

American University in Cairo

AUC Knowledge Fountain

Archived Theses and Dissertations

1999

How Egyptians and Israelis perceive each other

Gilan E. George

The American University in Cairo AUC

Follow this and additional works at: https://fount.aucegypt.edu/retro_etds



Part of the [Journalism Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

APA Citation

George, G. E. (1999). *How Egyptians and Israelis perceive each other* [Thesis, the American University in Cairo]. AUC Knowledge Fountain.

https://fount.aucegypt.edu/retro_etds/2662

MLA Citation

George, Gilan E.. *How Egyptians and Israelis perceive each other*. 1999. American University in Cairo, Thesis. *AUC Knowledge Fountain*.

https://fount.aucegypt.edu/retro_etds/2662

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by AUC Knowledge Fountain. It has been accepted for inclusion in Archived Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of AUC Knowledge Fountain. For more information, please contact fountadmin@aucegypt.edu.

HOW EGYPTIANS &
ISRAELIS PERCEIVE
EACH OTHER

GILAN E. GEORGE

1999

LIBRARY
USE
ONLY

thesis
1999/62

612483552
613841178

Thesis
1999/62

The American University in Cairo
School of Business, Economics and Communication

HOW EGYPTIANS AND ISRAELIS PERCEIVE EACH OTHER
A COMPARISON OF THE OSLO AND WHYE PEACE DISCUSSIONS
IN AL AHAM AND THE JERUSALEM POST

A Thesis Submitted to:
Journalism & Mass Communication Department

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

by:
Gilan E. George

under the supervision of
Dr. James F. Scotton

Spring Semester
June 1999

The American University in Cairo
School of Business, Economics and Communication

1999/62

HOW EGYPTIANS AND ISRAELIS PERCEIVE EACH OTHER
A COMPARISON OF THE OSLO AND WHYE PEACE DISCUSSIONS
IN AL AHRAM AND THE JERUSALEM POST

A Thesis Submitted by
Gilan E. George

to Journalism & Mass Communication Department
June 1999

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts
has been approved by

Dr. James F. Scotton
Thesis Committee Chair/Advisor

Dr. Hassan Ragab
Thesis Committee Reader

Prof. Naila Hamdi
Thesis Committee Reader

Dr. Farouk El Hitami, Dean
School of Business, Economics and Communication

Date 21 Jul 99

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN CAIRO

LIBRARY

THESES

Declaration to be signed by the author.

NAME.....

Gilan Emil George

TITLE OF THESIS.....

How Egyptians and Israelis Perceive each other.

DEPARTMENT Journalism & Mass Comm YEAR 1999 [Library No 1999/62]

Please sign and date ONE of the following paragraphs:

1. The thesis may be consulted in the Library and photocopied.

Signed..... Date 26/7/99

OR

2. The thesis may be consulted in the Library, but may not be photocopied. The restriction on photocopying will cease two years after the date below, unless I apply for, and am granted, its renewal.*

Signed..... Date.....

OR

3. The thesis may neither be consulted nor photocopied without written permission from me, or from the appropriate Head of Department if I cannot be contacted. This restriction will cease three years after the date below, unless I apply for, and am granted, its renewal.*

Signed..... Date.....

*Application for renewal of restrictions will be considered by the Librarian, the appropriate Head of Department and the Chairman of the Academic Board or his nominee.

Acknowledgements

DEDICATED

WITH LOVE & RESPECT

TO

MY FATHER, who was the most encouraging person

& MY MOTHER, for her continuous support

Heidy, My sister

Khaled, My fiancée

Mona, My best friend

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the supervision of Dr. James Scotton in the preparation of this thesis. I am very grateful he took over the supervision of my thesis after Dr. Napoli has left and that he spent a lot of his time evaluating this work, guiding and encouraging me to put it in order.

I also greatly appreciate the help, the guidance and valuable comments of Dr. Hassan Ragab who kindly managed to attend the defence of my thesis before his trip to the United States of America the next day.

Moreover, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Naila Hamdy for her valuable comments.

Although he did not see my thesis come to an end, I would like to thank Mr. James Napoli for guiding me to find this interesting topic and for all his assistance in my graduate as well as my undergraduate studies.

Very special thanks go to Mr. Alaa Mubarak for his help.

Also special thanks go to Ms. Mona El Keissy and Dr. Mohamed Nabih for their support and encouragement.

Special thanks go to all my colleagues in the Environmental Education and Training Programme (EETP) currently headed by Mr. Frank Runchel and formerly headed by Mr. David Kerrison for their understanding and their support.

Abstract

The media reflect the stereotyping of Arabs and Israelis that has been going on for centuries. They are important weapons in mobilizing people to adopt a certain attitude or view. The fluctuation of the images from positive to negative or vice versa depends on the attitude of the government, whether supporting or opposing the event.

This study will examine the role of the media in the Arab-Israeli conflict. It will observe how two elite newspapers, Egypt's Al-Ahram and Israel's Jerusalem Post, depict the other's regime. It will investigate whether the cross images portrayed by these papers are basically hostile or not.

To achieve this, the researcher used content analysis, a technique appropriate for our goal of monitoring the changing trends in perception. The content analysis focused on articles covering two major events: the Oslo Accord and the Whye Plantation Agreement. A panel of graduate students was used to read the selected articles and judge the images according to a set of characteristics (attached code sheet). The results of the study showed that there was a lack of enthusiasm for the recently concluded Whye Plantation talks compared to the original Oslo agreement that was reflected in the images portrayed by the two newspapers.

Thesis Outline

Chapter I

- Introduction	1
- Research Question	7
- Importance of The Study	8
- Limitation of The Study	9
- Methodology	12

Chapter II

- Literature Review	16
---------------------	----

Chapter III

- Findings (Description of Data) & Results	46
--	----

Chapter IV

- Conclusion	63
--------------	----

Bibliography	72
---------------------	----

Appendix	81
-----------------	----

INTRODUCTION

Without ever stepping into Israel, most Egyptians can nevertheless easily project mental images of this land and of Israelis. According to the Egyptian writer Abdel Basset Abdel Moety, Israelis are ruthless greedy Zionists, usurpers and violent terrorists (Abdel Moety, 1997, 40). They are, as Mohamed Abdel Moneim, editor-in-chief of the Egyptian magazine *Rose El Youssef*, described them paranoid and mentally insecure. Meanwhile they can own all the weapons they want, they envy us [Egyptians] and protest if we get any weapon (Rose El Youssef, March, 1999). Recently, in an interview for Israeli Television, President Hosni Mubarak perceived the present Jews as untrustworthy. They lost the credibility which they previously enjoyed for their word was to be trusted without even any documents (Soliman, 1998,12).

On the other hand, the Arabs inside and outside of Palestine were portrayed by former Israeli prime minister Golda Maeir several years ago, as biologically inferior. She said that "they are even cannibals" (Amin, 154). Meanwhile, Israeli leader Ben Gurion held the Egyptians responsible for the Israeli exodus from Egypt during the Pharaonic era (El Hassan, 52). Also, Ishak Modaie, the former Israeli Minister of Finance, regarded peace as an illusion and described President Mubarak as an Oriental dreaming man (Ha'arts, 12/3/1985). Lately, Netanyahu described the Egyptians as the Southern enemy (Al-Ahram, October, 1998).

What is the origin of these images? Like all images, they emerge from the wide range of information accumulated over time by our senses.

According to Webster's New Riverside University Dictionary (1988), a simple definition of image is:

- 1- A reproduction of the form of someone or something.
- 2- A mental picture of something unreal or not present.
- 3- The character projected by someone or something to the public, esp. by the mass media: REPUTATION.
- 4- A vivid description or representation.

Said Sadek stated that the terms "Image" and "stereotype" are synonymous with "composotype" and "generalized picture." He explained that the Latin origin of the word image is derived from the verb "imitari," which means mimic or act. Usually we utilize the term in relation to images that patrons of a particular country hold toward another (Sadek, 1996, 122).

The images that the Egyptians have of the Israelis and vice versa spring from vastly different historical, cultural, and personal experiences. The history of Egyptian-Israeli relations has been marked by alternating periods of cooperation and confrontation. They have swung like a pendulum from being allies to being adversaries. They have challenged each other, even fought each other several times. They have tried working things out. They have signed documents and treaties, held meetings, and consulted with friends about what to do. But still they remain unsure, equivocal, worried about how to handle this troubled relationship.

As the actual relations have improved or soured, the perceptions each side has of the other have naturally shifted. The perceptions themselves have also caused shifts in their relations. The history of Egyptian-Israel mutual perceptions is even more erratic than the actual relations of the two countries.

During the Egyptian-Israeli conflict, both sides used not only military weapons. The conflict was sometimes a "War of Words" and known on other occasions as a "War of Persuasion" and a "War of Nerves" (Kandil, 95).

Nations do not wake up one morning to wage wars or make peace with their neighbours. War and peace are complex social processes that require the mobilization of domestic public opinion by carefully planned propaganda campaigns waged by local media in coordination with the political system (Sadek, 1996, 1). By definition propaganda is the planned dissemination of news, information, special arguments, and appeals designed to influence the beliefs, thoughts, and actions of a specific group.

To propagandize, in the most neutral sense, means to disseminate or promote ideas. Propaganda differs from persuasion. Persuasion is transactive and attempts to satisfy the needs of both persuader and persuadee while propaganda is a form of communication that seeks to "achieve a response," a specific reaction or action from an audience "that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist." The one who benefits from the audience's response, if the response is the desired one, is the propagandist and not necessarily the members of the audience. People in the audience may think the propagandist has their interest at heart, but in fact, the propagandist's motives are selfish ones. Recipients of propaganda messages are discouraged from asking about anything outside the contained areas (O' Donnell, 1992, 21).

To measure the effectiveness or success of propaganda in the audiences' mind, there are four kinds of evidence to look for:

- 1- Responsive action by the target audience doing what they were asked to do by the propagandist.
- 2- Participant reports, e.g., a member of the target audience expresses the same views espoused by the propagandist.
- 3- Observer commentaries, e.g., observers report that target audience has carried out the goals of the propagandists.
- 4- Indirect indicators, e.g. propaganda calls for not buying a product and importers stop bringing it into the country.

(Sadek,1996, 93)

Propaganda is often classified in accordance with what appears to be its source as either overt (white) or covert (black). Overt propaganda is that whose true source is clearly acknowledged. Covert propaganda is that which appears to originate from a source other than the true one. Some writers describe still a third class of propaganda - grey, or that which avoids identification either as of friendly or of enemy origin. Still others maintain that grey propaganda is nothing more than poorly disguised covert, or black, propaganda (Daugherty, 1958, 2).

