

No. 27, May 2000

Head of the Institute:

Prof. Michael Keren

Founder of the Institute:

Shalom Rosenfeld

Editor, Qesher:

Dr. Mordecai Naor

Editorial Board:

Prof. Michael Keren

Prof. Nurit Geretz

Dr. Mordecai Naor

Editorial Assistant:

Carmen Oszi

English Section:

Judy Krausz

Hebrew Copy Editor:

Moshe Orr

Typesetting & Production:

S. Kedem Ltd.

Hebrew Cover:

Poster announcing the exhibition "The Press and Jewish Life in the 20th Century," based on archival materials from the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Press and Communications, now on view at the Cymbalista Jewish Heritage Center, Tel Aviv University. The poster shows the cover page of *Unzer Shtimme* (1946), the first newspaper produced by Holocaust survivors in Germany, which bears a resemblance to the well-known scene in Benini's 1998 film "Life is Beautiful."

Editorial and Administrative Offices:

Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, 69978.

Tel: (03)6413404, (03)6408665.

Fax: (03)6422318

E-mail:

ocarmen@post.tau.ac.il

http://spinoza.tau.ac.il/hci/ins/jpress

CONTENTS

Introduction / Michael Keren — 2e

English Abstracts of Hebrew Articles:

Is the Journalist Like Any Other Employee? The Rights and Obligations of Newspaper Publishers and Journalists in the Labor Relations Context / Elisheva Barak — 3e

Alfred Kerr: Critic and Essayist in Turn-of-the-Century Berlin / Moshe Zuckerman — 5e

"Israel" — A Trilingual Newspaper Published in Cairo Between the World Wars / Hagar Hillel — 6e

The Carrot and the Stick: Israeli Newspapers and their Attitude to the Arabs of Israel During the Intifada / Ilan Asya — 8e

Location and Identity in Two Israeli TV Series: "Florentine" and "Bat-Yam — New York" / Miri Talmon and Tamar Leibes — 9e

The "King of the Jews" (Herzl) as a Communications Wizard / Ohad David — 10e

"Al Hamishmar": The Anatomy of a Party-Sponsored Newspaper / Yariv Tsafati / 12e

Convergence and Distance in the Relationship Between the Center and the Periphery in Journalistic Discourse / Oren Sofer — 14e

Advertisements in the Israeli Press During the 1970s: From the Yom Kippur War to the Peace Agreement with Egypt / Yarden Vatikai — 16e

Rabin's Murder Through the Haredi (ultra-Orthodox) Prism / Chagit Mes-Tsfaty — 17e

"Greeninkeh Baimelekh" (Green Bushes) — A Yiddish Juvenile Newspaper in Vilna / Adina Bar-El — 18e

Changes in the Israeli Juvenile Press, 1950s-1990s / Irit Cohen and Dvora Feingoz — 19e

Contributors to This Issue — 21e

Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications - Information Center

The Information Center has established a computerized research library with an on-line data base of some 110,000 articles and newspaper clippings published in the Jewish and Israeli media from 1989 onward, updated daily. Topics include the functioning of the Jewish print and electronic media; relations with governmental, public, legal and economic networks; the mutuality between media and society; and information on media figures. Such areas as security, criminal and economic affairs widely covered by the media are on file, as is a wide range of bibliographic materials on the history of Jewish media in Israel and throughout the world.

A special section contains titles and details of approximately 10,000 Jewish periodicals in some 40 languages published since the late 17th century, constituting a significant portion of the estimated 15,000 Jewish periodicals thought to have existed.

The Center also houses several collections of current and historical exemplars of the Israeli and Jewish press, including special issues, and about 1,500 relevant books, video and audio cassettes and photographs.

For further information, contact **Carmen Oszi**, Tel: 972-3-6408102.

E-mail: ocarmen@post.tau.ac.il ; Internet site: <http://spinoza.tau.ac.il/hci/ins/jpress>.

INTRODUCTION / Michael Keren

This issue of *Qesher* is devoted as always to articles in varied disciplines — law, history, political science, communications and others — which deal with the Jewish media. The distinguishing feature of the present issue is the large space afforded to articles by graduate students, reflecting our interest in supporting student research in the field of the Jewish press and communications.

In the opening article, Elisheva Barak examines the issue of freedom of speech from a unique perspective, that of labor relations. She describes the distinctiveness of such relations as necessitating a large measure of integrity, trust and consideration between employees and employer, and explores the limits of the free speech of workers according to these criteria in the context of employment in a newspaper.

