

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

Mark Rebeck

Introduction

While the opinion and editorial (op-ed) pages can be considered as the voice of a newspaper, articulating its ideology, the hard-news story is commonly seen as representing the subjective raw facts, undistorted by any kind of bias. However, against this popular assumption is the view, held by certain media analysts such as Peter White¹, that because communication cannot simply be divorced from the beliefs, assumptions and prejudices of those who are doing the mediation, "all news reports are inevitably subjective" (White, 2000).

This paper takes at its starting point the premise that the hard-news story is "inevitably subjective". Four newspaper articles will be compared in order to ascertain the ways in which this subjectivity manifests itself. The story covered in these articles is an attack on Israelis at a bus stop near Tel-Aviv by a Palestinian bus driver, which took place on February 14, 2001, during the period of the second *intifada* (Palestinian uprising)². The attack did not involve a bomb or firearm, and the perpetrator was also caught alive. It thus stood out from the many bombings, shootings and suicide attacks on Israelis that preceded, and were to follow it, and was consequently the focus of extensive news coverage. The articles are from the following newspapers:

1. *The Independent*: a British broadsheet³.
2. *The Times*: a British broadsheet.
3. *The Muslim News*: Internet edition of a monthly newspaper providing news and views of Muslims in the United Kingdom⁴.
4. *Haaretz* (English language edition): Internet edition of an Israeli national daily (established in 1919, before the foundation of the state of Israel in 1948).

A British reader with an interest in the Middle East would probably be aware of the traditional position taken on the Israel-Palestine problem by *The Times* (generally pro-Israel) and the *Independent* (generally pro-Palestinian), and could also predict the stance that the *Muslim News* and *Haaretz* would be expected to adopt. The aim of this paper is to show how an analysis of the linguistic features of newspaper texts can reveal the way different journalists represent and evaluate, whether overtly or in more subtle ways, an event and its human participants.

The analysis begins with an examination of the headline and lead; the lead (the first paragraph of a news report) has been called the “micro-story” (Bell 1992, 176), containing the essence of the story’s news value.

Section two considers intertextual positioning. This refers to the quoting or referencing of the words or thoughts of another by a writer. By importing the words and thoughts of other people into a text, the writer indicates or implies that these quotes are, at the very least, relevant to his/her current communicative purposes.

The third section examines attitudinal positioning. An utterance that is attitudinal either conveys a negative or positive assessment, or can be interpreted as inviting the reader to supply their own negative or positive assessments.

THE HEADLINE /LEAD

The headline and lead are commonly considered to highlight the most salient aspects of a story, or what is considered by the writer to be of greatest salience. For this reason a newspaper's stance on a particular story can often be ascertained from just this part of a news article.

In the analysis that follows extracts will be identified by a letter followed by a number. The letters indicate the newspaper (I=the *Independent* T=*The Times* H=*Haaretz* M=the *Muslim News*), and the number shows from which paragraph the extract is taken. Full texts of the four articles can be found in the appendix.

The Independent

Bus driver brings carnage to Tel Aviv in worst Palestinian attack for four years

I1: Scattered documents, an army boot, a ruddy patch of blood, bodies under grey blankets, one marked with a square sign bearing the number “2” like an athlete’s vest. The detritus of guerrilla war is always shocking but never more so than when it is strewn around an urban landscape-in a lay-by, beside a car park, just off a motorway junction. Blink and you would think you were at a service station by the M1.

In deciding what is newsworthy and what is not, a journalist or an editor may unconsciously measure a potential news item against certain criteria. These criteria have been labelled “news values”. One of the best known lists of news values is that supplied by Galtung and Ruge (1965). They proposed the following set of twelve: frequency, threshold, unambiguity, meaningfulness, consonance, unexpectedness, continuity,

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

composition, reference to elite nations, reference to elite persons, personalisation, and negativity (see Bell, 1991, for a detailed examination of these news values).

Taking just three of these values, negativity, threshold and meaningfulness, it is clear from the *Independent's* headline/lead why a full page was apportioned to this piece of international news. The values of negativity and threshold in particular feature large: *carnage* draws attention in the headline, asserting the story's negative credentials while *worst...attack in four years* clearly indicates that this a big incident, easily above the threshold that qualifies it as worthy of attention. Meaningfulness is cultural proximity, or the "cultural familiarity of one country with another" (Bell 1991,157). Events happening in cultures very different from our own will often not be seen as being inherently meaningful to home audiences. The allusion to a mundane urban landscape (*Blink and you would think you were at a service station by the M1*) is likely to make the event more inherently meaningful, at least to British readers (the M1 is a major motorway (highway) linking London with the north of England), than if it had, for instance, occurred on a mountain pass in Kashmir.

The word *attack* in the headline may evoke images of either military or terrorist action, depending partly on the reader's position. The description is not of an attack "by a Palestinian bus driver", but of a *bus driver* who carried out a *Palestinian attack*. Thus, this headline subtly places the story in the context of the general Palestinian resistance against Israel.

The choice of the collocation, *guerrilla war*, provides an early indication of the ideological undercurrent of the text. *Guerilla* suggests a politically motivated struggle against stronger regular forces, in this case Israel's.

THE TIMES

ISRAEL POISED TO AVENGE BUS TERROR.

T1: Edud Barak, Israel's outgoing Prime Minister, was last night considering military strikes against Yassir Arafat's Palestinian Authority after a Palestinian man drove his bus into an Israeli crowd, killing eight people.

The headline/lead focuses on Israel's possible response to the *bus terror*. Compared to *attack* in the *Independent*, the noun *terror* evokes strong associations with terrorism. The victims are *eight people*; no indication of their status-military or civilian-is given.

MUSLIM NEWS**NINE ISRAELI SOLDIERS KILLED**

M1: In an operation this morning by a Palestinian bus driver, near Tel Aviv, nine Israeli soldiers were killed and 19 injured. Khalil Abu Alba, 34, father of 5, was seriously wounded and captured after a chase in which shots were fired.

It could be argued that with *operation* the head noun of the phrase opening the story (*an operation this morning by a Palestinian bus driver*), attention is drawn more to the fact of an *operation* completed rather than to the agent (the *bus driver*) contained in the *by-phrase*. *Operation* itself, a rather clinical word with strong military connotations, serves as an effective euphemism for violent action.