Facilitative or sub-propaganda is another form of propaganda. Here media spend a long time preparing their audience psychologically to accept the upcoming changes or the new ideologies, take particular sides and make suitable sacrifices (Sadek, 1996, 94).

Decision makers everywhere believe that the "intelligent usage of the mass media is the shortest and most effective way to achieve their goals" (Kandil, 12). In addition to the media's capability to mobilize public opinion and prepare for negotiations or act as intermediate to solve disagreements and disputes, diplomats everywhere stress the importance of the role that the media can play in facilitating negotiations. The media enables the governments to know through what is published in the papers whether the other governments have the desire to negotiate with them or not. Also, the media provides both sides with the essential data regarding the other side, and that is necessary to start negotiations on a true basis.

It is evident that the role of the media is not restricted to information. The media has become the filter through which we can see, hear and feel. Also, it "shapes our minds and hearts". We do not see the world and do not know it except as the media show it or introduce it to us (Kandil, 81). The media did succeed actually in accomplishing this role in the Middle East in the Arab-Israeli conflict, when it was the only available means of contact between the two disputing sides.

Research Question

My thesis will examine the role of the media in the Arab-Israeli conflict. I will observe how two elite newspapers, Egypt's El-Ahram and Israel's Jerusalem Post, depict the other's regime. I will investigate whether the cross images are basically hostile or not.

Importance of the study

Egypt is a leading Arab nation that tries to defend itself and other Arab countries, especially the occupied land, Palestine. Egypt involves itself in international relations to achieve peace in the Middle East. Therefore, it is important to understand the level of propagandistic struggle going on in Egypt and Israel and the impediments they present to the peace process in the Middle East.

"We must appreciate the images of the past before we can fully comprehend our current dilemma," points out one authority (English, 15). Therefore, we will look to past propaganda in Israeli-Egyptian relations. Also, in our interdependent world, private investors, multinational companies, donor governments and even secret services demand political forecasting evaluation of the nations where they intend to invest in or have invested or become involved politically. They desire to know of possible wars, coups, instability, terrorism, etc. that would damage their interests.

Limitation of the study

Why not study TV or radio? Would it not have been more suitable, practically speaking, to examine more popular, and perhaps persuasive, media like TV or radio in a nation with a high illiteracy rate? Why select the press, which is read by less than half the population? This is a reasonable question. It needs a reasonable reply.

First, the Egyptian elite prefer the press as the primary source of information because it reaches "the attentive public," (Sadek, 1996, 5). This public acts as sender and interpreter of news to the illiterates in a two-step communication model. The Egyptian press does circulate even among illiterate individuals who may purchase the papers on occasion during political crises or prominent football matches and accidents and have literate friends or relatives read the news for them.

Some media studies have indicated that 65% of those who received primary education certificates, about 75% of high school graduates and 95% of university graduates read Egyptian papers (Sadek, 1996, 5). Another study has revealed that 26% of Egyptians in rural areas frequently read newspapers, while 89% of opinion leaders rely on the press more than on TV for information. Moreover, the study classified the newspaper reading habits of readers in the Egyptian countryside as follows: 62.4% read political news, 64.5% read news about crime, 48.5% read sports news and 37.5% look at cartoons (Sadek, 1996, 5).

Second, despite the popularity of the Egyptian government-operated television (in more than 97.9% of households) and radio in the rural areas (sets owned by more than 75% of the countryside inhabitants), both TV and radio still remain largely a device for home entertainment, not news dissemination, according to many studies. Radio and TV are not used in the same way as the printed press to support government policies. Some important political programs did emerge on Egyptian-government-operated TV in the early 1990s. During the Gulf crisis/war, competition presented by international satellite channels forced this pattern upon Egyptian TV. These political programs are usually cancelled during the Muslim holy month of Ramadan and are irregular at other times (Sadek, 1996, 5).

A third and practical problem blocks studying Egyptian TV news bulletins. This is the lack of archives, like the Vanderbilt TV News Archives for the news bulletins of American Television networks (Sadek, 1996, 5).

Another limitation of the study is the built-in tendency bias. The individuals reviewing the newspapers articles for content analysis were all (with an exception of two, perhaps) Egyptians. That means that there is a certain bias. It could be a bias to find negative characteristics toward Israelis where there are none; it could be to find negative characteristics toward Egyptians where there are none.

Moreover, the individuals doing the content analysis know the source of each article. This is not a "blind" content analysis. It would be very difficult to disguise the sources since the articles from the Jerusalem Post are in English and those from Al-Ahram are in Arabic. This is another limitation of the study.

Methodology

My study will be on the period from 1992 to 1996. It is a very important period full of turning point incidents that changed some Middle East policies. These include the death of Ishak Rabin and the rule of Benjamin Netanyahu in Israel, and other vital events such as the Oslo accord, which will be the main focus of my study.

Content analysis will be used in this research. Content analysis is basically a research technique used for systematically collecting, analyzing and making inferences from messages (North, 1963, 50). Ole Holsti described it as "an instrument for measuring attitudes at a distance" (Holsti, 1966, 345), while Rapoport (1960, 11) views content analysis as a tool of systems theory. He acknowledges that it provides an excellent opportunity to put theories of interaction to work in areas where there is a richness of data and where the continuous nature of the variables can be better approximated. However, the most common definition was provided by Berelson. He defined content analysis as a "research technique for the objective, systemic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (Berelson, 1971, 18). Though the technique was used in Europe early in the 20th century, it first appeared in Egyptian media studies in the early 1970s.

The technique is appropriate for our goal of monitoring the changing trends in perception. It has a long history of being utilized as a means for examining propaganda, specifically as it relates to forecasting foreign policy. For instance, Suefeld et al. analyzed the content of the speeches made by Arab and Israeli politicians at the United Nations to forecast the 1967 war (Sadek, 1996, 9).

Al-Ahram newspaper and Jerusalem Post have been selected for content analysis because they are "prestige papers" or "elite press" of Egypt and Israel. It has been stated by Pool, Schramm and others that the elite or prestige press of a particular nation presents a rational index of attitudes of the national political elite of that nation. An "elite press," according to Merrill (1968, 11), is read by the elite of the country where it exists, as well as by the elite of other countries, and expresses a significant segment of international elite opinion. More opinion leaders read such newspapers. Lasswell, Pool et al., and Lasswell and Lerner (1952, 42), using the notion of "prestige papers," point out specifically that such elite newspapers "are widely read abroad by those seeking clues to the dominant attitudes in the countries in which these papers are published. There is the assumption that an 'elite or prestige' paper has built a reputation for being informative and for expressing the serious, well-seasoned opinion of the nation concerned." Merrill (1968) suggests that the "elite or prestige" papers always maintain intimate relations with government and have widespread news coverage.

Al-Ahram, the Egyptian newspaper, is a morning newspaper established in 1875. It is a government owned and semi-official paper published in Arabic, the national language (Agha, 1978, 7).

The Israeli newspaper, The Jerusalem Post, is published daily (except Saturday), and is an independent newspaper published in English by the Palestine Post Ltd. It was founded in 1932 by Greshon Argon. It has also a weekly edition published every Tuesday which contains material published in the six previous daily editions. The weekly overseas edition was founded in 1959 and is sold in 95 countries (Europa Year Book, 1974, 716).

The Jerusalem Post was selected because it is the leading Israeli newspaper in English and circulates widely outside Israel. Al-Ahram was chosen due to its popularity and its wide circulation in Egypt as well as abroad. Both Al-Ahram and The Jerusalem Post fit with the definitions of Merrill, Pool, Schramm, Lasswell and Lerner for prestige papers.

It is very difficult for any researcher writing about another nation to be neutral and not biased. But to avoid or lessen such bias we will use a panel of graduate students. They will be presented selected articles from Al-Ahram and The Jerusalem Post to judge the images found there according to a set of characters attached.

LITERATURE REVIEW

"We must appreciate the images of the past before we can fully comprehend our current dilemma" (English, 15).

"If the Jews are today despised, feared and hated," Trachtenberg writes in his preface, "it is because [they] are the heirs of the Middle Ages. The figure of the 'demonic' Jew, less than human, indeed antihuman, the creation of the medieval mind, still dominates the folk imagination" (Trachtenberg, 1983, XIV).

In the Middle Ages, the Jew was associated with the Devil (Felsenstein, 1995, 22). It was possible to find gospel evidence of the Satanic involvement of the Jews ... The Jews seem to have been perceived often as less than human, akin more to brute beast than humankind (31) and to have radiated a peculiarly foul smell, akin to that of the Devil (35).

The Devil and the Jews



The demon Belial presenting his credentials to Solomon

Shakespeare's famous character of Shylock in the Merchant of Venice reflected the inveterate image of the diabolized Jew (Felsenstein, 1995, XVI). The echo of Shylock should alert us to the equally persistent motif by which the Jews are represented in anti-Semitic discourse as cut-throat butchers and demonic mutilators intent on wreaking havoc on innocent Christian lives (6).



(Felsenstein, 174)

the downfall of Shylock alias Mackbeth.

Between 1290 and 1700, Jews were stereotyped as aliens, anti-Christ, bribers, "clippers and forgers," crucifiers, demons desecrators of the ritual Host, enemies of Christians, blasphemers, hypocrites, murderers of innocent children, and traitors (Felsenstein, 1995, 25). A seventeenth Century proverb, emphasizes the Jews' stiff-necked refusal of Christ. It juxtaposes "five things" that "exceed in stubbornness and pertinaciousness, the Dogge among beasts, the Cock among birds, the Goat among cattle, the Prickthorn among plants and the Jew among men" (Felsenstein, 1995, 33). The statement that someone 'looked Jewish' or 'looked crazy' reflected the visual stereotype which a culture created for the 'other' out of an arbitrary complex of features (Felsenstein, 1995, 20).

"In various circumstances, at home and abroad," remarked William Rae Wilson in the early 1820s, all Jews may be said to appear the same. Look at their face, the dark forehead, flashing eye, raven locks, bushy beard and eyebrow. A strong eastern character is in fact stamped on every countenance. Whether they are among their own people, or surrounded by those of the other lands, Jews appear as the most extraordinary beings on the face of the earth" (Felsenstein, 1995, 87). Wherever they are introduced, they are reflected as beings of a mean, avaricious, unprincipled, treacherous character (Felsenstein, 1995, 80) and considered as outcasts, thieves, sorcers and poisoners (25).



Jews receiving Stolen Goods.

