestine.” In contrast, they use “Gaza,” “Strip,” “Gaza Strip” and “occupied West Bank” to refer to the occupied territories. *The New York Times*, however, is the only out of the three that states “West Bank.”

The New York Times and *Al Jazeera* employ harder language when covering the suffering of Palestinians but is *Al Jazeera* the one that focuses the most on this topic. Moreover, both the American and the Arab media agencies employ adjectives and adverbs in the articles. In addition, *Al Jazeera* mainly uses the word “fighters” to refer to members of Hamas, conveying the idea of Palestinian resistance. In contrast, the *BBC* refers to them as “militants.” *The New York Times* uses both “militants” and “fighters,” along with “commander,” but “militant” is the main word used.

8. Conclusion

This analysis has provided answers to the research questions proposed. However, it has proven false some of the hypotheses presented. The findings are laid down hereunder.

H1: *Al Jazeera* is more likely to frame Palestinians in a positive light and Israel as the occupier, while *BBC UK* and *NYTimes* are more likely to follow the Orientalist framework and replicate certain elements and structures of the Israeli Project dictionary.

Al Jazeera does frame Palestinians in a more favorable light than *NYTimes* and the *BBC*, who are more likely to incorporate Israeli-centric messages, orientalist discourse

framework elements and structures of Luntz's dictionary. *Al Jazeera* frames Hamas actions as resistance and shares the suffering of Palestinians, conveying the settler colonial practices employed by Israel.

H2: Israeli voices prevail in all these media, but Al-Jazeera is more likely than *BBC UK* and *NYTimes* to incorporate Palestinian voices when reporting.

In the case of *NYTimes* and *BBC UK*, this hypothesis is proven. Nevertheless, *NYTimes* incorporated more Palestinian voices than *BBC UK*, especially because the American media outlet relies on journalists in the Strip – who are likely to be Palestinians – and residents for its coverage. In the case of *Al Jazeera*, the media outlet does not incorporate Israeli voices in the last articles selected but continues to cite Palestinians, Hamas authorities and international experts who explain the situation in Gaza.

H3: There has been a shift in the tone of the media over the last months and they are not framing Israeli actions as self-defense strategies anymore.

While in the first articles selected *Al Jazeera* would incorporate Israeli voices, this is not the case in the last two articles. In these articles, *Al Jazeera* focuses on the suffering of Palestinians portraying Israel as the main actor and cause of this suffering. *Al Jazeera* has taken a stricter position and has distanced itself from Israeli narratives. On the other hand, the *BBC* has not drastically changed how it reports on the issues. The suffering of Palestinians is not incorporated into its coverage, and it continues to perpetuate Israeli narratives in the last articles. Lastly, in the articles of *The New York Times* selected it is difficult to see a shift on the framing strategies employed by the journalist. The political line of the media outlet is strictly aligned with the one of the United States and, since this country is one of the main allies of Israel, the shift is barely noticeable. However, in the last articles *NYTimes* does acknowledge the International Law violations committed by Israel.

RQ1: How do *BBC UK*, *Al Jazeera* and *The New York Times* frame the current Palestinian-Israeli crisis in their coverage and how do these frames vary based on their political stance?

Since the *BBC* and *The New York Times* reproduce Israeli-centric messages and, in the case of the *BBC*, elements of the orientalist discourse, it can be concluded that their

political stance is closer to Israeli narratives than Palestinians narratives. In addition, it should be taken into consideration the political stance of the governments of the states where these media outlets are based. Both the United States and the United Kingdom have backed Israel and, therefore, *The New York Times* and *BBC UK* are more likely to be biased towards Palestinians. In fact, as it has been explained, both media outlets have been accused of misrepresenting Palestinians and their cause. Notwithstanding, these media outlets differ in the fact that, while *The New York Times* provides both historical and current context, *BBC UK* only focuses on the event it is covering, which makes its coverage and analysis shallower. In the case of *Al Jazeera* as an Arab media, Palestine, Palestinians, and their cause are represented in a more favorable light. In its articles, it focuses on the suffering of Palestinians rather than focusing on Israel as the victim of the October 7 attacks.

RQ2: Do these newspapers follow the orientalist discourse framework or repeat specific elements of the Israel Project dictionary?