Moshe Zuckerman presents a glimpse of the "Letters from Berlin" by critic and essayist Alfred Kerr, who wrote in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century. Kerr's articles on Berlin life, rediscovered recently, reveal an intellectual capacity that stemmed from his outsider status both as a Jew who converted out of his faith and as a foreigner in depicting the reality of his adopted city.

Hagar Hillel reviews the history of *Israel*, published in Egypt during the 1920s and '30s. A trilingual newspaper (Hebrew, French and Arabic), it was addressed to the Jews of the Middle East in an effort to conduct a "Middle Eastern dialogue." Inter alia, it found itself in competition with the Hebrew newspapers published in Eretz Yisrael.

Ilan Asya presents a survey of the Israeli Hebrew press during the Intifada, in terms of the attitude revealed toward the Arabs of Israel. His main point is that the press was part of an effort to warn the Arab citizens of Israel to keep their protest activity within the bounds of the legal options available to them.

Miri Talmon and Tamar Leibes examine the cultural significance of location and identity in two Israeli TV series, "Florentine" and "Bat-Yam — New York," and find that while location in foreign drama series is an integral element of the characters' social and cultural identity, in the Israeli series it reflects an unresolved identity conflict.

Ohad David analyzes Theodor Herzl's thoughtful use of

various media — the stage, the essay, oratory and others — and raises the fascinating question of whether this effective usage makes Herzl a brilliant national leader or a public relations expert who turned politics into theater.

Oren Sofer, exploring Israeli journalistic discourse on the issue of the "Yemenite Children" by applying the demanding criteria taken from Martin Buber's dialogue terminology, finds that the treatment of the issue in the Israeli press has lacked a strong "I-Thou" relationship. This finding, the writer argues, highlights the broader question of the existence of an "I-Thou" approach in journalistic discourse generally.

Yariv Tsfati describes the annals of *Al Hamishmar*, the Mapam newspaper, as exemplifying the party-sponsored as opposed to the commercial press in terms of content and linguistics, the recruitment of staff, the training of journalists and other aspects.

Yarden Vatikai illustrates how advertisements in the Israeli press from the Yom Kippur War of 1973 to the signing of the peace agreement with Egypt in 1979 reflected social and cultural coping with the trauma of the war and the transition to an era of peace.

Chagit Mes-Tsfaty describes the reactions to the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin in three haredi (ultra-Orthodox) newspapers — *Yated Ne'eman*, *Hamode'a* and *Yom Leyom* — a press that is not familiar to most of the Israeli public.

Adina Bar-El depicts the origins of *Greeninkeh Baimelekh*, a Yiddish juvenile newspaper that appeared in Poland at intervals from 1914 to 1939.

Lastly, Irit Cohen and Dvora Feingoz present a comparison between two juvenile newspapers in Israel — *Davar Liyeladim* and *Kulanu* — during three periods: the 1950s, 1980s and 1990s.

The Editorial Board welcomes the submission of articles to be published in the next two issues of *Qesher*, the first to be devoted to women in the Jewish press and communications, and the second to economic aspects of the Jewish press and communications such as publishing, financing and the financial press in Israel

IS THE JOURNALIST LIKE ANY OTHER EMPLOYEE? THE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS AND JOURNALISTS IN THE LABOR RELATIONS CONTEXT / Elisheva Barak

The author, a judge in the National Labor Court, explores the publisher-journalist relationship in terms of the rights of each side in the employer-employee context. When these rights conflict, she holds, a suitable balance between them must be found, as in any human rights conflict.

The Distinctiveness of Labor Relations

Labor relations, as distinct from ordinary contractual relations, are ongoing. Their stipulations change by virtue of the seniority accrued by the employee, salary raises, increased expertise and accumulated experience. Labor relations are thus dynamic and flexible. They are also close relations, involving an ongoing connection. This necessitates integrity and trust. Each side must show consideration for the other, so that each side derives satisfaction and even pleasure in the workplace, and not merely a livelihood.

The Suitable Balance Between the Human Rights of Each Side

The employer enjoys property rights, the right of freedom of employment, and the right to conduct his business as he sees fit. In fact, he has a duty to conduct his business as best he can – a duty to his employees, who have an interest in the success of the enterprise; and to the public, for the employer is a link in the national economy.

The employer's prerogative, however, is not absolute. It juxtaposes with other rights – those of the employees. The employees have labor power, which is a quasi property right. They, too, have the right of freedom of employment, i.e., the freedom to utilize their labor power to earn a livelihood, to realize their potential, and to work in their area of expertise. Working in one's area of expertise and developing this expertise is even a worker's duty.