(Felsenstein, 217)

When Johann Fischart, writing in 1591, attested that "in our time the Jews produce many sorcerers," he was revealing no startling discovery. The statement was a time-hallowed cliché, a "fact" that was taken for granted. Early in the 18th century the Frankfort theologian and antiquarian Johann Jakob Schudt heartily endorsed, Luther's verdict that "a Jew is as full of idolatry and sorcery as nine cows have hair on their backs, that is: without number and without end" (Trachtenberg, 1983, 57). It was therefore highly plausible to the medieval mind that the "heretical" Jewish people as a body should conspire to poison all Europe; [the Jews] were inevitably held accountable for the outbreak of contagious diseases and epidemics, such as the Black Death" (Trachtenberg, 1983, 214).

Heretic—Sorcerer—Jew



Sorcerers paying homage to the devil

The typical occupation of such a figure, the lending of money at interest, is also to be seen as the work of the Devil and in contradiction to the scriptures (Felsenstein, 1995, 33). Judaism and money-lending became synonymous (34). A print, dated May 1830, by the Caricaturist William Heath, depicted a devout Jew with a deed of bond showing from his pocket, reciting the eleventh commandment, seemingly intended for those of his faith: "Get all you can - Keep what you get - give away NOTHING" (Felsenstein, 1995, 75).



(Felsenstein, 77)

"Get all you can—keep what you get—give away nothing." William Heath, 11th Commandment. —

Even the peculiarities of the Jews, the errors of their foreign dialect and pronunciation, were mimicked and caricatured, as if to render them objects of perpetual derision and detestation (Felsenstein, 1995, 80). These pictures retained their power to shock even after the Nazi era; one can only surmise the impact they must have had on a population often more responsive to the pictorial image than to the written word (Trachtenberg, 1983, IX).

Modern so called "Scientific" antisemitism is not an invention of Hitler's. It was born in Germany during the last century, and it has flourished primarily in Central and Eastern Europe. There the medieval perception of the Jew which underlies the prevailing emotional antipathy toward him was and still is most deeply rooted ("Medieval" defines not a chronological but a mental epoch). (Trachtenberg, 1983, 5-6).

Antisemitic propaganda paints a fantastic Jekyll-Hyde portrait of the "international Jew." Apparently meek and powerless, impoverished and oppressed, few in number and pitifully disunited but in reality wielding immense power. They are dominant everywhere by virtue of their world-embracing secret organization, iron discipline, and unprincipled methods. At different times and places in Europe, Jews were refused the right of settlement. In England, William Prynne said that the Jew will never be permitted to rest but must wander the world to be execrated as a living symbol of his crime against mankind (Felsenstein, 1995, 36). He was, as perceived by Peter Burke, "the outsider who lived within the community, the traitors within the gates" (7). "The JEWS", declares an anonymous late 18th century pamphleteer, "are held in utter and universal abomination, and are scattered up and down the earth like wandering vagabonds."

They are seen as perpetual aliens whose *raison d'être* may only be signalized through their difference from the host group and their apparent incapability to assimilate (Felsenstein, 1995, 64). Even today wherever he lives, the Jew is considered by many a creature apart. He is seen as alien, not to this or that land, but to all Western Society, alien in his habits, his pursuits, his interests, his character, his very blood. His final goal: to conquer the world, to refashion it in his own craven image, enslave it to his own alien ends (Trachtenberg, 1983, 3).

Most Israelis, of course, do not like the role of conqueror, occupier, suppressor of a national movement. As Israelis, however, they must be concerned with their security vis-a-vis an apparently implacable foe. This view is shared widely in Israel. It is as much a part of the outlook of those most committed to making maximum concessions to the Arabs as of that of the "hardliners". Zionists, a strong minority in Israel, are suffused by the dream of building a fatherland for themselves "down to the very marrow of their bones." They are united in this will, are grounded in modern Western life, and are ready for rapid advance and progress (Patai, 1983, 260).

Jews, Israelis and Zionists are terms that are frequently used in this thesis. Although many people take it for granted that they all have the same meaning, each term has its own definition.

Interestingly, the definition of a Jew is one of the most controversial of all political issues in Israel. Some argue that anyone who identifies with Jewish culture and ethnicity and believes himself to be a Jew, is a Jew. In Israel, and therefore 'officially', only the Orthodox rabbinate is followed and recognized.

The Orthodox insist that Jewish nationality (or ethnicity) and Jewish religion are inseparable, and that the only acceptable definition of a Jew is derived from the Halacha, or Jewish law. This definition declares that a Jew is one born of a Jewish mother or converted to Judaism in a conversion authenticated by the Orthodox rabbinate (Wright, 1989, 73).

The State of Israel in practice does not accept conversions done by the other two schools for Jewish thought, reform and conservative. The Orthodox rabbinate is not concerned with a Jew's religious beliefs or lack thereof, but only his or her biological status as a Jew. Because the rabbinate considers even non-Orthodox, or for that matter, Communists who are born of a Jewish mother to be Jews, they have overlooked religious faith and went straight to the question of biology; that is, the mother Jewish question. They believe that only by a strict interpretation of religious rules can Jewish nationality be determined.

The Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, as a result of pressure from the religious faction, enacted legislation defining a Jew in conformity with religious law. The law now states that "Jew" means a person who was born of a Jewish mother or has become converted to Judaism and who is not a member of another religion (Wright, 1989, 74). Thus, a Jew is whoever adopts Judaism. Judaism is a religion, and following it does not represent one civil or national formation (Kadry, Hefni).

Nevertheless, geneticists in Israel are working to show that Jews are, in the words of Dr. Bonne-Tamir, Professor of Human Genetics at the Sackler School of Medicine of Tel Aviv University, "genetically distinctive". As any scientist knows, this is in effect saying that the Jews are a race. Bonne-Tamir does not advocate biological superiority for Jews, but there is a danger that others will (Wright, 1989, 74).

It is a fallacy to say that Judaism is a nationality or that the Jews are one people. Western and non-Western sources are full of refutations of these allegations. Jews are spread over the countries of the world. They do not live in one place and do not speak the same language. They do not have the same ethnic trait, or lineage, or Kinship and they do not live under the same economic or civil conditions. Judaism is a religion, and the Jews have always been minorities that are not tied (bonded) by one civil bond. This is why they were affected by many civilizations and peoples.

On the other hand, an "Israeli" is the one who is living in Israel and has Israeli nationality. Israel does not impose on its citizens the Jewish religion as a requirement for Israeli nationality.

Finally, a "Zionist" is whoever calls for the gathering of the world Jews in Palestine, and believes that this is the solution of the Jewish problem. A Zionist must help to accomplish this assembly by all means, be it financial or moral. A Zionist has the aim of realizing greater Israel - from the Nile to the Euphrates. He or she may not even be Jewish.

Zionism is a racist belief founded on the idea of the ethnic purity of the Jews. It calls for returning to the promised land. According to the decree no. 3379 (30) dated 10 November 1975 and issued by the General Assembly of the United Nations, Zionism is considered a form of racism. This decree certified that Zionism has expansionist objectives, practices racist methods and uses religion as a cover for its purposes (El Fare'e, Ahmed Youssef, 5).

The word "Zionism" comes from "Zion" which is a mountain in the South West of Jerusalem, where the Jews go for pilgrimages, and where they think God resides (Ibrahim, 1979, 8). The powerful psychology of Zionism has long been a problem in Palestine. Lord Balfour wrote in a secret memorandum submitted to the British cabinet in 1919: "Zionism be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long traditions, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder importance than the desires and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land" (Wright, 1989, 61). Soon after started the organized immigration of the Jews to Palestine. They began to occupy the land by all legal and illegal means and expel its original owners - after adopting the famous principle of "the end justifies the means." This strategy culminated in the 1948 war between the Arabs and the Israelis and the Arabs were defeated (Ibrahim, 1979, 52).

Granting the land of Palestine to the Israelis through Balfour's promise in 1917 can be considered a turning point in the Egyptian-Israeli relations. It was the first sign that raised the awareness of the Egyptians of the Israeli hostility (52) toward all non-Jews in Palestine and their allies.

The Egyptian-Israeli relationship is a very old one. The Jews represented a religious group and were called Hebrews. The contact of the Egyptians with the Hebrews began after the immigration of Abraham and his family to Egypt coming from Iraq. In Egypt, the Hebrews resided in a ghetto for two reasons. One was that they were without any organized civilization in the time when Egypt was very organized. The second was that they had special rituals different from those of the Egyptians (Ibrahim, 1979, 58). With time, the Jews mingled and adapted to the Egyptian society. They had their own religion but they lived in Egypt in peace until the 1948 war broke out when most of the Jews migrated to Israel (Ibrahim, 1979, 58).

Nassar, in her book Al-Sihaafah Al-Israa'iiliyyah Wa-Al-Di'aayah Al-Sihyuniah Fi Misr or The Israeli Press and Zionist Propaganda in Egypt, described the introduction of the Zionist movement in Egypt. She examined the status of the Jews in Egypt before the Zionist movement and how the Jews affected Egypt economically, socially, politically, and culturally. Then, she analyzed the infiltration of the Zionist movement in Egypt, the importance of Egypt for the Zionist expansion and the importance of using the media and all propagandistic means to achieve Zionist goals.

The book also described the Jewish-owned newspapers available in Egypt before 1948. These were mainly in French to serve the needs of the aristocratic and cultured Jews living in Egypt. In these newspapers, the Arab was perceived as an aggressive Bedouin with an instinct for robbery. On the other hand, the Jew was peaceful for he did not enter Palestine by force, while the Arab was the one who fought and shed blood (Nassar, 1991, 416).

Arab leaders - as perceived by these papers - were unrealistic and did not properly estimate facts. They were lying to the Arabs, using them, attacking and insulting them (416). Also, according to these Jewish papers, the alleged peace between the Moslems and Christians was fake. There was no unity between Moslems and Christians, but a wicked policy, the policy of organizing conspiracies (416).

Until July 1967, Israel stressed the image that it created for itself: a small peaceful country fighting to defend itself and protecting its existence. It was struggling for stability and peaceful co-existence with its neighbours who, on the other hand, refused to acknowledge its existence and declared their determination to destroy it (Kandil, 99).

The Israelis viewed the final goal of the Arabs as similar to that of the Nazis and that is getting rid of the Jews and throwing them in the sea. The saying of "throwing the Jews in the sea", although never proven to be said by any Arab authorized person, was the most successful media slogan used by Zionists to gain the sympathy of the West, and instigate the hatred of world Jews towards the Arabs.

Zionist propaganda tried to introduce Israel in the image of "Young David": unarmed, peaceful, threatened by an "Arab giant destructive monster" (Granof, 1986, 38). Internally, the reason behind focusing on this image was making others sympathize with Israel and motivate the community to stick together. Externally, it aimed at raising funds and generating publicity and achieving full mobilization of the country, financially as well as morally, at any time (Kandil, 99).