The *BBC* is the media outlet that follows the orientalist discourse framework the most out of the three outlets studied. Important examples include the usage of “terrorist” to describe Hamas members and “Hamas-run ministry” to present the numbers of Palestinians killed since October 7. In addition, this newspaper reproduces specific elements of the Israeli Project dictionary and does not engage nor react to it, making the Israeli narrative the cornerstone of its articles. On the other hand, In the articles selected from *The New York Times*, few examples of orientalist discourse framework prevail. Nonetheless, the American media outlet does reproduce Israeli centric messages and specific elements of Luntz’s dictionary. Even if the authors of the articles engage with the Israeli narrative and provide proofs to debunk it on several occasions, these narratives prevail over the ones of Palestinians. Finally, Regarding *Al Jazeera*, orientalist discourse framework is barely present in the articles selected and Israeli voices and narratives do not prevail. Israeli-centric messages are engaged with and debunked by citing international experts, Palestinians voices or international conventions.

RQ3: Are there any references to previous events - like the *al-Nakba* – or there is missing context when reporting on Israel and Palestine?

Both *Al Jazeera* and *The New York Times* reference previous events and clashes between Palestine and Israel. Notwithstanding, *The New York Times* provides more context than the Middle Eastern media outlet. *NYTimes* references the Yom Kippur War, the 1967 War, among other notable events. Regarding the *BBC*, the British media outlet is out of the three the one that provides the less historical context, so it makes it difficult for the audience to understand the history between the two parties involved. Due to this fact, the October 7, 2023, attack carried out by Hamas appears to be baseless and coming “out of nowhere”, even if authorities of Hamas have explained why they committed it.

As this study has shown, different newspapers will frame the same event differently due to the information they are able to acquire, their political stance and the interest of the media outlet. Framing, which is defined both by what is included and by what is omitted of a narrative, and by what element is given more salience to, can change abruptly from one media outlet to another.

9. References

- Abdulrahim, R., Yazbek, H. and Al-Hlou, Y. (2023). *A Sudden Blast, Then Carnage in a Hospital Courtyard*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/18/world/middleeast/gaza-hospital-deaths-aftermath.html>
- Adams, P. and Gritten, P. (2024). *Israel-Gaza war: More than 100 reported killed in crowd near Gaza aid convoy*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-68434443>
- Addameer (2024). *Summary of arrest campaign data from October 7th until today, April 22, 2024*. Addameer.org. <https://addameer.org/news/5327>
- Al Jazeera (2023a). *Israel retaliation kills 230 Palestinians after Hamas operation*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/10/7/sirens-warn-of-rockets-launched-towards-israel-from-gaza-news-reports>
- Al Jazeera (2023b). *Gaza authorities say hundreds killed in Israeli air raid on hospital*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/10/17/gaza-authorities-say-hundreds-killed-in-israeli-air-raid-on-hospital>
- Al Jazeera (2023c). *Israel intensifies Gaza bombardment as internet and phone services go down*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/10/27/israel-intensifies-gaza-bombardment-as-internet-and-phone-services-go-down>
- Al Jazeera (2023d). *Hamas releases 24 captives from Gaza as Israel truce comes into effect*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/11/24/hamas-releases-24-hostages-from-gaza-after-truce-comes-into-effect>
- Al Jazeera (2023e). *South Africa files case at ICJ accusing Israel of 'genocidal acts' in Gaza*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/12/29/south-africa-files-case-at-icj-accusing-israel-of-genocidal-acts-in-gaza>
- Al Jazeera (2024). *Senior Hamas official Saleh al-Arouri killed in Beirut suburb*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/1/2/top-hamas-official-saleh-al-arouri-killed-in-beirut-suburb>