These rights, however, are not absolute. They are liberties, i.e., they may not be exerted in a way that harms the other side. The rights of employers and of employees, therefore,

must be balanced against each other. This is accomplished by means of a test of proportionality. Measures adopted by the employer must balance the needs of his business with the needs of his workers. An employee with a certain expertise may not be shifted to a job requiring less expertise even if his salary is unaffected; he is entitled to work satisfaction and promotion, not demotion.

There are also limits to the extent of the employer's intervention in the employee's manner of carrying out his work. With this, the employee, too, must respect the rights of the employer. He may not deliberately cause a disturbance at work or refuse to carry out an assignment without due cause.

The Right of Freedom of Speech

This right is especially important in the context of labor relations. Certain limitations on freedom of speech were imposed by Israeli law (1959) on civil servants, i.e., a prohibition against public criticism of the government or of government policy. These restrictions were legislated before the passage of two basic laws – Basic Law: Dignity and Liberty, and Basic Law: Freedom of Occupation. Today, such restrictions might not be upheld, as they violate the freedom of speech of the employee and damage the public interest by preventing the public from being informed of irregularities in the workplace. Employees must be able to express their opinion about the firm's management and work methods. Moreover, they must be free to report on corruption in the workplace. Such workers risk dismissal and may fear to complain. Legislation was passed in Israel in 1958, reinforced by additional legislation in 1997, to protect such workers. Today, the Knesset is considering shifting the burden of proof regarding the motive for dismissing such workers, to the employer.

The Prerogative of Management Differs in Regard to Different Employers

Different employers have different obligations to their employees. A public-sector employer, whose function is to serve the public, has more restrictions placed on him than a private employer. Prohibitions against discrimination, improper motive or conflicts of interest are more stringent for the public-sector employer. A third category of employer falls between these two: private bodies that provide services to the public, such as universities or hospitals. They are subject to the restrictions applied to private employers, but certain rules that apply to public bodies apply to them, too, based on the duty to act in good faith.

Newspaper Owners and Journalists

The newspaper owner, who is generally the publisher as well, has rights and obligations as any other employer. He is the proprietor. He has the prerogative to conduct his newspaper as he sees fit. In addition, however, he has another basic right, which is integral to his status as a newspaper owner: the right of free speech and a free press. This is a distinctive right, different from the right of free speech of other employers in that it constitutes the very essence of his occupation. He is free to determine the format, content and point of view of his newspaper. However, as every right, his prerogative is not absolute. The employer must consider the rights of others – the employees and the general public.

Journalists, too, have rights, as all other employees: the right to work, to freedom of occupation, to the autonomy of free will. Additionally, as in the case of newspaper owners, they have another right that is specific to their particular work and expertise – the right to freedom of speech and press, which is the essence of their work.

The freedom of speech of the employer, the editor and the journalists conflicts with each other and with the public's right to be informed.

The Balance Between the Freedom of Speech of All Parties

The first balance that must be achieved is that between the rights of the owner and publisher on the one hand and the employees – the editor and journalists, on the other. In the case of politically sponsored newspapers, which existed in Israel until some years ago, it is only natural for the owner to

seek to mold the paper along party lines. The question is the extent of his intervention in the daily writing and editing. If he dictates linguistic usage, persons who may and may not be interviewed, or the elimination of credible information about the performance of government officials, his intervention, in the author's view, is not legitimate and harms the freedom of press of the journalist, which is the essence of his work. While the owner has the right to hire and fire the journalists on his staff, within the limits of the law, he does not have the right to dictate how they craft their articles.

Freedom of Speech of the Public in a Democratic Society

Beyond the obligation of the newspaper owner and the journalists not to violate each others' rights, they have an obligation to the public. A newspaper is a private enterprise but it also serves the public. It falls into the third category of employer described above, with obligations that stem from the judicial principle of serving the public with integrity. Because the media play a central role in a democratic society as public opinion molders, they must supply the public with a broad range of news and views. A newspaper owner who insists on publishing a one-sided, unbalanced paper does not discharge his obligation to the public with integrity. A free press improves public debate, which is vital to a democratic society in assuring the rule of law, in the same way that an employee's right to criticize his employer's practices is essential.

The owner's obligation to the public imposes a limitation on him: he is not entitled, from the public's point of view, to publish a one-sided newspaper that reflects his views only.