Be it emotionally, culturally, economically or militarily, Israel has always had a base of support from the American people. Israel is America's most reliable ally in the Middle East. Israel provides a solid foothold for the West in the region. Therefore it seems reasonable for the U.S. media to portray Israel as the only democracy in the Middle East. It is seen as a society that loves peace and encourages individual freedom in the midst of antagonistic states that have dictators, fanatics and terrorists trying to destroy it.

In addition to these unbalanced representations of the Jews and Arabs, the U.S. media are also blameworthy of using terminology coined by Israelis. This is a highly effective device for influencing opinion. Thus the October War becomes the "Yom Kippur War," instead of the "Ramadan War" as the Arab fighters were fighting during the Muslim fasting month of Ramadan. Similarly, the June War of 1967 becomes the "Six Day War," which emphasizes Israel's rapid triumph over the Arabs. Any military act taken by the Palestinians is instantly considered an act of terrorism, yet a parallel act taken by Israel a few weeks later is called retaliation (El Awar, 1991, 6).

In a dictionary, Thesaurus and Thesaurus of Synonyms and Antonyms an Arab is defined to mean vagabond, vagrant, tramp or bum. An Oxford children's reference library The Arab World, asks "What is an Arab?" The author gives several answers: "The baggy trousered workman asleep on the corner of the pavement and not bothered at all whether he finishes his work today, tomorrow or never. A peasant ... Who rides a donkey while his wife in a long, black robe walks behind carrying bundles. Concludes the author, all these people are Arabs!" Thus the American children from school-age are introduced to the meaning of an Arab in a wrong and unbalanced way. This same image is established through cartoons and serials children watch on T.V.

Western media - films, television, radio, newspapers, magazines, textbooks, and popular writing - have continually bombarded the Western public with distorted images and negative stereotypes of the Arabs and Muslims. Arabs have been typically stereotyped in their traditional desert dress or ominous military fatigues. The use of these undifferentiated villains is a shortcut to the readers' psyche. "Hence the Western public continues to be exposed to a constantly reinforced, distorted image of the ... Middle East as a whole." (9)

Arab is defined as a "name given to about 100 million persons who live in a group of independent nation-states in north Africa and the Middle East, and have a common linguistic and cultural heritage. The religion of Islam has shaped this heritage, although about one tenth of the Arabs are not Muslims ... Language is the basis of cultural unity and of Arab efforts to achieve political unity. The Arabic language, ... is the principal cultural characteristic shared by all Arabs. As the language of the Koran, it is the Arab's link with the Islamic tradition. It is a vehicle of cultural and political expression among [them] ..." (24)

Childers (1961) mentions that "... [T]o attempt any racial answer to the question, 'What is an Arab?', is to founder hopelessly in the waves of several thousand years of migration, invasion, and intermarriages In a more comprehensive way, "Arabism" has nothing to do with race, but with language, cultural tradition and heritage, religion (to a certain degree), and the growing sense of commonality which these elements have engendered when fused with the Western concept of the nation."

A similar view is expressed by Hamady (1960) who mentions that "the name Arab does not denote a racial concept. It is rather a term of cultural association. The people who today are called Arabs are descendants of several racial stocks, of which two are predominant - the Semitic and the Hamitic - both being branches of the Mediterranean race." (25)

The Arab countries which are different in their culture and ethnicity are all lumped under one abstraction the "Arab World." So the Arabs are all portrayed as Bedouins, who ride camels, have as many wives as they please, have more money than they know what to do with, are all oil sheikhs and the list goes on. 10

On the literary level, [it was common] to misrepresent the Arabs in general (Amin, 1986, 164). They were described as "people without any cause because simply they do not know the meaning of the nation and that is why they ran away from the land where they lived till before the war (Exodus) begins, despite the appeals of the Israelis to the Arabs not to ran away for they are their friends (165). The Arabs do not only sell the military secrets to the German and the British and to whoever pays but also they are willing to sell themselves and their nations to whoever pays too" (165).

Bedouins were "almost" the stereotype representing the Arabs in general. Bedouins were represented always as human beings lacking any values or virtues. For instance, in "Ho za El Nar", the Bedouin was a hash addict, semi crazy, and has a dog-like voice. As portrayed by Rashah Derbister, he is a leopard, small dwarf, more like a ghost than a human being, etc. (Amin, 1986, 156). Also we can see Hertzels telling us in the beginning of the century about the Arabs who live in houses that have "a strange smell like that of the tombs" (155).

Zionist literature and other Israeli publications were banned in Egypt before the 1967 war and Arab scholars were forbidden from studying Israeli society. Books on Israel were prohibited or seized by authorities. Dr. Mursi Saad El Dein, the former chairman of the Egyptian Censorship Department on English periodicals from 1956-1974, said, "I used to ban any book or magazine on Israel or that carried a map of Israel. After 1973 war, we began to open up and permit and translate books on Israel to learn about the enemy" (Sadek, 1996, 167).

In 1973, El Sayed Yassin used content analysis to investigate "the Arab personality" in some writings and studies that emerged after 1967 in Israel and in the Arab World. In this study, the Israeli' image of the Arabs was that they do not understand anything except the language of force and therefore using violence is the perfect method to deal with them. Arabs are individual people, scattered and ununited. They tend to lie and exaggerate and deceive others. Compared to the Israelis, they are lazy, cowardly traitors with a very low I. Q. (Ibrahim, 1979, 79). In a speech given before the committee of Foreign Relations and Defence in the Knesset, General Rafael Itan declared that when the Israelis resided in the land all "that the Arabs did in this regard was quickly run here and there like drugged cockroaches" (Terry, 1986, 117).

Moreover, the image of the Arab soldier was very negative. He did not stick to his goals, his IQ was low, and therefore it was hard for him to use modern weapons. He was not ready to take risks and he tended to ignore his injured colleagues (Kandil, 103).

Meanwhile, Israel introduced itself to the world as a fortress that cannot be penetrated. It portrayed Moshe Dayan as the typical image of the true military leader that cannot be defeated and the Israeli soldiers as a group of "Supermen" or other copies of James Bond.

These images that dominated the media till the defeat of Israel in 1973 proved to be very exaggerated and false. And this was the Arab image perceived by some Israeli leaders (Ibrahim, 1979, 105). Ishak Rabin, for instance, admitted in his diary that the period between 1967 and 1973 was of vital importance to Israel and that the dominant images of Arabs at that time were full of exaggerations and misleading (105).

Also, Abba Iban, the former Israeli Foreign Minister, and the Israeli delegate to the United Nations for a long time, has said in an interview published by French newspapers in 1973 that the sudden victory that Israel achieved during the June 1967 war caused a dangerous mental condition in Israel. Israelis believed that they could not be defeated. This condition was due to the exaggerated images and unrevealed truth between 1967 and 1973, he said (Ibrahim, 1979, 105).

Moshe Dayan, the Defence Minister, during the October War said that he was like other Israelis. He believed the images portrayed to the extent that he even declared in the Israeli Ministerial Meeting on the 3rd of October 1973, that the Egyptians would not cross the Suez Canal. If they did, the Israeli defence would attack them from all directions and they would face a very difficult situation. "We have" in Israel a lot of people who say, "we hope they come," Dayan said (Ibrahim, 1979, 106).

One of the Egyptian journalists has described his first experience in Israel. "Often I stopped in the streets to contemplate the people and concentrate on their features and [watch] their actions. I was astonished when I found out that their eyes and noses are like ours. They have toes and feet like we do. They walk and move, eat and react like us. They did not come from another planet and they did not suck the milk of the Gods. But we [Egyptians] have drawn their images through the feeling of hatred and fear and the desire for revenge." Therefore, [when confronted with the reality], these images revealed a big amount of exaggeration and they were illogical, inaccurate and false.

The Egyptians perceived the Israelis as Morad Beik and Ibrahim Beik portrayed Napoleon and its French expedition when they came to Cairo. Although at that time Napoleon was a star in the military and achieved victories, he and his army were described as "Pistachio for cracking and eating". The Egyptian Memlouks underestimated the French army. The Egyptians had only swords and sticks to fight with and their military techniques were a century out of date (Ibrahim, 1979, 113).

The media kept reflecting the image of the Israelis as scattered people in a corrupt community. An Israeli woman was unfaithful and a whore. But we were surprised when we found out that she held canons and drove planes and tanks. She even took captives from our army. Our media kept blinding us by underestimating the enemy and overestimating oneself (113).

The images of the Israeli leaders that were broadcast by television cameras from Ben Gurion airport during the reception of President Sadat caused a tremendous shock because they totally contradicted the perception of the audience. "We have seen Moshe Dyan a short man who seemed to be greedy, if he walked you felt he would fall down, Golda Ma'er candle-like coloured and short and Benjin a thin man". This was strange because "we have imagined Dayan as a vicious giant, Ma'er as a very robust lady and Bejin as a fierce monster" (Ibrahim, 1979, 113).

On the other hand, the Israelis felt the same about the Egyptians. They perceived them through the feelings of fear, envy and hatred and drew their images through these feelings. Mr. Anis Mansour, editor-in-chief of October Magazine, has described his visit to a camp near Tel-Aviv. He said that the young children there did not know me. But when they were told they got scared and held each others tightly and kept looking at me as if I was a ghost or a resident of some other planet. They did not find fire spiting out of my eyes or my nails. Then, they laughed as if they were laughing at themselves, came closer to me and kept saying: "Sadat, Salam or peace, Sadat," Mansour said (Ibrahim, 1979, 114).

Agha, in Cairo Papers in Social Science titled Mass Communications and October War, examined the aspect of trust-suspicion between Egypt and Israel before, during, and after the October War 1973. As tensions declined, either because of cease-fire agreement or because of any other reaction or event, countries engaged in inter-state conflicts exhibited more trust for their opponent than they did at the height of those conflicts or during times of increasing tensions. The editorials from the countries engaged in an inter-state conflict visibly reflect the trends in their relations.