The Palestinian driver is described as being *wounded* and *captured*, words that resonate with the image of a military-type operation. No mention is made of the agent (police) that did the wounding and capturing. Radical Palestinian and Muslim organizations that refuse to accept Israel's right to exist and its moral legitimacy often avoid the word "Israel" and use alternative labels such as "Zionist entity". Although the *Muslim News* does refer to *Israeli soldiers*, *Israeli MOSSAD* (secret service), and *Israeli Ministers* later in the article, the passive tense may have been used so as to avoid reference to the police. A possible reason: while even an illegitimate "entity" can possess an army, a police force is primarily associated with "legitimate" nation states.

The headline/lead in the *Muslim News* contains two inaccuracies. The total number of dead is given as *nine* (there were actually eight) and the fact that civilian and female casualties were amongst the dead goes unreported. The incorrect Israeli death count may have resulted from inaccurate reporting, or a possible deliberate exaggeration for propaganda purposes. In speculating on why female and non-military casualties were not mentioned in the article, the fact that in *jihād*, or holy war, the deliberate killing of women and civilians is considered by many Muslim scholars to be forbidden in Islam (BBC News online, 2004) may be relevant. Alternatively, the view that all Israelis-whether or not in military uniform, and regardless of sex- are potential soldiers (virtually all Israeli citizens are required to do national service and regular reserve duty) would have rendered casualty details irrelevant.

HAARETZ**PA SEALED AFTER WORST ATTACK IN YEARS****PALESTINIAN BUS DRIVER PLOWS INTO STOP KILLING 8, INJURING 26, THREE SERIOUSLY**

H1: A Palestinian crashed a bus into a crowded bus stop in Azur town, south of Tel Aviv, yesterday morning killing eight Israelis-seven soldiers and a civilian-and injuring 26 others. It was the deadliest Palestinian attack on Israelis in four years.

In stark contrast to the *Muslim News*, which is unspecific about the nature of the operation, the verb *plow* vividly brings to mind images of a fast moving, perhaps out of control, vehicle.

Worst attack in years stresses the threshold value, or the magnitude, of the story. There is no mention of "terror" or "terrorism" in the lead/headline as one could have expected from an Israeli newspaper; an attack by a Palestinian on Israelis may automatically be associated with terrorism, without needing to be explicitly labeled as such. Alternatively, since at the time this story was printed (February 15, 2001), the bus driver's injuries precluded the police from questioning him, the paper may have been disinclined to jump to conclusions before the release of further details.

INTERTEXTUAL POSITIONING

Intertextual positioning is concerned with how a writer deals with other people's words or thoughts. The way in which a politician's comment or an eyewitness's account of an event is incorporated into an article can serve to position it ideologically. When looking at this tool of analysis it is important to be aware not only of the voices which are given prominence, but also those which have been excluded (Fairclough 1995,106); absent voices also speak volumes about the writer's overall rhetorical aims.

Using the linguistic resources of intertextual positioning, a writer can indicate how they stand in relation to a specific utterance. For example, the reporting verb "claim" in the concocted sentence, "Arafat claimed it was a traffic accident", would show quite clearly that the writer was not aligning himself with Arafat's comments. Claim is therefore being employed to show "disendorsement". Conversely, utterances can be supported by the writer through "endorsement". An example of a reporting verb indicating endorsement is "point out." A more equivocal attitude towards an utterance may be indicated through a reporting verb such as "say", which is often considered to be neutral.

THE INDEPENDENT

The *Independent*, *The Times* and *Haaretz* all report graphic eyewitness accounts of the attack, which convey the horror of the scene left in the wake of the bus. However, as will be illustrated, the *Independent's* article diverges from that of *The Times* and *Haaretz* in several respects.

*I7: There were claims from the Palestinians that it may have been a road accident.*⁵

Whilst *The Times* and *Haaretz* attribute this comment to Arafat, the *Palestinians* are the source of this claim in the *Independent*. Surmising on reasons for this difference, the reporter may have considered that a comment by Arafat naturally represented the voice of the Palestinian people, or he could have been seeking to protect Arafat from association with a potentially embarrassing remark.

One may speculate further and consider that not naming Arafat was also a snub of sorts; later in the article he is, after all, lumped unfavourably with the *region's politicians* (I14). If this were a reason, it may reflect the influence of Roberk Fisk, the *Independent's* chief Middle East editor, who was extremely critical of the deceased PLO Chairman's "dictorial" leadership (Fisk,2004).

I11: Israeli officials conceded that the attack could have been in retaliation to an assassination on Tuesday.

White (2000) points out that *concede* indicates that a writer "endorses" (holds-to-be true) a proposition while distancing themselves from the speaker. There is the implication that what is conceded is the truth of the matter. The Israeli officials may have, in fact, only suggested a possible reason for the attack, but *concede* intimates that their country's *extra-judicial killings* was to blame.

I6: In the past four and a half months, only a few workers have been allowed out of the strip because of a devastating Israeli blockade, which yesterday- despite appeals from Britain, the UN and the EU for it to be eased-was tightened further.

The *Independent*, unlike *Haaretz*, brings in the voices of the international community. Although not explicitly showing endorsement for these voices, they are integrated into the text in a way that adds weight to the writer's point: condemnation by *the EU and Britain* supports the conjecture that this attack was, at least in part, retaliation against assassinations conducted by Israel.

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

While condemnations against Israel probably gain greater credence if they are made by the respectable voices of *Britain* and *the EU*, the following proposition maybe dismissed by some readers as a journalist's bias:

I10: ...a well-armed Israeli army that thinks nothing of killing an Arab

For other readers, however, such "unattributed authorial assertions" may be the most persuasive of all the voices. One reason for this persuasivity is that while readers expect critical utterances in the comment section, assertions made in the reporter's voice are less likely to invoke directly oppositional social positions. This is particularly true for the extract above because as a restrictive relative clause, the information (...*that thinks nothing of killing an Arab*) defining the noun phrase (*a well-armed Israeli army*) is rendered more irrefutable.

The *Independent* includes a quote by the brother of the bus driver:

I10: "Yesterday, I saw Khalil near the house. He told me he was thinking about many things. My brother was always pained when he heard the Israeli's have killed children. The incident today was a natural reaction," Mr Abu Olbeh said.

Coming as it does after a description of Israeli army violence that has left no one in Gaza *untouched*, the brother's words can readily be interpreted as justification for Khalil's action. *The Times* also draws on the same source, but the message is different:

T11: "He was behaving normally when he left for work. He's never been a member of any political movement. This must have been an accident," he said. "I cannot believe that he would want to kill people."