Freedom of the Press vis-a-vis the Government

Freedom of the press for the newspaper owner means, *inter alia*, a balance between freedom of press and freedom from governmental intervention. In principle, the government has no right to intervene in newspaper publishing or to impose censorship. Only in specific cases of national security or libel can the freedom of the press be restricted. In the latter case, a post facto judicial suit is preferable to publishing restrictions. In the case of danger to national security, governmental intervention is warranted only when the published material causes severe harm to the peace and security of the public, or when the likelihood of such harm is clear and present.

Cross-Ownership

The concentration of control of the press in the hands of a small number of parties, especially in the present era, is a serious problem worldwide and in Israel as well. It prevents competition and shrinks the public marketplace of ideas. In the author's view, the present antitrust law in Israel is insufficient to overcome this problem, and additional legislation is needed.

Remedies

When a journalist's freedom of press is violated by a

newspaper owner, leading to the resignation of the journalist, the resignation should be treated as a constructive dismissal, i.e., one that obliges severance pay, on the basis that the worker cannot be expected to continue working at his job. He should be treated as if he has been dismissed. The author herself handed down such a judgment in the 1990s in the case of the resignation of 30 journalists from the *Jerusalem Post* following the transfer of ownership of the newspaper.

Another means of supporting journalists is by obligating newspaper owners to balance their freedoms with those of their employees and of the public at large through court action. The defense of journalists and of the public must be even more forceful in cases of cross-ownership.

ALFRED KERR: CRITIC AND ESSAYIST IN TURN-OF-THE-CENTURY BERLIN / Moshe Zuckerman

Born in 1867 to a well-established Jewish family in Breslau, then under German control, Alfred Kempner as a young man changed his name to Kerr, converted to Protestantism and moved to Berlin. In many ways he came to typify the Jewish intellectual in turn-of-the-century Germany struggling with a perpetual tension between potential cultural belonging and its non-fulfillment socially. A common denominator for many of these intellectuals — personified, inter alia, by Walter Benjamin — was Berlin, the paradigm of the modern German metropolitan experience.

Kerr studied history, philosophy and Germanic studies at the University of Halle, moving to Berlin in 1887. He soon began writing sketches for various periodicals in Berlin and theater reviews for papers in and around Breslau. A series of reports by him, titled *Letters from Berlin*, was published in the *Breslauer Zeitung* during 1895-1900. His career thereafter as one of the most brilliant German-language theater critics ever was founded on his association with the Berlin newspaper *Der Tag* during 1900-19. At the same time, he also published an arts magazine, *Pan*, which he edited; his first volume of poetry, *Die Harfe* ("The Harp"); and his first series of collected theater reviews (in five volumes), *Die Welt im Drama*. These works showed him to be an admirer of Henrik Ibsen, George Bernard Shaw and the German playwright Gerhard

Hauptmann. His writing style was provocative, witty, illuminating and focused, a combination that led to his singular accomplishment of turning drama criticism into a distinct literary genre.

Kerr became a prolific critic in the two most prominent dailies of the Weimar Republic period — *Berliner Tageblatt* and *Frankfurter Zeitung*. Later, his reviews became increasingly cynical and mannered. He attacked Brecht's plays, praised the political involvement of Erwin Piscator, and most particularly opposed the National-Socialist Party in a series of reports he wrote for Berlin Radio. During this period he also published compilations of travel essays about France, England and Spain (1923-25); another anthology of verse, *Caprichos* (1926); and an autobiography, "The Book of Friendship" (1928).

Immediately upon Hitler's rise to power, Kerr emigrated with his family first to Prague (February 1933) and from there to Vienna, Zurich and Paris. His published work was publicly burned by the Nazis. Two years after his arrival in Paris, he migrated to England, where he acquired citizenship and was to live for 10 years. He was a founder of the Free German Cultural Association, and from 1938 served for four years as chairman of the German P.E.N. society in London. Following the end of World War II, he returned to Germany and wrote

for *Die Welt* and *Die Neue Zeitung* until his death in 1948.

Kerr's Letters to Berlin, rediscovered and reprinted in 1997 approximately a century after their original appearance, caused a literary sensation. Laudatory reviews cited the exceptional wealth of content and compelling early style, which served to breathe life into the century-old events depicted while transforming his journalistic oeuvre into literature. His subject matter — Berlin at the turn of the century — was equally fascinating. The city was rapidly metamorphizing then from a provincial capital (of Prussia) to a pan-German metropolis that set the tone politically, artistically, socially and

economically. It was also undergoing dizzying physical expansion and population growth.