- Al Jazeera Staff (2024a). *'Massacre': Dozens killed by Israeli fire in Gaza while collecting food aid*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/2/29/dozens-killed-injured-by-israeli-fire-in-gaza-while-collecting-food-aid>
- Al Jazeera Staff (2024b). *'Death trap': Israeli forces kill six in new attack on Gaza aid seekers*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/3/14/death-trap-israeli-forces-kill-six-aid-seekers-in-gaza-city>
- Almahallawi, W., & Zanuddin, H. (2018). *50 days of war on innocent civilian: Maan news agency coverage of Israeli and Palestinian conflict*. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.9), 145–150. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.9.2063>
- Attar, D., & King, G. (2023). *Media framing of the Intifada of the Knives*. *Media, War & Conflict*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17506352221149554>
- Baron, D. P. (2006). *Persistent media bias*. *Journal of Public Economics*, 90(1-2), 1–36. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2004.10.006
- Berg, R. and Baker, G. (2024). *Hamas deputy leader Saleh al-Arouri killed in Beirut blast*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-67866346>
- Bhowmik, S., & Fisher, J. (2023). *Framing the Israel-Palestine conflict 2021: Investigation of CNN's coverage from a peace journalism perspective*. *Media, Culture & Society*, 45(5), 1019-1035. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231154766>
- Caballero, J.X. (2010). *The Impact of Media Bias on Coverage of Catastrophic Events: Case Study from The New York Times' Coverage of the Palestine/Israel Conflict*. https://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/7515/1/Caballero_2010.pdf
- Carl, T. (2023). *South Africa accuses Israel of genocide in a U.N. court*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/29/world/middleeast/south-africa-israel-genocide.html>
- Carruthers, S. L. (2011). *The media at war* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chaevich, A., & Shirshikov, V. (2021). *The Role of Media during Conflicts*. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/m2vxh>

- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environments. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 99–118. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00331.x
- De Simone, D. and Davies, A. (2023). *South Africa files ICJ case accusing Israel of 'genocidal acts'*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-67844551>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). *Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm*. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Entman, R. M. (2007). *Framing bias: media in the distribution of power*. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 163-173. http://www.communicationcache.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10887248/framing_bias-_media_in_the_distribution_of_power.pdf
- Fog, K., Budtz, C., Munch, P., & Blanchette, S. (2010). *Storytelling*. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-88349-4
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1987). *The changing culture of affirmative action*. In R. G. Braungart & M. M. Braungart (Eds.), *Research in political sociology* (Vol. 3, pp. 137–177). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Gritten, D. (2023) *Gaza sees heaviest night of Israeli bombardment since start of war*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-67248320>
- Gritten, D. (2024) *Gaza war: UNRWA says Rafah aid centre hit by Israeli forces*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-68557035>
- Gritten, D. & Pelham, L. (2024) *Khan Younis: UN says 12 killed at Gaza shelter as fighting rages*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-68078580>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.

- Hibri, C. (2023) *Orientalism: Edward Said's groundbreaking book explained*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/orientalism-edward-saids-groundbreaking-book-explained-197429>
- Horsley, K. (2007). *Storytelling, conflict, and diversity*. Community Development Journal, 42(2), 265–269. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44259047>
- Hubbard, B., Bergman, B., Boxerman, A., Ward, E. and Schmitt, E. (2024) *Top Hamas Official Is Killed in Lebanon as Fears Grow of a Wider War*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/01/02/world/middleeast/israel-hamas-leader-war.html>
- International Committee of the Red Cross (2008) *How is the Term "Armed Conflict" Defined in International Humanitarian Law?* ICRC. <https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/assets/files/other/opinion-paper-armed-conflict.pdf>
- International Committee of the Red Cross (n.d.) *Exploring Humanitarian Law: Glossary*. ICRC. <https://www.icrc.org/data/files/ehl/ehl-english-glossary.pdf>
- International Court of Justice (2023, December 29). *The Republic of South Africa institutes proceedings against the State of Israel and requests the Court to indicate provisional measures*. [Press release]. <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/192/192-20231229-pre-01-00-en.pdf>
- Jhally, S. (dir.) (2016). *The Occupation of the American Mind*. New York (NY): Media Education Foundation. Film, 84- minutes. <https://vimeo.com/277492186>.
- Johnson, A. & Ali, O. (2024) *Coverage of Gaza in the New York Times and other major newspapers heavily favoured Israel, analysis shows*. The Intercept. <https://theintercept.com/2024/01/09/newspapers-israel-palestine-bias-new-york-times/>
- King, G., & Jegić, D. (2024). *Copyediting Palestine: Media bias in journalism style guides*. [Editar Palestina: Sesgo Mediático en los Manuales de Estilo Periodístico]. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 82, 01-20. <https://www.doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2024-2052>
- Kingsley, P., Bergman, R., Zraick, K. and Yazbek, H. (2023) *Israel Intensifies Gaza Strikes and Says It Is Expanding Ground Activity*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/27/world/middleeast/israel-gaza-raid-hamas.html>