The findings of the Middle East Institute of Images of the Arabs and Israelis that was reported by Shelley Shale in the fall of 1980, is a clear reflection of "The Image of the Arabs in America"

Following Sadat's peace initiative, Egypt and the Egyptians [were no longer] depicted as part of the Arab mainstream ... [The] Western society was, in fact, saying that since the Egyptians had become friends with Israel they could not be like the rest of the Arabs, who were still perceived in almost totally negative terms ... Such a separation implied that not only was the West no longer to view Egypt as part of the Arab World, but that the Egyptians were no longer to be Arabs. In other words, the Egyptians were to deny their own identity and adopt one largely formulated and popularized by the West." (12)

Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized	24%	3%
Friendly	3%	20%
Treacherous, Cunning	41%	11%
Meanest Woman	42%	4%
Wicked, Bloodthirsty	40%	3%
Ignorant, Uneducated	20%	2%
Defiant	13%	2%
Persecuted, Exploited	12%	27%

Images of Arabs, Israelis: Fall 1980

(El Awar, 1991, 11)

The findings of the Middle East Institute of images of the Arabs and Israelis that was reported by Shelley Slade in the fall of 1980, is a clear reflection of "The Image of the Arabs in America"

	Arabs	Israelis
Brave	12%	47%
Rich	69%	12%
Intelligent, Competent	17%	47%
Stupid	12%	3%
Barbaric, Cruel	39%	7%
Strong, Powerful	40%	32%
Involved in Prostitution	20%	3%
Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized	24%	5%
Friendly	5%	28%
Treacherous, Cunning	41%	11%
Mistreat Women	42%	4%
Warlike, Bloodthirsty	43%	7%
Illiterate, Uneducated	22%	2%
Dishonest	18%	2%
Persecuted, Exploited	12%	27%

Images of Arabs, Israelis: Fall 1980

(El Awar, 1991, 11).

In another study to test "The Israeli identity as perceived by the different strata of the Egyptians", Ibrahim used the random sample technique (600 samples). She examined the perceptions of the Israelis before and after the peace initiative process and she deduced that:

The Israeli Stereotypes as perceived by a random sample (600 Egyptians)

The +ve characteristics		The -ve characteristics	
	%		%
1 Ambitious	0,91	1 Materialistic (Loves Gathering Money)	0,93
2 Plans	0,90	2 Greedy	0,90
3 Intelligent	0,82	3 Traitor	0,89
4 Persistent	0,82	4 Racist	0,89
5 Has a scientific mind	0,75	5 Fears	0,88
6 Organized	0,74	6 Non Believers	0,85
7 Intellectual	0,73	7 Doubtful	0,84
8 Cooperative	0,70	8 Restless and Anxious	0,84
9 Is concerned with Traditions	0,69	9 Hypocrite	0,81
10 Self Confident	0,65	10 Arrogant	0,80
11 Positive	0,64	11 Hostile	0,80
12 Religious	0,62	12 Unfaithful	0,80
13 Flexible Thinking	0,57	13 Cruel Heart	0,78
14 Is concerned with his appearance	0,55	14 Coward	0,78
15 Sociable	0,52	15 Envious	0,76
		16 Pessimistic	0,76
		17 Does not feel guilty	0,76
		18 Does not respect the traditions of others	0,76
		19 Feels lost	0,72
		20 Feels superior	0,71
		21 Feels Persecuted	0,69
		22 Dependent on others	0,66
		23 Hesitant	0,57
		24 Feels inferior	0,54
		25 Does not stick to principles	0,53
		26 Sad	0,52

The percentage of the positive characteristics reached 37,2% of the total characteristics while the negative characteristics reached 62,8%

The +ve characteristics		Al- Ahram			Jerusalem Post		
		Aug-93	Sep-93	Degree of Change	Aug-93	Sep-93	Degree of Change
1	Brave, Strong, Powerful	4	6	2	4	2	-2
2	Rich	1	1	0	2	1	-1
3	Intelligent	4	4	0	3		-3
4	Friendly, Sociable		1	1			0
5	Peaceful		7	7	1		-1
6	Ambitious/ Civilized	1	1	0	1	1	0
7	Trustworthy		1	1			0
8	Flexible Thinking		3	3	2		-2
9	Confident	7	4	-3	3	3	-3
10	Like Planning			0			3
11	Intellectual		4	4	1		-1
12	Is concerned with Traditions			0	3	1	-2
13	Religious			0	1	3	2
14	Optimistic		3	3	1	1	0
15	Innocent, Faithful			0			0
16	Superior	6	6	0		1	1
17	Independent		1	1			0
18	Has Principles		2	2	1		-1
19	Humble		5	5			0
20	Honest		1	1	1	1	0
21	Fidèle			0			0
22	Democratic		3	3	1		-1
TOTAL		23	53		25	14	
The -ve characteristics		Aug-93	Sep-93	Degree of Change	Aug-93	Sep-93	Degree of Change
1	Coward		2	2	1	1	0
2	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy	5	1	-4		1	1
3	Stupid			0	2		-2
4	Alienated		1	1		3	3
5	Hostile, Cruel, Bloodthirsty	5	1	-4	5	3	-2
6	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric			0	3	2	-1
7	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite		1	1		2	2
8	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor	1	1	0		2	2
9	Hesitant		1	1	3	1	-2
10	Chaotic			0	1		-1
11	Illiterate, Uneducated			0	1		-1
12	Untraditional	4	2	-2			0
13	Blasphemer			0	2		-2
14	Pessimistic	2	2	0	4		-4
15	Guilty		3	3			0
16	Inferior		2	2	3	2	-1
17	Dependent on others	5	2	-3	2		-2
18	Does not stick to principles	5	4	-1	1		-1
19	Arrogant			0	2	2	0
20	Dishonest	1	3	2	2		-2
21	Traitor		5	5			0
22	Racist	4	2	-2	1	2	1
TOTAL		32	33		33	21	

The +ve characteristics			Al- Ahram			Jerusalem Post		
			Sep-98	Nov-98	Degree of Change	Sep-98	Nov-98	Degree of Change
1	Brave, Strong, Powerful		8	4	-4	3	1	-2
2	Rich		2	1	-1		4	4
3	Intelligent		5	5	0	3	4	1
4	Friendly, Sociable		4	1	-3	1	4	3
5	Peaceful		6	4	-2	1	5	4
6	Ambitious/ Civilized		3		-3	1		-1
7	Trustworthy		2	4	2			0
8	Flexible Thinking		2		-2	1	5	4
9	Confident		6	4	-2		1	1
10	Like Planning		5		-5	2	1	-1
11	Intellectual		3	1	-2		5	5
12	Is concerned with Traditions		2		-2			0
13	Religious		3		-3			0
14	Optimistic		2	1	-1			0
15	Innocent, Faithful		3		-3		1	1
16	Superior		2		-2	1		-1
17	Independent		3	1	-2	1	4	3
18	Has Principles		4		-4	2		-2
19	Humble		2		-2		1	1
20	Honest		4	1	-3	1		-1
21	Fidele		2	1	-1			0
22	Democratic		5	4	-1	1	4	3
TOTAL			78	32		18	40	
The -ve characteristics			Sep-98	Nov-98	Degree of Change	Sep-98	Nov-98	Degree of Change
1	Coward				0			0
2	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy		3	2	-1	2		-2
3	Stupid			2	2			0
4	Alienated		1		-1			0
5	Hostile, Cruel, Bloodthirsty		9	8	-1	2		-2
6	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric		1	2	1	1	1	0
7	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite		7	5	-2	1		-1
8	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor		9	7	-2	2		-2
9	Hesitant				0	1	1	0
10	Chaotic		2		-2			0
11	Illiterate, Uneducated				0		3	3
12	Untraditional		1		-1	1	3	2
13	Blasphemer				0		3	3
14	Pessimistic		3	2	-1	1	4	3
15	Guilty		9	7	-2	2	3	1
16	Inferior		2		-2			0
17	Dependent on others		2		-2	4	1	-3
18	Does not stick to principles		10	6	-4			0
19	Arrogant		5	2	-3		1	1
20	Dishonest		6	5	-1			0
21	Traitor		4	2	-2			0
22	Racist		3	2	-1			0
TOTAL			77	52		17	20	

The Results of the study

1993 - The Oslo Agreement Period

Degree of change in the Positive Characteristics

August 1993 Results compared to September 1993 Results:

A- Al-Ahram Results:

From August to September, the period of the Oslo Agreement, Al-Ahram's view of the Israelis reflected an increase in the positive characteristics describing the Israelis. Some new positive characteristics that were not mentioned in August appeared in September:

- Peaceful emerged with 7 mentions.
- Humble had 5 mentions.
- Intellectual had 4 mentions.
- Democratic, Flexible Thinking and Optimistic; each had 3 mentions.
- Has Principles had 2 mentions.
- Friendly/Sociable, Honest, Independent and Trustworthy; each was only mentioned once.

These 11 new characteristics out of the total 22 reflect a striking change in the positive attitude of the Egyptians - or at least the Egyptian government - regarding the Israelis. Two of these new characteristics have appeared strongly in September 93; Peaceful and Humble.

In addition, one of the August positive characteristics Brave/Strong/Powerful increased in frequency from 4 to 6 mentions September.

Meanwhile, Confident was the only characteristic that decreased from August to September falling from 7 to 4 mentions.

Some other positive characteristics remained unchanged: Superior (6 mentions), Intelligent (4 mentions), Ambitious/Civilized and Rich (1 mention).

B- The Jerusalem Post Results:

On the other hand in the Jerusalem Post there was a decline in the positive characteristics of the Egyptians. Unlike Al-Ahram, only two new positive characteristics out of 22 have emerged in September and that are:

- Like Planning with 3 mentions.
- Superior with only 1 mention.

Other characteristics were completely omitted in September: Intelligent, Peaceful, Flexible Thinking, Confident, Intellectual, Has Principles and Democratic.

Religious was the only positive characteristic that showed some kind of increase. It has increased from 1 mention in August to 3 in September.

Meanwhile, some of the characteristics have exhibited some kind of decrease:

- Brave/Strong/Powerful falling from 4 to 2 mentions.
- Is Concerned with Traditions declined from 3 to 1 mention.
- Rich dropped from 2 to 1 mention.

Ambitious/Civilized, Honest and Optimistic (one mention each) were the only positive characteristics that remained constant.

Travis with 3 mentions.

Daily with 3 mentions.

Coward and Inferior with 2 mentions each.

Alienated, Untrustworthy/Treacherous/Cunning/Hypocrite and

Hesitant, with only 1 mention each.

Degree of change in the Negative Characteristics
August 1993 Results compared to September 1993 Results:

A - Al-Ahram Results:

From August to September, the period of the Oslo Agreement, Al-Ahram's view of the Israelis reflected a considerable decrease in the negative characteristics describing the Israelis. Some new negative characteristics that were not mentioned in August emerged in September:

- Traitor with 5 mentions.
- Guilty with 3 mentions.
- Coward and Inferior; with 2 mentions each.
- Alienated, Untrustworthy/Treacherous/Cunning/Hypocrite and Hesitant; with only 1 mention each.

Meanwhile, Dishonest was the only negative characteristic that witnessed an increase eventhough it was slight. It was raised from 1 mention in August to 3 in September.