How can this discrepancy be explained? Either Abu Olbeh portrayed his brother as someone seeking revenge for unjust brutality to one reporter, and to another insisted that the bus driver would never kill anyone intentionally, or else each journalist quoted different sections of the same interview. Shades of nuance may be lost in translation, but it is unlikely that mistranslation could have produced such conflicting accounts. Whatever the explanation, it is clear that the quote included in the *Independent* serves to bolster the article's ideological tone. In *Haaretz*, on the other hand, no column space is allotted to the

voice of perpetrator's family.

THE TIMES

T2: While President Bush appealed for calm and demanded that Mr Arafat put an end to the violence in the region, the Palestinian leader dismissed the carnage at the Azure Junction south of Tel Aviv as a "road accident".

In contrast to the *independent*, which lumped Bush's statement on the attack with the *stale* (I15) comments of other politicians in the region, the President's words are foregrounded in *The Times* by their proximity to the lead and their juxtaposition with Ararat's comment.

Because *dismiss* implies treating something as being unworthy of serious consideration, the use of this verb seems to imbue Arafat with a callousness that another word, for example "describe", could not have done (cf. *the Palestinian leader [described] the carnage at the Azure Junction south of Tel Aviv as a "road accident"*).

Although disendorsement, where a writer distances themselves from the utterance, is commonly achieved through the use of a quoting verb such as "claim" or "allege", the same effect is achieved here solely by quotation marks. They signal that the words thus marked are someone else's, and not to be read as part of *The Times*' ideological system.

As in *Haaretz*, voices which describe Israel's stern response to the attack are also given prominence in *The Times*. A security adviser, Danny Yatom, is reported giving a warning that:

T3: Mr Arafat's infrastructures face imminent attack. "If the Palestinian Authority doesn't straighten itself out, we will need to take steps that could hurt very badly the Palestinian Authority itself".

Although it is indeterminable whether the collocation *imminent attack* was actually used by Yatom or is a paraphrase by the writer, the sentence preceding the direct quote appears more blunt than the quote itself. This reinforcement of a quote that follows can be considered another form of endorsement.

MUSLIM NEWS

The article from the *Muslim News* introduces indirect quotes from three sources: the claim of responsibility

from the *Return Brigades*, an official with... *Fatah*, and Israeli ministers.

It is notable how different voices perform comparable roles in the respective articles: the official from *Fatah* in the *Muslim News* rejects the *Return Brigade's* claim and describes the attack as *a personal operation*. According to *Haaretz*, however, it is the *Israeli officials* who express doubt that this group was involved (H7). In *The Times Mr Olba's family* dismissed the same claim (T12).

The source that is sought and used in a news story, especially in a breaking one, may be related to proximity and ease of access to that source. *Israeli officials*, for example, would likely be most easily accessed by a mainstream Israeli paper like *Haaretz*. It is probably also the case with the *Muslim News*, and to a lesser extent *Haaretz*, that the sources quoted represent an ideological alignment with, and an assigning of authority to that source.

HAARETZ

H4: *There apparently are no immediate plans for military retaliation.*

The adverb *apparently* indicates that the writer is not assuming sole authorial responsibility for the material. However, by not attributing a comment explicitly to any external source, a newspaper may appear to be functioning as a "mouthpiece" for some outside influence, in this case the Israeli government/security forces.

H6: *"If we can't trust people like him every Palestinian can be a threat," said one official.*

Say can be considered a "neutral speech-verb" (Bell 1991, 206) and when used as a quoting verb indicates a non-endorsing or neutral stance. Another verb such as "warned", or even "lamented", instead of *say*, may have overtly signaled endorsement. A neutral speech verb suffices here, however, since the readership itself is likely to positively endorse the statement without such authorial prompting. At the same time *Haaretz* can maintain a neutral stance, befitting a venerable member of an Israeli press generally considered highly independent⁶.

H8: *Security officials are not convinced any organizations had any connection with the attack. "As of now it looks like a single individual conceived and carried out this attack, apparently under the influence of the severe incitement on the Palestinian street," said one.*

Here a quote reiterates and expands on the sentence that introduces it. This serves to integrate the external voice with that of the newspaper, another case of the reinforcing observed earlier in *The Times* (T3). It can again be seen in:

H21: PA Chairman Yasser Arafat's refusal to halt the violence, much of which is instigated and implemented by PA officials, "should prevent him from enjoying the international status of a head of state," Barak said.

Again, it is unclear whether the sentence before the direct quote are the former Prime Minister's words paraphrased or the journalists own text, designed to resonate with the quote. By not placing this part of the text in inverted commas, it appears as a presupposition, signalling that the assessment of Arafat and the PA officials can be taken as read.

H20: Prime Minister Edhud Barak called the attack an "abominable crime" and charged that Palestinian Authority's incitement "creates an atmosphere that encourages fatal attacks."

The use of the genitive in the noun phrase, *Palestinian Authority's incitement*, produces a seemingly factual statement, possibly one that does not invite negation (cf....*the Palestinian Authority's incitement does not create(s) an atmosphere...*).

H22: Arafat himself declined to condemn the attack, saying at first it was Israel's fault for inflaming Palestinian public opinion through its "military escalation", and later that it was not even a terrorist attack but a "traffic accident."

In the extract above, the words in quotation marks are Arafat's. Inverted commas function to bring an external voice into the text, but at the same time they also appear here to serve as "scare quotes". Scare quotes are quotation marks placed around a word or phrase from which the writer wishes to be distanced because, for instance, that word or phrase is considered odd or inappropriate. Since scare quotes are also frequently used to intimate negative judgment, they have the alternative name of "sneer quotes". Even if *Haaretz's* writer did not intend Arafat's words to be sneered at, the sheer abundance of scare quotes in today's textual environment may be making readers less likely to take words bounded by inverted commas at face value. This would be especially the case when the direct quote, like many scare quotes, has only

one or two words (for example, "*military escalation*" or "*traffic accident*").

A verb of disendorsement such as "claim" could have replaced the neutral reporting verb *say*, but disapproval and dismissal of Arafat's "*traffic accident*" comment is effectively achieved by inclusion of *not even*.

The voices in *Haaretz* come from Israeli politicians, security officials and witnesses to the attack. The Palestinian voice is limited to a single paragraph (H22) reporting Arafat's reaction, while the comments of politicians and organizations from outside the region, except for President Bush, are absent. It is thus evident in the *Haaretz* article, and indeed in the other texts, that intertextual positioning mainly operates by foregrounding the comments of certain players and backgrounding, or ignoring others, rather than through endorsement or disendorsement with reporting verbs. Foregrounding is achieved both through direct quotation and by assigning more space to one voice over another.