- Kingsley, P., Goldbaum, C., Nazzal, R. and Yuhas, A. (2023) *First Captives Freed in Tense Gaza Truce Between Israel and Hamas*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/24/world/middleeast/israel-hamas-hostage-deal.html>
- Kingsley, P. and Kershner, I. (2023) *'We Are at War,' Netanyahu Says After Hamas Attacks Israel*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/07/world/middleeast/israel-netanyahu-hamas-attack.html>
- Knell, Y., Berg, R. and Gritten, D. (2023) *Israel attack: PM says Israel at war after 250 killed in attack from Gaza*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-67036625>
- Lentin, R. (Ed.). (2008). *Thinking Palestine* / edited by Ronit Lentin. Zed Books. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350223646>
- Luntz, F.(2009) *The Israel Project's 2009 Global Language Dictionary*. The Israel Project. <https://www.transcend.org/tms/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/sf-israel-projects-2009-global-language-dictionary.pdf>
- Mercier, A. (2005). *War and media: Constancy and convulsion*. International Review of the Red Cross, 87(860), 649–659. doi:10.1017/S1816383100184486
- Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B., & Roselle, L. (2012). *Forging the World: Strategic Narratives and International Relations*. Royal Holloway.
- Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B., & Roselle, L. (2013). *Strategic Narratives: Communication Power and the New World Order* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315871264>
- Mokhiber, C. (2023) *Resignation Letter*. DocumentCloud. <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/24103463-craig-mokhiber-resignation-letter>
- Morrisette, E., McKeon, G., Louie, A., Luther, A., and Fagen A., (2017) *Introduction to Media Studies*. PressBooks. <https://pressbooks.pub/mediastudies/chapter/media-bias/>
- Newsweek Staff. (2010). *How to sell Americans on Israeli settlements*. <https://www.newsweek.com/how-sell-americans-israeli-settlements-81783>

- OXFAM International (2024) *Daily death rate in Gaza higher than any other major 21st Century conflict - Oxfam*. Oxfam. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/daily-death-rate-gaza-higher-any-other-major-21st-century-conflict-oxfam>
- Patil, A. (2024) *Israeli forces make a lethal strike on a U.N. aid warehouse in Rafah..* The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/03/13/world/middleeast/rafah-gaza-aid-israel-unrwa.html>
- Puddephatt, A. (2006) *Voices of War: Conflict and the Role of the Media*. International Media Support, Copenhagen.
- Rai, A. K. (2000) *Media at war: Issues and limitations*, Strategic Analysis, 24:9, 1681-1694, DOI: 10.1080/09700160008455312
- Roberts, G. (2006). *History, Theory, and the Narrative Turn in IR*. Review of International Studies, 32(4), 703–714. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40072179>
- Rosas, P. (2023) *Procesados desde los 12 años: los niños palestinos juzgados por tribunales militares en Israel*. BBC News Mundo. <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/articles/cv2zzk1p7l7o>
- Rufo, Y. (2023) London doctor in Gaza says hospital ceiling fell in after blast. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-london-67142786>
- Rutledge, P. (2016). *Everything is Story: Telling Stories and Positive Psychology*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343921003_Everything_is_Story_Telling_Stories_and_Positive_Psychology
- Safdar, A. (2023) *As Israel pounds Gaza, BBC journalists accuse broadcaster of bias*. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/11/23/as-israel-pounds-gaza-bbc-journalists-accuse-broadcaster-of-bias>
- Said, E.W. (1979). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.
- Said, E. W. (1980). *The question of Palestine*. Vintage Books.
- Said, E. W. (2001). *Introduction*. In E. Said and C. Hitchens (eds.), *Blaming the victims: spurious scholarship and the Palestinian question* (pp. 1 – 19). Verso.

https://refugeeacademy.org/upload/library/Blaming_the_Victims_Spurious_Scholarship_and_the_Palestinian.pdf

Scheufele, D. A. (2000) *Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication*, *Mass Communication & Society*, 3:2-3, 297-316, DOI: 10.1207/S15327825MCS0323_07