On the other hand, some of the characteristics have witnessed some kind of decrease:

- Does not stick to principles declined from 5 to 4 mentions.
- Dependent on others dropped from 5 to 2 mentions.
- Hostile/Cruel/Bloodthirsty and Materialistic/Greedy/Stingy; each declined from 5 mentions in August to only one in September.
- Untraditional and Racist; each dropped from 4 to 2 mentions

Only two negative characteristics were invariable: Pessimistic (2 mentions) and Stubborn/Persistent/Prosecutor (1 mention).

B- The Jerusalem Post Results:

As portrayed in the Jerusalem Post in the period of the Oslo Agreement, some characteristics that did not appear in August emerged in September:

- Alienated with 3 mentions
- Stubborn/Persistent/Prosecutor and Untrustworthy/Treacherous/Cunning/Hypocrite with 2 mentions.
- Materialistic/Greedy/Stingy with only one mention.

Meanwhile, Pessimistic (4 mentions), Blasphemer, Dependent on others, Dishonest, Stupid (2 mentions), Does not stick to principles, Chaotic and Illiterate/Uneducated (1 mention) were the negative characteristics of the Arabs that were detected in August and omitted in September 93.

Racist was the only negative characteristic that increased in September (2 mentions) than in August (1 mention).

1938 - The 1938 Platform Agreement Period

Changes of change in the Positive Characteristics

On the other hand, some negative characteristics witnessed a decrease:

A. Al-Ahram Results:

- Hostile/Cruel/Bloodthirsty falling from 5 to 3 mentions.
- Backward/Primitive/Uncivilized/Barbaric and Inferior; each declined from 3 to 2 mentions
- Hesitant dropped from 3 to only 1 mention.

The only two characteristics that remained without change were Arrogant (2 mentions) and Coward (1 mention).

In addition, Eleven out of 22 characteristics dropped considerably:

- Brave/Strong/Powerful falling from 5 to 4 mentions.
- Confident and Fearful; each declined from 5 to 4 mentions.
- Democratic dropped from 5 to 4 mentions.
- Friendly/Sociable and Honest; each decreased from 4 to 1 mention.
- Independent and Intelligent; each falling from 3 to 1 mention.
- Fidel, Optimistic and Bold each dropped from 2 to 1 mention.

1998 - The Whye Plantation Agreement Period

Degree of change in the Positive Characteristics

September 1998 Results compared to November 1998 Results:

A- Al-Ahram Results:

There is an obvious fall in the number of the positive characteristics of the Israelis. Many of the positive characteristics that were present in September 98 were not found in November 98: Like Planning (5 mentions), Has Principles (4 mentions), Ambitious/Civilized, Innocent/Faithful, Religious (3 mentions), Flexible Thinking, Humble, Is Concerned with Traditions and Superior (2 mentions).

In addition, Eleven out of 22 characteristics dropped considerably:

- Brave/Strong/Powerful falling from 8 to 4 mentions.
- Confident and Peaceful; each declined from 6 to 4 mentions.
- Democratic dropped from 5 to 4 mentions.
- Friendly/Sociable and Honest; each decreased from 4 to 1 mention.
- Independent and Intellectual; each falling from 3 to 1 mention
- Fidel, Optimistic and Rich; each dropped from 2 to 1 mention.

Trustworthy was the only positive characteristic that increased (augmenting from 2 to 4 mentions), while Intelligent was the only one that remained unchanged (5 mentions).

ch (4 mentions), Confident, Innocent/Faithful and Humble (1 mention each) were the only positive characteristics that emerged in November and were absent in September.

Meanwhile, Has Principles (2 mentions), Ambitious/Civilized, Honest and Superior (1 mention each) disappeared in November after being perceived in September.

Some positive characteristics witnessed an increase in November over in August:

- Flexible Thinking and Peaceful increased from 1 to 5 mentions.
- Friendly/Sociable, Independent and Democratic augmented from 1 to 4 mentions.
- Intelligent increased slightly from 3 to 4 mentions.

On the other hand, Brave/Strong/Powerful (from 3 to 1 mention) and Life Planning (from 2 to 1 mention) were the only characteristics that decreased in November than in September.

B- The Jerusalem Post Results:

Intellectual (5 mentions), Rich (4 mentions), Confident, Innocent/Faithful and Humble (1 mention each) were the only positive characteristics that emerged in November and were absent in September.

Meanwhile, Has Principles (2 mentions), Ambitious/Civilized, Honest and Superior (1 mention each) disappeared in November after being perceived in September.

Some positive characteristics witnessed an increase in November than in August:

- Flexible Thinking and Peaceful increased from 1 to 5 mentions.
- Friendly/Sociable, Independent and Democratic augmented from 1 to 4 mentions.
- Intelligent increased slightly from 3 to 4 mentions.

On the other hand, Brave/Strong/Powerful (from 3 to 1 mention) and Like Planning (from 2 to 1 mention) were the only characteristics that decreased in November than in September.

Degree of change in the Negative Characteristics

September 1998 Results compared to November 1998 Results:

A- Al-Ahram Results:

As reflected in Al-Ahram, some of the negative characteristics that appeared in September were no longer existent in November: Chaotic, Inferior, Dependable on others (2 mentions each), Alienated and Untraditional (1 mention each).

On the other hand, Stupid was the only negative characteristic that was absent in September and emerged in November.

Backward/Primitive/Uncivilized/Barbaric was the only negative characteristic that increased, rising from 1 to 2 mentions.

The Jerusalem Post Results

Meanwhile, Eleven out of the 22 negative characteristics were decreased:

- Does not stick to principles from 10 to 6 mentions.
- Hostile/Cruel/Bloodthirsty from 9 to 8 mentions.
- Stubborn/Persistent/Prosecutor and Guilty from 9 to 7 mentions.
- Untrustworthy/Treacherous/Cunning/Hypocrite from 7 to 5 mentions.
- Dishonest from 6 to 5 mentions.
- Arrogant from 5 to 2 mentions.
- Traitor from 4 to 2 mentions.
- Materialistic/Greedy/Stingy, Pessimistic and Racist from 3 to 2 mentions.

B- The Jerusalem Post Results:

In the Jerusalem Post, a general decrease in the negative characteristics describing the Egyptians was noticed. Some negative characteristics that appeared in September ceased to exist in November:

- Hostile/Cruel/Bloodthirsty, Materialistic/Greedy/Stingy and Stubborn/Persistent/Prosecutor (2 mentions each).
- Untrustworthy/Treacherous/Cunning/Hypocrite (1 mention).

Meanwhile, other negative characteristics that were non existent in September emerged in November:

- Illiterate, Uneducated and Blasphemer (3 mentions each).
- Arrogant (1 mention).

Guilty (from 2 to 3 mentions), Pessimistic (from 1 to 4 mentions) and Untraditional (from 1 to 3 mentions) were the only negative characteristics that increased.

Dependable on others was the only negative characteristic that decreased, falling from 4 to 1 mention.

Hesitant and Backward/Primitive/Uncivilized/Barbaric were the only two characteristics that did not change from September to November.

Conclusion

The media are reflecting the stereotyping of Arabs and Israelis that has been going on for centuries. They are important weapons in mobilizing people to adopt a certain attitude or view. Thus, they are the shaper of opinion. The images reflected in the newspapers, whether in Israel or Egypt, did not freeze throughout history but they fluctuated as did the relation between the two countries.

During the Middle Ages, the Jews were generally perceived as Demonic and Anti-Human. In the period from 1290-1700, they were stereotyped as Aliens, Anti-Christ, Bribers, Crucifiers, Blasphemers, Hypocrites, Murderers of innocent children, Traitors, etc. In the early 1820s, they were characterized as Mean, Avaricious, Unprincipled, Treacherous, Outcasts, Thieves, Sorcers, Poisoners, Peculiar and lenders of money at interest. After Hitler, the Jews were portrayed as Jekyll-Hyde, apparently meek, powerless, impoverished and oppressed, few in number and pitifully disunited but in reality wielding immense power. The claim was they were dominant everywhere by using unprincipled methods. They are Wandering Vagabonds, "the Outsiders who lived within the community, the traitors within the gates" (Felsenstein, 1995, 7).

The Egyptian-Israeli relationship is a very old one. In Egypt, the Jews used to be called Hebrews and lived in seclusion because they had special rituals. Until 1967, Israel used to propagandize itself as a small country, unarmed, peaceful, threatened by an "Arab giant destructive monster". The Egyptians used to think of them as scattered people who lived in a corrupt community and viewed their women as unfaithful and whores.

Recently, in his book Tahwiid 'Aql Misr, or Brainwashing Egypt's mind to adopt Jewish Thinking, Alii purported there was a Zionist cultural invasion, which he said seeks to brainwash the Egyptians and program them to tolerate the Zionist entity. He stated that the battle for culture and the battle for men's mind is not separate from the battle for the land (Alii, 1989, 8). Examples of such invasions were detected through the activities of "Israeli Academic Center in Cairo" like organizing conferences and lectures and inviting Israeli professors and through other centers and institutions that are "suspicious." He asserted that different institutions and centers work as undercover agencies for the CIA and/or the Mossad (Alii, 1989, 9).

On the other hand, the Arabs were all portrayed by the Israelis as Bedouins who ride Camels, have as many wives as they please, have more money than they know what to do with, are all Sheikhs, etc. The Arabs were seen as scattered and ununited. They tend to lie, exaggerate and deceive others. They are lazy, cowardly traitors with a very low I. Q. They are willing to sell themselves and their nations to whoever pays. Their soldiers were unable to use modern weapons and take risks.

In Egypt, as portrayed in the Jewish newspapers issued in 1948, were the Arabs who fought and shed blood. The Arab leaders were unrealistic and could not estimate facts. They were lying to the Arabs, using them, attacking and insulting them.

Following Sadat's peace initiative, however, Egypt and the Egyptians were no longer depicted as part of the Arabs mainstream. The Egyptians had become friends with Israel. They could not be like the rest of the Arabs, who were still perceived in negative terms.

The development of characterization and imaging by the press of Arabs and Israelis has been the focus of study for many researchers who tried to cover many crucial phases in the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict. In one of these studies, Janice Belkaoui made a content analysis of "Time" "Newsweek", "U.S. News and World Report" and the "Sunday New York Times" in the period 1966 - 74. She looked for the changes in the image of the Arabs (including Egyptians) and the Israelis in the American press (Belkaoui, 732-733). Although these newspapers are not Egyptian or Israeli, the strategic significance of the Middle East to the U.S.A. and other countries makes the relation between Arabs and Israelis occupy a significant position in the World press.

According to Belkaoui, the way the press reports the political news is dependent on the economic interest related to these events which is called the manipulative model of the press (Belkaoui, 732). Thus, the economic impact a political event will have on the interest of the country and its people will influence the way it is reported by the local press (733).