ATTITUDINAL POSITIONING

Analysis of the headline/lead and of intertextual positioning has provided some indication of the perspective, or interpretation adopted in each article in relation to the news story under consideration. The focus of this section will turn to those individual words, phrases and sections of the text which are attitudinal (that is, convey either a negative or positive assessment), or can be interpreted as inviting the reader to supply their own negative or positive evaluation. The analysis will focus on all or some of the following aspects of the story:

1. Details of the attack/ eye-witness accounts.
2. The capture of the bus driver.
3. The bus driver's life/ background.
4. Responsibility/explanation for the attack.
5. Response to the attack.

THE INDEPENDENT

Details of the attack/ eye-witness account

I3: ...with a burst of speed he veered off the four-lane thoroughfare and swept away the lives of eight people, seven of them Israeli soldiers, five of them women."

The use of the metaphor *swept away* conveys the swiftness with which lives were taken en masse and,

arguably, a sense of the meaninglessness of these deaths. It matches the tone of futility that could be said to permeate the article. The *Independent* explicitly frames the attack in the context of the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict; horrific, yes, but not without reason:

I2: War arrived even here yesterday...It was delivered by a Palestinian bus driver who saw no need for bombs or bullets but used his own vehicle as his weapon.

This framing is also achieved by linking the timing of the attack to the *intifada*:

I3: At 7:50 am, in the height of the rush hour on the 139th day of the Al-Aqsa intifada...

The bus driver's life/ background

Khalil Abu Olbeh's work for *Egged* (the Israeli National Bus Company) is described as:

I8: ferrying Palestinian workers from Gaza to low-paid menial jobs [through a strip of land suffering under] a devastating Israeli blockade.

The negatively evaluative adjectives *menial* and *devastating* again serve to contextualize the attack as one occurring in, and most likely stemming from, an environment of Israeli restriction and exploitation.

Responsibility/explanation for the attack.

I4...all talk of the "Oslo peace process" is even more farcical than ever.

As well as being placed in the context of the war and *intifada*, mention of the failure of the "*Oslo peace process*" implicitly relates the attack to political negotiation that is regarded as ineffectual. This offers a bona fide example of the "scare quotes" mentioned earlier. Here the quotation marks placed around "*Oslo peace process*" serve as a symbolic form of ridicule and resonate with the negative evaluation of the process being *even more farcical than ever*.

I11:...like 1.2 million others,[he]lived in Gaza, where an armed conflict pitting the Palestinians imprisoned on the 25-mile strip against Israeli soldiers...

The *Independent* seeks an explanation for the attack in the conditions that the driver endured along with

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

1.2 million others in Gaza. The description of the *25-mile strip* combines with *imprisoned* to again evoke images of confinement and restriction. The replacement of the word *imprisoned* with “living”, for instance, would have been considerably less evaluative.

The *strip* is rendered even less hospitable by:

I12: Israeli armoured bulldozers... turning orchards and farmland into moonscape.

In this context, *moonscape* is negatively evaluative, bringing forth images of Arabs and their ruined land at the mercy of the Israeli army. The destruction of Arab land is reported as occurring *yesterday* (I12) (February 14, the day of the bus attack), framing the attack in the context of Israeli army action that is on-going.

That same morning was also marked by a deadly shooting:

I14: The 21st victim appears to have been notched up yesterday morning, when the Israeli army shot dead a 24 year-old Palestinian policemen [sic]...

The use of *notched up* as a metaphor for the killing of Palestinians evokes an image of soldiers employing lethal force with little thought, as if it were a game. This phrasal verb resonates with the earlier assertion that the Israeli army *thinks nothing of killing an Arab* (I12):

Response to the attack

The political response is presented as purposeless. The article’s penultimate paragraph echoes the sense of futility that permeated the first:

H16: As Israel slumped into another debate about whether the ultimate answer lies in total separation from the Palestinians-an impossibility-the region’s politicians went through the usual motions.

Rather than using the common collocation “entered into a debate”, the metaphoric use of *slump* complements the assertion that separating the two peoples is *an impossibility*. This assertion stands without a qualifying phrase such as “(something) regarded as (an impossibility)”, which would have indicated a commonly held view, and is therefore presented as an undisputed fact⁷.

The wrap conveys a final image of hopelessness: Israelis out for revenge:

I17: ...scores of enraged protesters who later gathered at the site of the bus attack chanting “revenge,

revenge” and “death to Arabs.”

The same demonstration is described in *Haaretz* thus:

H19: Following the attack, a few dozen people gathered at the site shouting “death to Arabs!” Denunciations of the current government, and demands that Prime Minister-elect Ariel Sharon, keep his promise to restore security to Israel, could also be heard.

Apart from the number of people conveyed by *a few dozen* not sounding as impressive as that suggested by *scores*, the *Independent's* description gives the impression that the crowd on mass were shouting only anti-Arab slogans. On the other hand, *Haaretz* reported that other slogans could also be heard. Additionally, the verb *chant* (the *Independent*) may also be considered the choice of fervent protesters over *shouting* (*Haaretz*). The former verb arguably conveys an impression of a more amorphous and threatening body of people.

The Times' report, in contrast, describes the demonstration with a single line:

T5: Some people demonstrated angrily.

The order in which this episode appears in the news report also seems significant. In the *Independent* the demonstration serves to wrap up the story, leaving the reader with an image of Israeli fanatics out for revenge and a never ending cycle of violence. On the other hand, *The Times'* mention of the demonstration is embedded in the body of the report thus consigning it to a position of relatively minor importance.

Kress (1988:120) has commented that the “role of language consists in supplying the categories which may be imposed by the perceiver on the event”. The selection of one category (*some* rather than *scores*, *enraged* rather than *angry*) is, according to Kress, guided by the “theoretical frameworks or schemata” which the perceiver brings to bear on the particular event. The perceiver’s (that is reporter’s) selection, is therefore by no means arbitrary.

THE TIMES

The bus driver’s life/ background

T10: The family of the driver, a father of five who has a pregnant wife...

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

Although such a statement of fact may not in itself be judgmental, readers may interpret it judgmentally. For example, sympathy may be aroused if this information is seen as evidence of how a normal, family man could be pushed to an act of desperation.

Response to the attack

T9: Mr Arafat first blamed the Israelis for having increased the violence over the past week but later described the tragedy as a traffic accident...

The writer uses *tragedy*, an affective, or emotionally charged, word to refer to the attack. It contrasts with, and thereby foregrounds, Arafat's description. Replacing *tragedy* with "attack" would arguably not direct the same degree of implicit negative judgement towards Arafat.