Schmitt, O. (2018) *When are strategic narratives effective? The shaping of political discourse through the interaction between political myths and strategic narratives*, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 39:4, 487-511, DOI: 10.1080/13523260.2018.1448925

Senehi, J. (2002) *Constructive Storytelling: A Peace Process*. *Peace and Conflict Studies*: Vol. 9: No. 2 , Article 3. DOI:10.46743/1082-7307/2002.1026 Available at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs/vol9/iss2/3>

Siddiqui, U., and Zaheer, O.A. (2018). *50 Years of Occupation A Sentiment and N-Gram Analysis of U.S. Mainstream Media Coverage of the Israeli Occupation of Palestine*. 416Labs. Retrieved from: https://www.media-palestine.online/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/416_LABS_50_Years_Of_Occupation.pdf

The Israel Project (n.d.a). *Home* [LinkedIn page]. LinkedIn. Retrieved January 9, 2024, from <https://www.linkedin.com/company/the-israel-project/about/>

The Israel Project (n.d.b) *What is TIP*. The Israel Project. <https://web.archive.org/web/20130910214435/http://www.theisraelproject.org/what-is-tip/>

UN-ESCWA (2017). *Israeli practices toward the Palestinian people and the question of Apartheid*. Retrieved from: https://electronicintifada.net/sites/default/files/2017-03/un_apartheid_report_15_march_english_final_.pdf

UN General Assembly, *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, A/RES/260A(III), 9 December 1948, <https://www.refworld.org/legal/agreements/unga/1973/en/26955>

UN General Assembly, *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, A/RES/44/25, 20 November 1989, <https://www.unicef.org/media/52626/file>

UN General Assembly, *International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid*, A/RES/3068(XXVIII), 30 November 1973, <https://www.refworld.org/legal/agreements/unga/1973/en/26955>

United Nations Human Rights (2023, November 2). *Gaza is 'running out of time' UN experts warn, demanding a ceasefire to prevent genocide*. [Press release]. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2023/11/gaza-running-out-time-un-experts-warn-demanding-ceasefire-prevent-genocide>

Williams, P. & Ball, A. (2014). *Where is Palestine?*, *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 50:2, 127-133, DOI: 10.1080/17449855.2014.883164

Wright, G. (2023). *Israel-Gaza: Families' relief as hostages released*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-67524090>

Yazbek, H. and Boxerman, A. (2024). *As Hungry Gazans Crowd an Aid Convoy, a Crush of Bodies, Israeli Gunshots and a Deadly Toll*. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/02/29/world/middleeast/israel-gaza-palestinian-death-toll.html>

Zanuddin, H., & Almahallawi, W. (2018). *Media Framing Approach Of Israelis And Palestinian Conflict*. In M. Imran Qureshi (Ed.), *Technology & Society: A Multidisciplinary Pathway for Sustainable Development*, vol 40. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences* (pp. 682-694). Future Academy. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.05.56>

9. Annexes

9.1 Interview with Sarah Babiker on November 20, 2023. (Transcript in English, own translation)

Vega: How would you define the media coverage that is being made of Palestine in Spain at the moment?

Sarah Babiker: I think it is quite terrible even if Spain is not one of the worst countries in this paradigm of intensification. Let's say [that there is] a frame that assumes without discussion the proposals of the State of Israel and I think it is the product of a very powerful propaganda machine that is deepening more and more both in media and political spaces of the country. The COM [Media] and to others are reproducing it uncritically [for example] to describe Palestinian resistance as terrorism, to insist all the time on the right of self-defense of Israel, and even in more subtle issues and structurally dangerous issues. For example, those [frames] that have to do with erasing the context, with erasing history, with not making an analysis that goes back to a colonial scheme, or with reducing the whole history to peaceful attempts and the peaceful settlements in the 1990s that has not resulted in any progress or improvement of the Palestinian people. In contrast, we are, in one of the worst historical moments for the population in occupied Palestine. So, yes, that would pretty much be my idea. I believe that there are more left-wing or critical media, let's say, for not placing them on the left, which do retain a more critical look. Some include a colonial analysis and includes history, but these are not the main media. The mainstream media with a larger audience are directly reproducing the Israeli propaganda, or are adopting a equidistant frame, in which both sides have an equal situation. This frame certainly does no favors, not only the cause of the Palestinian people, but also to human rights, and any discourse that puts human rights at the center.