The Belkaoui study showed that after the 1973 war, the press held a "more favourable" image of the Arabs and "less favourable" image of the Israelis (Belkaoui, 735). During the 1967 phase, the image was more or less neutral towards Israelis and more negative towards Arabs. In this period, the announcements of the Arabs were negatively described as Aggressive, Angry and Threatening (Belkaoui, 736). But as mentioned above, these images of the Arabs and Israelis changed in the 1973 period. A striking illustration of this change can be seen in the characteristics used to describe the Arab and Israeli leaders. In 1967, the Israeli leaders were seen as Heroes, Winners and Strong while in 1973, they were described in the U.S. media as "Battle-scarred, Understrength and Tired military forces (737). As for Arab leaders and more specifically Egyptian leaders; in 1967, Egyptian President, Abdel Nasser, was perceived as Villain, Dangerous, Belligerent, Usurper, Nervy and Abuser while in 1973, President Sadat, was described as Prestigious, Subtle, Rational, Relaxed and Genial (737). This confirms the shift in the perception of the Arabs and Israelis in the 1967 -1973 phases studied by Belkaoui.

The Belkaoui study showed that American public opinion towards Arabs and Israelis was affected by the political events that took place in 1967 and 1973 (799). Apparently, this study supports the hypothesis of my study that the images reflected in the press tend to be affected by the ongoing political event.

Kamal Zoheiri, who kept on attacking Israel in Al-Gomhoria during 1977-79, said that his anti-Israeli columns used to be broadcast on the state-run radio when relations between Egypt and Israel were bad. "If they were warming up, my column was not even allowed to be printed", he said. From his experience, Zoheri concluded that attacking foreign countries in the Egyptian press is usually through a campaign involving more than one paper and editor-in-chief (Sadek, 189).

Anis Mansour said that "the government often uses such media campaigns to heat or cool relations with a foreign country, domestic public opinion and to escalate or de-escalate conflicts (Sadek, 189). This is obvious in my study because the characterization and stereotyping of the Egyptians by the Israeli press and the Israelis by the Egyptian press was and still is tinted by the political relations dominating both sides. We can see that the Oslo Agreement was obviously more favoured by Arabs than by Israelis. It had more positive reaction in the Egyptian than in the Israeli press. It was one of the most important positive steps taken in which the Arabs succeeded in securing some of their rights. This was reflected in the increase in the positive characteristics of the Israelis as found in the Egyptian press.

In the Oslo Agreement, the positive characteristics of the Israelis as reflected in Al-Ahram reached 53 mentions in September, up from 23 in August. The most striking among these positive characteristics were: Peaceful and Humble.

The Oslo agreement wasn't as satisfactory to the Israelis as it was to the Arabs. This was mirrored in the Israeli press that described the Egyptians with fewer positive characteristics. The positive characteristics describing the Egyptians in the Jerusalem Post decreased to 14 mentions in September from 25 in August. According to the Israelis, *Like Planning* and *Religious* were the most striking positive images that describe the Egyptians in that period.

Regarding the negative characteristics, in the first phase, the image of the Israelis in Al-Ahram almost did not change. It scored 32 mentions in August and moved to 33 in September.

In the Jerusalem Post, the negative characteristics of the Egyptians decreased from 33 mentions in August to 21 in September. The most prominent of these negative characteristics were: *Alienated*, *Untrustworthy/Treacherous/Hypocrite/Cunning* and *Stubborn/Persistent/Prosecutor*.

As for the Whye Plantation Agreement, it seems that it was more desirable to the Israelis than to the Egyptians and this was reflected in the press. In Al-Ahram, there was a drop in the total positive characteristics of the Israelis in November to 32 mentions from 78 in September. *Trustworthy* was the only positive characteristic that increased in November over September.

As for the image of the Egyptians in the Jerusalem Post, the total positive characteristics more doubled in November to 40 mentions from 18 in September. The most important among these positive characteristics were: *Intellectual, Rich, Peaceful, Friendly/Sociable, Independent, and Democratic.*

On the other hand, the negative characteristics of the Israelis dropped from 77 in September to 52 in November. *Stupid* and *Backward/Primitive/Uncivilized/Barbaric* were the most prominent frequent negative terms in this phase.

The negative characteristics of the Egyptians as reflected in the Jerusalem Post increased to 20 mentions in November from 17 in September. *Illiterate/Uneducated, Blasphemer, Pessimistic* were the most frequent negative characteristics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abstracts of the Journal of Peace Research, 1987: The Journal of Peace Research 25

Abstracts of the Journal of Peace Research, 1987: The Journal of Peace Research 25

In sum, "while the vast majority of Palestinians and Israelis support reaching a peaceful agreement of mutually-agreed upon self-determination, there was a resounding lack of enthusiasm for the recently-concluded talks [the Whye Plantation], compared to the Original Oslo agreements" (NEWS&LETTERS). The fluctuation of the images from positive to negative or vice versa depended on the attitude of the government, whether supporting or opposing the event. When a conflict is ending, the public opinion may still require a mixture of conflict and peace vocabulary so that the transition to permanent peace is smooth. Therefore, images are to be handled carefully. They are like a double-edged sword. If manipulated to distort the reality about the enemy, they would hinder the peace process. But if used positively, they would not only help in peace making but also in peace-keeping and trade. People would rather buy goods from friendly countries with favourable images than from countries with unfavourable images, even in a condition of official peace. Therefore, it is recommended to "learn about your neighbour" instead of "learning about your enemy" (Sadek, 208).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel Moety, Abdel Basset. (1997) "The Israeli's Image as perceived by the Egyptian in the General Culture and Television Drama." *Rose El Youssef*. pp. 40-44.
- Abdel Moneim, Mohamed. (1999) *Rose El Youssef*. March.
- Agha, Olfat Hassan. (1978) The Role of Mass Communications in Inter-State Conflict: The Arab-Israeli War of October 1973. *The Cairo Papers in Social Science*. The American University in Cairo: Cairo.
- Alexander, Yonah. (1973) The Role of Communications in the Middle East Conflict. Praeger Publishers: New York. Washington. London.
- Alij, Arafah Abduh. (1989) Tahwid 'Aql Misr. Sina for Publishing: Cairo.
- Amin, Badi'a. (1986) *Mawquif Al-l'laam Al-Sihyuunii Min El-Shaab El-Felistini.* l'laam Al-Sihyuunii: Utruuhaat Wa-Mawaagif. El Monazama El Arabia Lel Tarbeya Wa El Thakafa Wa El Oloum: Tunisia.

- Belkaoui, Janice Monti. (1978) Images of Arabs and Israelis in the Prestige Press, 1966-74. *Journalism Quarterly*. PP.732-738.
- Berelson, Bernard. (1971) Content Analysis in Communication Research. Hafner Publ. Co. Inc.
- Cohen, Raymond. (1990) Culture And Conflict in Egyptian-Israeli Relations. Indiana University Press: Bloomington & Indianapolis.
- Daugherty, William E. & Morris Janowitz. (1958) A Psychological Warfare Casebook. The Johns Hopkins Press: Baltimore.2
- El Ebyari, Fathi. Fann El Di'aayah-Wa-al Mukhattat al-Sihyuunii. El Haya El Masriya ElAmmal Lel Ketab.
- English, Robert D. & Jonathan J. Halperin. The Other Side: How Soviets And Americans Perceive Each Other. Edwards Brothers, Inc: Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- El Eweini, Mohamed Ali, El Sayed Eleiwa Hassan & Samir Quana'ni. Maqalat Fi El Da'aya El Sahyouneya Wa Harb October. Research Centre PLO: Beirut.

- Felsenstein, Frank. (1995) Anti-Semitic Stereotypes.
- Granof, Vladimeer. (1986) El Gawhar El Rag'ee Lel Sahyouneya. I'laam Al-Sihyuunii: Utruuhaat Wa-Mawaaqif. El Monazama El Arabia Lel Tarbeya Wa El Thakafa Wa El Oloum: Tunisia.
- El Hassan, Nafea'. (1986) Dor El E'lam El Sihyuni Fi Estratigiat Ehbat El Salam. I'laam Al-Sihyuunii: Utruuhaat Wa-Mawaaqif. El Monazama El Arabia Lel Tarbeya Wa El Thakafa Wa El Oloum: Tunisia.
- Holsti, Ole R. (1966) "External Conflict and Internal Consensus: The Sino-Soviet Case" In Philip Stone et al. *The General Inquirer: A Computer Approach to Content Analysis.* M.I.T. Press: Cambridge.
- Holt, Robert R. and B. Silverstein. (1989) "On the Psychology of Enemy Images: Introduction and Overview." *Journal of Social Issues*, pp. 3-4.
- Ibrahim, Asmaa. (1979) The role of image in the Arab-Israeli Conflict. Ph. D. Thesis: Ain Shams University: Cairo.
- Kadry, Hefni. The Israelis: Who are they? Ph. D. Thesis. Ain Shams University: Cairo.

- Kandil, Ragia Ahmed. The Image of Israel in the Egyptian Press.
Years: 1973-74-78. Ph.D. Thesis. Ain Shams University:
 Cairo.
- Koopman, Cheryl et al. (1989) American Elite Views of Relations
 with the Soviet Union. *Journal of Social Issues*, pp. 120.
- Lasswell, Harold D., Daniel Lerner and Ithiel de Sola Pool. (1952)
The Comparative Study of Symbols. (Hoover Institute
 Studies). Stanford: Stanford U. P.
- Luostarinen, Heikki. (1989) "Finnish Russiophobia: The study of
 an Enemy Image". *Journal of Peace Research*, pp. 124-5.
- El Monzari, Soliman. (1998) "El Itigah Thaghra Fi Nehaya El Nafaq
 El Mozlim". *Al-Ahram El Iktisadi*, pp. 12.
- Merrill, John. (1968) The Elite Press: Great Newspapers of the
World. Pitman: New York.
- Nassaar, Sihaam. (1991) Sihaafah Al-Israa'iiliyyah Wa-al-
Di'aayah Al- Sihyuniah. El Zahraa Lel-E'lam El Arabi: Cairo.

- North, Robert, et al. (1963) Content Analysis: A Handbook with Applications for the Study of International Crisis. Northwestern Univ. Press: Evanston.

- O' Donnell, Jowett. (1992) Propaganda and Persuasion. California.

- Pool, Ithiel De Sola. (1962) The Prestige Papers, A survey of Their Editorials. Stanford U. P.: Stanford.

- Rapoport, Anatol. (1960) Fights, Games and Debates. Univ. of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

- Saalih, Saalih. 'Abd al-Jawad. Harb al-Bayaanaat Al-Israa'iliyaah Al-Muzawarah. Markaz El Kuds Lel Derasat El Enmaeya: Amman.