THE MUSLIM NEWS**Responsibility/explanation for the attack**

In providing background information about the *Return brigades-The Engineer's Disciples*, the *Engineer* (Yahya Ayyash) is described as a *martyr*. *Haaretz* labels this man as:

H7: a leading Hamas terrorist assassinated by Israel in 1996.

Both *martyr* and *terrorist* are explicitly judgmental. A man who was killed for making bombs to blow up Israelis is evaluated positively as a *martyr* by the *Muslim News*, but negatively as a *terrorist* by the Israeli newspaper. Kress's (1988:126) assertion that "words exist within systems which are organized by and represent ideological systems" appears particularly apt in this example.

It should be noted that although *martyr* is not exclusively reserved to describe someone sacrificing their life for the cause of Islam, the word in recent years has become strongly associated with more fundamental aspects of this religion. Therefore, depending on reader position, *martyr* may now be imbued with negative connotations. Likewise, for other readers the word *terrorist* will always be perceived to lie within "scare (sneer) quotes", whether or not these marks actually appear in print.

Response to the attack

M2: Israeli ministers immediately called for the Palestinian territories to be totally sealed.

The use of *Palestinian territories* seems to this author less ambiguous than *territories under full Palestinian control*, which appears in *Haaretz* (H29). Just as prepositional phrases are generally optional parts of English sentences, the prepositional phrase (*under...*), which describes *territories*, seems potentially more provisional than the succinct term in the *Muslim News*.

HAARETZ

Details of attack/eye witness accounts

Physical proximity to the event means readers will inevitably desire more details. Name, army rank, hometown and age of the victims is therefore listed in full in H2. This proximity is probably amplified in a country with a relatively small land area (Israel is about the size of Wales in the UK).

The capture of the bus driver

The taxi driver who initially gave chase is described as *alert* (H16), a positive evaluation in a society where vigilance by the general public has long been extolled.

The bus driver's life/ background

H6: *Under all the accepted criteria-age, marital status, family, and a total lack of any past suspicious activities-Abu Alba was considered safe.*

Here *safe*, describes a Palestinian who does not threaten Israeli's security. It is unbounded by quotation marks; thus, it is presented as a natural, unquestionable part of the presented reality that should be taken at face value. Of course, certain readers may again mentally attach their own "sneer quotes" to the word as used in this context.⁸ The *Independent*, on the other hand, reported that the driver did *not fit Israel's definition of a "terrorist"* (H7). Here again "scare quotes" serve to distance the writer from the word in quotes and simultaneously imply negative evaluation on those (the Israeli and the US governments, for example) who do use the word *sans* quotation marks.

Response to the attack

The language used to describe Israel's action of closing the territories in each article is revealing:

H4 : *In response to the attack, Israel imposed a full closure on the territories*

T9: *Mr Barak described the incident as "an abominable crime" and immediately ordered a tighter closure of all West Bank and Gaza Strip towns and villages.*

I8: *...a devastating Israeli blockade ...was tightened further* (S7).

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

M2 : Israeli ministers immediately called for the Palestinian territories to be totally sealed.

The *Independent* makes it clear that restrictions on movement in and out of the territories were already in place before the attack. In *Haaretz* and *The Times*, this is only implied by means of the adjectives *full* and *tighter* which describe *closure*. Compared to *closure*, the verb *sealed* evokes more of a complete cutting off.

The *Independent's* employment of the passive makes the agent (Israel) appear more remote and all-powerful, while use of the noun phrase *a devastating Israeli blockade* arguably conveys more permanency than a *by+agent* construction (cf. *a devastating blockade ... was tightened further [by Israel]*).

It has been said that "all reporting is a mediation" with an event "mediated from a perceiver to someone who is assumed not to have been a perceiver of that event" (Kress 1983: 120). When a reader attempts to reconstruct the original event from a text, they must depend on the language presented. Considered out of context, differences in linguistic nuance of a few words may seem too subtle to be perceived; however, their cumulative effect is to tilt the text in one direction or another, or nudge the reader to interpret or reconstruct a piece of news in a certain way. *Terrorist, martyr, blockade, and safe* - some of the words considered in this article - do not exist in a vacuum, but in the context of sets of related words. Therefore, the associations they can trigger in the mind of the reader has the potential to amplify their rhetorical effect.

Conclusions

In the *Independent*, *The Times* and *Haaretz* the themes developed in the headline/lead were to a large extent expounded upon as the text developed. These three articles all reported eye-witness accounts of the attack, but other voices were given varying degrees of prominence. The *Independent*, for example, provided the Palestinians with a greater airing than either *The Times* or *Haaretz*.

It was observed that intertextual positioning was signaled less by reporting verbs, for example *say* or *claim*, than through the way an outside voice was framed by and integrated into the surrounding text.

Concerning attitude, it was seen that while *Haaretz* brought in external voices to convey negative or positive assessments, the *Independent* article contained several unattributed authorial assertions that made what was ostensibly a hard-news story read in places like comment.

Due to the shorter length of the *Muslim News* text, a proportional comparison with the other three articles

was not possible. The lexical analysis of this text was nonetheless revealing in that it showed how a certain ideological position could be clearly conveyed even in a brief, hard-news story.

Notes

- ¹ During the 2000 academic year, the author was fortunate enough to have taken Professor Peter White's Media Language course, one of the modules for Birmingham University's MA in TEFL programme.
- ² The second *intifada* was touched off by a controversial visit by the then Israeli opposition leader (and present Prime Minister) Ariel Sharon, on September 28, 2000, to the Temple Mount, the site of the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem.
- ³ The term broadsheet has become a misnomer since both the *Independent* and *The Times* now print tabloid-sized or "compact" versions of their newspapers.
- ⁴ In a recent (May 20, 2005) Internet search the author was unable to locate the articles which were originally downloaded from homepages of the *Muslim News* (<http://www.muslimnews.co.uk>) and *Haaretz* (<<http://www.haaretzdaily.com>>) in February 2001.
- ⁵ The Tel Aviv District Court found Khalil Abu Olbeh, 35, guilty of eight counts of premeditated murder and 21 counts of causing grievous bodily harm. Khalil said he drove the bus into the Israelis to avenge the death of Palestinians in the *intifada*. He was sentenced to eight life sentences.
- ⁶ The view of an Israeli press which is free from government influence is refuted by some in the UN; see for example: <<http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2004/pal2002.html>>
- ⁷ The erection by the Israelis of the first segment of a security fence/wall commenced in August 2003. If the fence/wall is completed it will effectively achieve the separation of Israelis from the Palestinians. How one describes this barrier is itself an indication of which side of the metaphorical fence a person stands. A recent Google search by the author revealed that the barrier is generally described as a *fence* by those in favour, and as a *wall* by those who oppose its construction.
- ⁸ When Israeli border restrictions are in place, only men who are married with children are allowed to enter Israel for work. Single, young Palestinian males are considered potential suicide bombers since they "have less to lose" (Langan Behind the Lines: Life's a Beach. BBC2, March 12, 2001).