Vega: I wanted to ask you if you think that Israel's narratives prevail in the Spanish media and if Palestinian voices are missing.

Sarah Babiker: I can't give you a super complete analysis of this because I'm not really following the other Spanish media because I get depressed. But I believe that [the Israeli narrative] prevails, that narrative is normalized, and it creates into an axis of "us" and "them" that takes root even more deeply. [It is rooted] in the broader narrative that is working in the European Union and that has to do with Islamophobia, with the fear of

migration, with our European values and so on. [In this narrative] this "we", even if it is a subconscious way, encompasses Israel and not Palestine. From that subconscious identity thing, it's easier to empathize or put us in the place of a white Israeli living in a house like ours than [in the place of] a Muslim Arab Palestinian living in a refugee camp. I do think the media does encourage this narrative and promote this worldview, consciously or unconsciously. But I do believe that the thing goes beyond Zionist propaganda. There is a whole network, or a cultural scenario based on confrontation in which Palestinians lose: they are assimilated like that other threatening Muslim Arab, barbaric, savage, that kills like a beast, while the Israelis kill with bombs of last generation and high technology.

Vega: In your articles and interviews you use terms like ethnic cleansing or genocide. Why do you think it is important that the media use these terms and not others like conflict or war, which are the terms that are usually seen in the mainstream media?

Sarah Babiker: Because we have to call a spade a spade. If something is making this last chapter of the Israeli colonizing enterprise possible, it is that there is no timidity or second reading in what they claim. We have heard ministers and relevant figures from the Israeli government say, "we must end all", "Gaza is going to be ours", "how beautiful Gaza is." So, I think it is necessary to make everyone understand this very strong evidence. To bomb for 45 days such a small and populated territory, to force the displacement of one million six hundred thousand people from a population of two million three hundred thousand... If that is not ethnic cleansing and genocide, we do not know what it can be. It is very important to repeat these words because they also have to enter into the collective imaginary with all the dimensions they have.

What does seem dangerous to me is that we end up normalizing this. There is a certain acceleration of news, impacts and shocks. We will see within some time if "genocide" becomes part of the realpolitik. [Maybe] It will be something that we can assume as long as the genocide is against the "others."

9.2 Excerpt of the interview with Dr. Gretchen King conducted on March 14, 2024.

Vega Pérez Castro: Sometimes the coverage of *Al Jazeera* English and *Al Jazeera* Arabic is different. How are these differences visible and why do those differences exist in the first place?

Dr. Gretchen King: Any kind of private media entity is a for-profit entity, and it is trying to monetize its content for its basic means of income and sustainability, that includes everything from advertising to the kind of monetization that happens through their websites, through their social media platforms and so on.

When you look at what *Al Jazeera* Arabic is doing versus what *Al Jazeera* English is doing, you have to think about the ways in which they're trying to turn their media into a commodity or monetize the audiences that see that media, and so they're trying to get the biggest mass audience as possible, because that means more income.

That means catering the content to the pre-existing ideas of the audience and not putting out there something that's too challenging that would potentially offend or turn the audience away. So, they want to be that reliable source.

I think *Al Jazeera* remains the predominant source that's broadcasting in both English and Arabic that still has journalists reporting on the ground in Gaza because of the systemic nature of the Israel attacks shooting to kill, murder and otherwise bomb and murder Palestinian journalists. There are still a number who get quite a wide audience on *Al Jazeera*.

In terms of the differences, also, I think that it comes back to who's managing and what policies are implemented in these newsrooms and also which experience is the management and the journalists are coming from. We've seen different waves of journalists populating *Al Jazeera*, both in English and Arabic.

If you ever have a chance to visit, I think you should visit *Al Jazeera* and Doha, and see who works there. And surprisingly, there are a lot of Palestinians working on both the English and the Arabic side. I think that also puts Palestinians in a better position towards self-representation.

But without it being a Palestinian owned media It's not full self-representation because it ultimately is to up to the line the economic line and the political line because, as we know, *Al Jazeera* does have links to the Qatari government, and it is considered a form of state media. Even though it brands itself as a public broadcaster, it's very much restricted to the rules of Qatar as it is licensed and operates mainly from there. That also influences the differences that we see coming out of the Arabic side versus the English side of *Al Jazeera*.