- Sadek, Said Moustafa. (1996) Changes in the Perception of the Egyptian-Israeli Conflict in the Egyptian Press 1977-1979. Cairo University Press: Cairo.

- Schramm, Wilbur. (1960) One Day in the World's Press. Stanford U. P. : Stanford.

- Al-Shaykhali, Khaalid Rachid. (1990) Judhuur Al-Siraa' Al-Arabii-Al-Shihuunii Wa-Dawr Al-E'laam. El Rachad for Publishing: Baghdad.

- Spillman, Kurt R. and K. Spillman. (1991, December) Sour al Adw wa-Tas'aoud Al Khilafa. *Al Majalla Al Dawlia Lil Iloum Al Igtimaia.*

- El Tahri, Hamdi. Harb October Fi El E'lam El Alami. El Alamia for Publishing: Cairo.

- Terry, Janice. (1986) El Moshqela Allati Tafouk El Wasf. I'laam Al-Sihyuunii: Utruuhaat Wa-Mawaaqif. El Monazama El Arabia Lel Tarbeya Wa El Thakafa Wa El Oloum: Tunisia.

- Trachtenberg, Joshua. (1983) The Devil & The Jews. The Medieval Conception of the Jew & Its Relation to Modern Anti-Semitism. The Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia.

- El Tohami, Mokhtar. Tahlil Madmoun El Da'ya Fi El Nazareya Wa El Tatbeik. Dar El Maa'ref: Cairo

- Europa Yearbook 1974: A world Survey. Europa Publications: London.
- Webster's New Riverside University Dictionary. (1988) Riverside Publishing Company, pp. 610.
- Wright, Clifford A. (1989) Facts & Fables. The Arab-Israeli Conflict. Kegan Paul International: London & New York.

NEWSPAPERS

- Al-Ahram Egyptian Daily Newspaper
- The Jerusalem Post Israeli Daily Newspaper

URL:

Barry, Kevin A. and Mary Holmes. (1998) Mid-East agreement.

<http://WWW.newsandletters.org/11-98olat.html>

Al-Ahram, August 93

Appendix

Table No. 1.

The Positive Characteristics of the Israelis

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Confident	7
2	Superior	6
3	Brave, Strong, Powerful	4
4	Intelligent	4
5	Rich	1
6	Ambitious, Civilized	1
Total		23

Al-Ahram/ August 93

Table No. 1.

The Positive Characteristics of the Israelis

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Confident	7
2	Superior	6
3	Brave, Strong, Powerful	4
4	Intelligent	4
5	Rich	1
6	Ambitious, Civilized	1
Total		23

Al-Ahram/ August 93

Table No. 2.

The Negative Characteristics of the Israelis

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy	5
2	Hostile, Cruel,	5
3	Dependent on others	5
4	Does not stick to principles	5
5	Untraditional	4
6	Racist	4
7	Pessimistic	2
8	Stubborn, Persistant	1
9	Dishonest	1
Total		32

Table No. 3.

The Positive Characteristics of the Israelis

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Peaceful	7
2	Brave, Strong, Powerful	6
3	Superior	6
4	Humble	5
5	Intelligent	4
6	Confident	4
7	Intellectual	4
8	Flexible Thinking	3
9	Optimistic	3
10	Democratic	3
11	Has Principles	2
12	Rich	1
13	Friendly, Sociable	1
14	Ambitious, Civilized	1
15	Trustworthy	1
16	Independent	1
17	Honest	1
Total		53

Table No. 4.

The Negative Characteristics of the Israelis

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Traitor	5
2	Does not stick to principles	4
3	Dishonest	3
4	Guilty	3
5	Coward	2
6	Untraditional	2
7	Pessimistic	2
8	Inferior	2
9	Dependent on others	2
10	Racist	2
11	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy	1
12	Alienated	1
13	Hostile, Cruel, Bloodthirsty	1
14	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite, Traitor	1
15	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor	1
16	Hesitant	1
Total		33

Table No. 5.

The Positive Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Brave, Strong, Powerful	4
2	Intelligent	3
3	Confident	3
4	Is concerned with traditions	3
5	Rich	2
6	Flexible Thinking	2
7	Peaceful	1
8	Ambitious, Civilized	1
9	Intellectual	1
10	Religious	1
11	Optimistic	1
12	Has Principles	1
13	Honest	1
14	Democratic	1
Total		25

Table No. 6.

The Negative Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Hostile, Cruel, Bloodthirsty	5
2	Pessimistic	4
3	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric	3
4	Hesitant	3
5	Inferior	3
6	Stupid	2
7	Blasphemer	2
8	Dependent on others	2
9	Arrogant	2
10	Dishonest	2
11	Coward	1
12	Chaotic	1
13	Illiterate, Uneducated	1
14	Does not stick to principles	1
15	Racist	1
Total		33

Jerusalem Post/ September 93

Table No. 7.

The Positive Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Like Planning	3
2	Religious	3
3	Brave, Strong, Powerful	2
4	Rich	1
5	Ambitious, Civilized	1
6	Is concerned with traditions	1
7	Optimistic	1
8	Superior	1
9	Honest	1
Total		14

Jerusalem Post/ September 93

Table No. 8.

The Negative Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Alienated	3
2	Hostile	3
3	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric	2
4	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite, Traitor	2
5	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor	2
6	Inferior	2
7	Arrogant	2
8	Racist	2
9	Coward	1
10	Materialistic	1
11	Hesitant	1
Total		21

Table No. 9.

The Positive Characteristics of the Israelis

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Brave, Strong, Powerful	8
2	Peaceful	6
3	Confident	6
4	Intelligent	5
5	Like Planning	5
6	Democratic	5
7	Friendly, Sociable	4
8	Has Principles	4
9	Honest	4
10	Ambitious, Civilized	3
11	Intellectual	3
12	Religious	3
13	Innocent, Faithful	3
14	Independent	3
15	Rich	2
16	Trustworthy	2
17	Flexible Thinking	2
18	Is concerned with traditions	2
19	Optimistic	2
20	Superior	2
21	Humble	2
22	Fidele	2
Total		78

Table No. 10.

The Negative Characteristics of the Israelis

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Does not stick to principles	10
2	Hostile	9
3	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor	9
4	Guilty	9
5	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning	7
6	Dishonest	6
7	Arrogant	5
8	Traitor	4
9	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy	3
10	Pessimistic	3
11	Racist	3
12	Chaotic	2
13	Inferior	2
14	Dependent on others	2
15	Alienated	1
16	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric	1
17	Untraditional	1
Total		77

Table No. 11.

The Positive Characteristics of the Israelis

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Intelligent	5
2	Brave, Strong, Powerful	4
3	Peaceful	4
4	Trustworthy	4
5	Confident	4
6	Democratic	4
7	Rich	1
8	Friendly, Sociable	1
9	Intellectual	1
10	Optimistic	1
11	Independent	1
12	Honest	1
13	Fidele	1
Total		32

Table No. 12.

The Negative Characteristics of the Israelis

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Hostile, Cruel, Bloodthirsty	8
2	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor	7
3	Guilty	7
4	Does not stick to principles	6
5	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite, Traitor	5
6	Dishonest	5
7	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy	2
8	Stupid	2
9	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric	2
10	Pessimistic	2
11	Arrogant	2
12	Traitor	2
13	Racist	2
Total		52

Table No. 13.

The Positive Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Brave, Strong, Powerful	3
2	Intelligent	3
3	Like Planning	2
4	Has Principles	2
5	Friendly, Sociable	1
6	Peaceful	1
7	Ambitious, Civilized	1
8	Flexible Thinking	1
9	Superior	1
10	Independent	1
11	Honest	1
12	Democratic	1
Total		18

Jerusalem Post/ September 98

Table No. 14.

The -ve Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Dependent on others	4
2	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy	2
3	Hostile	2
4	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor	2
5	Guilty	2
6	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric	1
7	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite, Traitor	1
8	Hesitant	1
9	Untraditional	1
10	Pessimistic	1
Total		17

Jerusalem Post/ November 98

Table No. 15.

The Positive Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The +ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Peaceful	5
2	Flexible Thinking	5
3	Intellectual	5
4	Rich	4
5	Intelligent	4
6	Friendly, Sociable	4
7	Independent	4
8	Democratic	4
9	Brave, Strong, Powerful	1
10	Confident	1
11	Like Planning	1
12	Innocent, Faithful	1
13	Humble	1
Total		40

Jerusalem Post/ November 98

Table No. 16.

The Negative Characteristics of the Egyptians

	The -ve Characteristics	Mention
1	Pessimistic	4
2	Illiterate, Uneducated	3
3	Untraditional	3
4	Blasphemer	3
5	Guilty	3
6	Backward, Primitive	1
7	Hesitant	1
8	Dependent on others	1
9	Arrogant	1
Total		20

Thesis Titled:

The image of the Egyptians in the Israeli Press &
The image of the Israelis in the Egyptian Press

Instruction Sheet

In an attempt to identify how Egyptians and Israelis perceive each others, please read the following article (s) carefully and then select the appropriate characteristic(s) (Positive and/or Negative) from the code sheet here attached.

Please write on the code sheet: "the Egyptians are perceived as " or "the Israelis are perceived as ... " then mark the characteristic(s), if applicable.

Thank you for your evaluation. I really appreciate your help.

Code Sheet

The +ve characteristics		The -ve characteristics	
1	Brave, Strong, Powerful	1	Coward
2	Rich	2	Materialistic, Greedy, Stingy
3	Intelligent	3	Stupid
4	Friendly, Sociable	4	Alienated
5	Peaceful	5	Hostile, Cruel, Bloodythirsty
6	Ambitious/ Civilized	6	Backward, Primitive, Uncivilized, Barbaric
7	Trustworthy	7	Untrustworthy, Treacherous, Cunning, Hypocrite, Traitor
8	Flexible Thinking	8	Stubborn, Persistent, Prosecutor
9	Confident	9	Hesitant
10	Like Planning	10	Chaotic
11	Intellectual	11	Illiterate, Uneducated
12	Is concerned with Traditions	12	Untraditional
13	Religious	13	Blasphemer
14	Optimistic	14	Pessimistic
15	Innocent, Faithful	15	Guilty
16	Superior	16	Inferior
17	Independent	17	Dependent on others
18	Have Principles	18	Does not stick to principles
19	Humble	19	Arrogant
20	Honest	20	Dishonest
21	Fidèle	21	Traitor
22	Democratic	22	Racist

AMERICAN UNIV. IN CAIRO LIBRARY
3 8534 01013 6426