References

- Bell, A. 1998. *The language of the News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- BBC News online. *Analysis: Interpreting Islam*. Retrieved July 9, 2004 from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3880151.stm>
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.
- Fisk, R. (2004). Arafat died years ago. *The Independent*, November 9.
- Kress, G. 1983. Linguistic and ideological transformations in news reporting. In *Language, image, media*. Eds. H. Davis and P. Walton. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 120-39.
- White, P. (2000). Mass media rhetoric: Introduction. p2. (Unpublished lecture handout).

Appendix

a) *The Muslim News* b) *The Times* c) *The Independent* c) *Haaretz*

The Muslim News

Nine Israeli-soldiers Killed

By Yusra Khreegi

14 February, 2001

M1: In an operation this morning (Wednesday) by a Palestinian bus driver, near Tel Aviv, nine Israeli soldiers were killed and 19 injured. Khalil Abu Alba, 34, father of 5, was seriously wounded and captured after a chase in which shots were fired. He has been seriously injured.

M2: A previously unknown group, called the "Return Brigades- The Engineer Disciple's (Martyr Yahya Ayyash, assassinated by the Israeli MOSSAD was known as the "Engineer") claimed responsibility for the operation, and said it was in retaliation for the assassination of Palestinian officer Masood Ayad on Tuesday. But an official with Mr Arafat's Fatah organisation described it as a personal operation. Israeli ministers immediately called for the Palestinian territories to be totally sealed.

THE TIMES
Thursday 15 February

Israel poised to avenge bus terror

From Sam Kiley
in Holon, Israel

- T1 EHUD BARAK, Israel's outgoing Prime Minister, was last night considering military strikes against Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority after a Palestinian man drove his bus into an Israeli crowd, killing eight people.
- T2 While President Bush urged calm and demanded that Mr Arafat put an end to violence in the region, the Palestinian leader dismissed the carnage at the Azur Junction south of Tel Aviv as a "road accident".
- T3 The remark, made in Turkey, drew an immediate response from Danny Yaaron, a security adviser to Mr Barak, who gave warning that Mr Arafat's infrastructure faced imminent attack. "If the Palestinian Authority doesn't straighten itself out... we will need to take steps that could very badly hurt the Palestinian Authority itself," he said.
- T4 Last night Mr Barak was meeting his security cabinet to discuss how to react to the hit-and-run killings at the Azur Junction close to Holon, which left Route 44 strewn with the bodies and the severed limbs of seven soldiers, including four women, and a civilian. At least another 18 people were injured, some critically.
- T5 Crowds gathered to stare at the blue-fringed prayer shawls brought by Ultra-Orthodox burial teams to cover the victims. Some people demonstrated angrily. Most of the dead, men and women in their late teens and early 20s, were returning home for a break from compulsory military service.
- T6 One witness, Avshalom Cohen-Natan, said: "The bus was moving slowly and suddenly it speeded up and drove into the soldiers. One of them was thrown up into a tree and fell to the ground."
- T7 A burial worker added: "We saw the dead bodies thrown along the kerb. It was a very harsh attack and there were body parts thrown about. It was different from an explosion in that it was more concentrated and the bodies were left mutilated."
- T8 Khalil Abu Otha, 35, the driver of the Israeli state-run bus from the Egged company, drove another 18 miles towards Gaza, where he lives, before he was shot by police and crashed into a lorry. Last night he was critically ill at Ashdod Hospital, where

many of his victims are also being treated. Israeli intelligence agents are anxiously waiting to interrogate him to find out why his bus ran into the crowd.

T9 Mr Arafat first blamed the Israelis for having increased the violence over the past week but later described the tragedy as a traffic accident and said that he was against terrorism in any form. Mr Barak described the incident as "an atrocious crime" and immediately ordered a tighter closure of all West Bank and Gaza Strip towns and villages.

T10 The family of the driver, a father of five who has a pregnant wife, said that he was not a radical or militant. His brother, Hussein, 35, said that he had been moved by what he had seen on the television during the Palestinian uprising but had not shown any outward signs of anger.

T11 "He was behaving normally when he left for work. He's never been a member of any political movement. This must have been an accident," he said. "I cannot believe that he would want to kill people."

T12 A previously unknown Palestinian group calling itself the "Return Brigades" told a satellite television station that it carried out the attack to avenge the death of Maqoud Alshaykh, a member of Mr Arafat's Force 17 bodyguard, in an Israeli helicopter strike on Tuesday. But Mr Otha's family dismissed the claim.

T13 Israeli police said that the bus driver had passed security checks by Shin Bet, Israel's internal security service. Ariel Sharon, who beat Mr Barak in elections last week on a "security ticket", said that he viewed the incident with "the utmost gravity".

T14 Mr Sharon has advocated striking hard against Mr Arafat and his administrative and security apparatus as a way to stop the violence. Last night it appeared as if his views were being taken to heart by Mr Barak. Israeli helicopter gunships hovered close to Gaza and other military hardware was being sent into the area before what the Palestinians expected would be a heavy response to the killings.

T15 Mr Bush urged caution, saying that the "tragic cycle of action and reaction between Israel and the Palestinians, particularly the escalation this week, needs to stop".



Khalil Abu Otha sits wounded in his bus after he was shot by police 18 miles from where he crashed into a crowd of Israelis at a bus stop

Leading article, page 21



Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

Bus attack brings carnage to Tel Aviv in worst Palestinian attack for four years*Phil Reeves**The Independent**February 15, 2001*

11) Scattered documents, an army boot, a ruddy patch of blood, bodies under grey blankets, one marked with a square sign bearing the number "2" like an athlete's vest. The detritus of guerrilla war is always shocking but never more so than when it is strewn around an urban landscape - in a lay-by, beside a car park, just off a motorway junction. Blink and you would think you were at a service station by the M1.

12) And yet war arrived even here yesterday, reaching deep into this concrete dormitory suburb, south of Tel Aviv. It was delivered by a Palestinian bus driver who saw no need for bombs or bullets but used his own vehicle as his weapon, crashing it into a crowd waiting at a bus stop and popular hitch-hiking post.

13) At 7.50am, in the height of the rush-hour on the 139th day of the Al-Aqsa intifada, Khalil Abu Olbeh, 35, made it his turn to strike at Israel's heartland. He drove his bus past a plant nursery, past a vacant lot, through some traffic lights, and past a couple of scrappy palm trees that stand in front of a snack and ice cream stall. Then - witnesses say - with a burst of speed he veered off the four-lane thoroughfare and swept away the lives of eight people, seven of them Israeli soldiers, five of them women.

14) It was by far the deadliest Palestinian attack since the start of the intifada, the worst atrocity in Israel for more than four years, and a moment that seemed to confirm the sense of international panic that there is no quick remedy for this worsening conflict; that all talk of the "Oslo peace process" is even more farcical than ever, and that there will be much more bloodshed before peace is restored.

15) As his victims' broken corpses lay scattered in his wake, and the injured - at least 18 of them, three critical - cried for help, Mr Abu Olbeh drove the bus south for more than 20 miles, pursued by Israeli police and a helicopter in a high-speed chase that ended when he shunted into the back of a lorry after being shot by his pursuers.

16) "The bus was moving slowly and suddenly it speeded up and drove into the soldiers," said one witness, Ayelet Cohen-Natan, as white-gloved volunteers from an ultra-Orthodox Jewish burial service combed the site, gathering body parts into plastic bags in compliance with a religious law that says that every effort must be made to collect even the smallest body parts for burial. "I saw dead people with arms, heads and legs cut open. It was terrible. One of the soldiers was thrown into a tree."

17) The task of working out specifically why Mr Abu Olbeh committed this mass killing, and whether it was spontaneous, will now rest with his Israeli interrogators. The answer is not as obvious as it might seem. He does not fit Israel's definition of a "terrorist".

18) For five years, he has worked for Israel's state-owned bus company, Egged, ferrying Palestinian workers from Gaza to low-paid menial jobs. In the past four and a half months, only a few workers have been allowed out of the strip because of a devastating Israeli blockade, which yesterday - despite appeals from Britain, the UN and the EU for it to be eased - was tightened further.

19) Reports said Mr Abu Olbeh took his usual route, dropping off 51 labourers in the town of Ramle. There were claims from the Palestinians that it may have been a road accident. But the details - the burst of speed, the long chase, the deviation from his route - strongly suggested otherwise. Instead of going to rest at a nearby depot, he headed north to Aful on the edge of Tel Aviv where he committed his carnage.

110) Mr Abu Olbeh was a trusted employee who carried a permit from Israel's Shin Bet internal security service and had been vetted anew only a fortnight ago. Palestinian officials said he had no connection with any political organisation, although there were claims of responsibility yesterday from the Hamas' military wing, Izzadin Kissam, and from an unknown group called the "Return Brigades".

111) But, like 1.2 million others, Mr Abu Olbeh lived in Gaza, where an armed conflict pitting the Palestinians imprisoned on the 25-mile strip against Israeli soldiers and settlers has continued almost daily since the intifada began, largely outside the gaze of the international media.

112) Yesterday, as on many days previously, Israeli armoured bulldozers were busy turning more Arab orchards and farmland into moonscape. Since last September, many hundreds of Palestinian rioters have been maimed and killed after hurling themselves at the might of a well-armed Israeli army that thinks nothing of killing an Arab. No one in Gaza has been untouched by these events. Mr Abu Olbeh is a father of five. According to his 39-year-old brother, Hussein, he was upset about the death of scores of Palestinian children. "Yesterday, I saw Khalil near the house. He told me he was thinking about many things. My brother was always pained when he heard the Israelis have killed children. The incident today was a natural reaction," Mr Abu Olbeh said.

113) If true, this may not be the only explanation. Israeli officials conceded that the attack could have been in retaliation to an assassination on Tuesday. Missiles fired from an Israeli helicopter killed Masoud Ayad, 54, a commander of Yasser Arafat's Force 17 bodyguard detail in Gaza. He was the 20th victim of Israel's policy of extra-judicial killings - a violation of international law that was condemned yesterday by the EU and Britain.

114) Urging an end to violence, the Foreign Office described Mr Ayad's death as murder, a term it also used for yesterday's bus stop killings. The 21st victim appears to have been notched up yesterday morning, when the Israeli army shot dead a 24-year-old Palestinian policeman near Anabta, on the West Bank.

115) This escalation could scarcely be happening at a more politically precarious time. Israel is undergoing an interregnum: the discredited, defeated Ehud Barak is still Prime Minister pending the formation of a government by Ariel Sharon. Belatedly, the international community (Britain included) is warning that Mr Arafat's Palestinian Authority is heading for collapse and that anarchy is looming.

116) As Israel slumped into another debate about whether the ultimate answer lies in total separation from the Palestinians - an impossibility - the region's politicians went through the usual motions. Mr Barak called the attack "abominable"; Mr Sharon said it was proof that the Palestinians see no difference between settlements in the West Bank and pre-1967 Israel; Mr Arafat blamed Israel's recent "military escalation". George Bush said it was a "terrible act".

117) But these words have become stale in this region. None of them will matter much to the Israelis whose lives were ruined yesterday, to the 3,000 Palestinians who turned out for Mr Ayad's funeral, or to the scores of enraged protesters who later gathered at the site of the bus attack chanting "revenge, revenge" and "death to Arabs".

HA'ARETZ

Thursday, February 15, 2001

Ha'aretz Staff and Agencies

PA sealed after worst attack in years

Palestinian bus driver plows into stop falling 8, injuring 26, three seriously

H1: A Palestinian crashed a bus into a crowded bus stop in Azur town, south of Tel Aviv, yesterday morning killing eight Israelis - seven soldiers and a civilian - and injuring 26 others. It was the deadliest Palestinian attack on Israelis in four years.

H2: The soldiers were Staff Sergeant Ophir Megidish, 20, of Kiryat Malachi; Sergeant David Iluz, 21, of Kiryat Malachi; Sergeant Julie Weiner 21, of Jerusalem; Sergeant Rachel Levy, 19, of Ashkelon; Sergeant Kochava Polansky, 19, of Ashkelon; Corporal Alexander Minyevich, 18, of Ashkelon; and Corporal Yasmin Karisi, 18, of Ashkelon. The civilian was Simcha Sheetrit, 30, of Rishon Letzion. Megidish and Iluz, were buried yesterday evening, the other funerals will be today.

H3: Three women soldiers were seriously injured and only one had started to show signs of returning to consciousness yesterday. The other victims were lightly injured and all but six of them were later released from hospital.

H4: In response to the attack, Israel imposed a full closure on the territories and canceled all the work and entry permits recently issued to Palestinians. It also reinstated roadblocks around major cities in the West Bank and Gaza, shut down the Dehanyeh Airport in Gaza, and closed border crossings leading from the territories into Egypt and Jordan, except for people going on the traditional haj pilgrimage to Mecca. In addition, a naval blockade imposed on Tuesday will continue, and senior Palestinian Authority officials are barred from entering Israel. There apparently are no immediate plans for military retaliation.

H5: Behind the attack was Khalil Ala Abu Alba, 35, a father of five, who is now in custody. Abu Alba has worked for the Egged bus company for five years ferrying Palestinian workers from Gaza to Israel. He had a full security clearance from the Shin Bet security service from last month.

H6: On orders from Prime Minister Ehud Barak, the Shin Bet started to look for new ways to screen

Palestinians before they are allowed to enter Israel. Under all the accepted criteria - age, marital status, family and a total lack of any past suspicious activities - Abu Alba was considered safe. "If we can't trust people like him every Palestinian can be a threat," said one official.

H7: A hitherto unknown organization calling itself "The Return Brigades - Students of the Engineer" claimed responsibility for the attack and said it was in revenge for Israel's killing of a senior Palestinian security official, Masoud Ayad, on Tuesday. The Engineer, or Yihye Ayash, was a leading Hamas terrorist assassinated by Israel in 1996.

H8: Security officials are not convinced any organization had any connection with the attack. "As of now it looks like a single individual conceived and carried out this attack, apparently under the influence of the severe incitement on the Palestinian street," said one.

H9: The officials also doubt the attack was revenge for Ayad's death, as Abu Alba had no known connection with him.

The attack

H10: The attack occurred around at, around 7:40 A.M., after Abu Alba had already completed his usual routine of picking up workers in Gaza and ferrying them to Ramle, he was scheduled to head north to Tel Aviv and leave the bus at the city's central bus station. At some point, he decided to turn back and when he reached the Tempo Junction near Azur, he plowed the bus into the soldiers and civilians who were walking toward the bus stop.

H11: "Suddenly I saw a bus driving fast up on the curb, and simply hurling all the people and all the soldiers to the side... It drove over the people," said 19-year-old soldier Moshe Saroussi after being treated for shock. "The bus was moving slowly and suddenly it accelerated and drove into the soldiers," added a bystander, Ayelet Cohen-Natan.

H12: One soldier was thrown into a tree and fell to the ground. People were hurled in the air, and bodies were strewn across the pavement along with army boots, backpacks and jackets. "I saw dead people with arms, heads and legs cut open. It was terrible," said Cohen-Natan.

H13: Later, bodies covered in blood-soaked blankets and marked with numbers lay on the roadside amid

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

the scattered rubbish: Personal belongings were strewn across the bloodstained sidewalk.

H14: White-gloved volunteers from an ultra-Orthodox burial service searched the site, gathering body parts into plastic bags. A large section of Road 44, where the attack took place, was closed until about 11 A.M. while the wounded were treated and the clean-up began.>

H15: "We got here within minutes. We saw the dead bodies thrown along the curb. It was a very savage attack and there were body parts thrown about," said Shabtai, a burial worker. "It was different from an explosion in that it was more concentrated, and the bodies were left mutilated."

H16: An alert taxi driver took off after the bus as soon as he realized there had been a terrorist attack and was able to give police the bus license.

H17: Police proceeded to chase the bus for more than 30 km before one policeman saw an opportunity to open fire and damaged it. Other officers set up a roadblock, and when Abu Albs tried to crash his bus through it, he lost control and crashed into a truck

H18: Police said Abu Alba was driving at 140 km per hour at the time and was seriously injured in the crash. He had a leg amputated in an operation at Kaplan Hospital in Rehovot. His other leg was also injured in the crash, and he was apparently wounded in the chest by police gunfire. He was in stable condition, but had not regained consciousness and had not been questioned.

H19: Following the attack, a few dozen people gathered at the site shouting "death to Arabs!" Denunciations of the-current government, and demands that Prime Minister-elect Ariel Sharon keep his promise to restore security to Israel, could also be heard.

H20: Later in the evening, a memorial ceremony was held at the site of the attack.

PM, Sharon blast PA

H21: Prime Minister Ehud Barak called the attack an "abominable crime" and charged that Palestinian Authority's incitement "creates an atmosphere that encourages fatal attacks."

H22:Barak told Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar that "the world must use its influence on the Palestinian Authority, and the person who heads it, to put an end to the violence and terror." PA Chairman Yasser Arafat's refusal to halt the violence, much of which is instigated and implemented by PA officials, "should prevent him from enjoying the international status of a head of state," Barak said. Barak also told Aznar it was impossible to ease economic sanctions on the PA while the violence continued. Sharon gave Aznar an identical message.

H23:Arafat himself declined to condemn the attack, saying at first that it was Israel's fault for inflaming Palestinian public opinion through its "military escalation," and later that it was not even a terrorist attack but a 'traffic accident.'

H24:Sharon said the attack once again proved "that Palestinian terrorists see no difference between Tel Aviv, Hebron, Hadera or Ariel." He added that restoring security to Israel's citizens would be his government's top priority.

H25:U.S. President George Bush called Barak to offer condolences for the attack, and said he has instructed Secretary of State Colin Powell to demand that Arafat take immediate steps to end the violence.

H26:Barak used the conversation to protest America's equation of Israeli assassinations of terrorists with Palestinian terror attacks against civilians. "Israel's responses, which are measured, considered and part of its self defense, cannot be compared to Palestinian terror, which targets innocents," he said.

More terror likely

H27:Chief of Staff Shaul Mofaz predicted yesterday that the recent escalation in the violence will continue, telling a Tel Aviv press conference that the army has received warnings of additional terror attacks.

H28:"We see this attack as the crossing of a threshold," he told reporters, stressing that the PA has created an atmosphere that makes such attacks possible.

H29:"This attack was a direct result of the policy of encouraging violence and terror which the Palestinian Authority is implementing, both directly and via those who are subordinate to it," Mofaz said.

Terrorist or martyr? Evaluation and representation in news texts

*H30:*He said the PA has not only refused to arrest wanted terrorists, it has also released terrorists who were already in jail- including those involved in some of the worst terror attacks against Israel in the last decade. "The Palestinian Authority's prisons are empty of murderers," he said.

*H31:*One concrete step the army plans to take to prevent future attacks is increased activity on the borders of Area A, the part of the territories under full Palestinian control.

*H32:*Tel Aviv police commander Yossi Sedbon, meanwhile, has ordered his men to step up patrols aimed at preventing terror attacks.