The young Kerr was a chronicler of this flowering, portraying the city as restless and scintillating. His fascination with Berlin, however, was ambivalent, for his desire to belong to the city's nouveau riche contrasted with his ironic, mocking depiction of them. Kerr, part outsider, part insider, impaled each manifestation of pretension astutely. This ambivalence — the acute awareness of the vanities of the social stratum which fascinated him — was the key to Kerr's greatness as an observer and commentator.

“ISRAEL” – A TRILINGUAL NEWSPAPER PUBLISHED IN CAIRO BETWEEN THE WORLD WARS / Hagar Hillel

In 1920, an unusual Jewish newspaper appeared in Cairo, published in French, Hebrew and Arabic. Devoted to unifying the Egyptian Jewish community in support of the “Jewish cause,” it was influenced by the disbandment of the Ottoman Empire and the spread of a spirit of liberalism in the wake of World War I, along with the promise of a Jewish national home in Palestine following its conquest by the British.

The newspaper was the co-production of a husband-and-wife team: Cairo-born Albert Mosseri, scion of a prominent Sephardi family, who was educated locally and in Paris, and Mathilda nee Mani, daughter of the first Jewish judge in Ottoman Jerusalem, Malkiel Mani.

The pro-Zionist *Israel* espoused a three-pronged program for Jewish national revival: rejuvenating the Jewish community of Egypt in the spirit of Jewish nationalism; developing Jewish solidarity by greater contact with the diaspora and a dedication to building up a Jewish national center in Palestine; and nurturing good relations with the Arabs of Egypt and Palestine in the common cause of benefiting the region. Mosseri's decision to publish a trilingual newspaper aimed at stimulating discourse between the various populations involved in this revival — local Jews, Jews elsewhere and non-Jews. In the case of the Hebrew edition, he was aware that the readership would be limited but he viewed the project as a symbolic Jewish national act. In the event, the Hebrew edition was discontinued four years later, in 1924.

Following Mosseri's death in 1933, Mathilda committed herself to continue operating the two surviving papers. A year later, however, in 1934, she was forced to cease publication of the Arabic edition for lack of viability. Five years later, in 1939, she had to close down the French edition as well, as a result of a libel suit brought against it by the Italian Consulate in Cairo for its blunt criticism of the fascist and Nazi regimes. Moreover, an attachment order was issued for the printing press under her ownership, leading her to acknowledge that the political and economic conditions in Egypt were no loner as hospitable as in the past. However, she assured the continuity of the newspaper by merging it with an Alexandria-based paper, *La Tribune Juif*. Thereafter, she joined her two children, who had settled in Palestine.

In appearing in three languages (at first in a single combined edition and later in three separate editions), *Israel* represented three cultures that existed side by side within the Jewish community of Egypt and of several neighboring countries. The point of view of the paper was that public discourse in this heterogeneous society would pave the way for a consensus internally and for good relations between the Jews and their non-Jewish environment. Each linguistic edition had its own editor in chief (Mosseri himself assumed this role for the French edition). Each ran separate editorials, selected different news items and carried different advertisements in accord with the interests of, and the message projected to, its particular readership. All, however, reflected the publisher's journalistic

integrity: credible information, the presentation of a broad range of views, and an avoidance of slander.

French, the lingua franca of the foreign communities in Egypt and of the Egyptian elite, was the primary language of communication of the Jews during the interwar period. It was the language of instruction in the community's schools, the language used in community institutions and the language of most of its press. It also reflected the close political and economic ties between the Jewish community in Egypt and Europe. French-educated Egyptian Jews served as managers and administrators of commercial enterprises in Egypt that were based on foreign investment and whose affairs were conducted in French. Not surprisingly, the French edition of *Israel* elicited the greatest interest and was the most successful of the three. Begun as a biweekly, it quickly became a weekly and for a time a semi-weekly. It grew in size, incorporated technical improvements and widened its content with the passage of time. Despite growing competition from other French-language Jewish papers in the mid-1930s, it retained a circulation of some 2,000, which made it viable.

The readership of the French edition consisted of the Jewish business and professional sector, who were part of the middle class and above in Egypt. Their lifestyle and interests were European, they traveled frequently, and they were well educated. Despite a trend toward secularization and assimilation, the readership remained largely loyal to its Jewish traditions.

In contrast to French, Arabic lost prominence in the Jewish community from the start of the twentieth century onward. Spoken Arabic became associated with the poorer Jewish sector, while knowledge of literary Arabic was limited to a small group of religious scholars and intellectuals only. Judeo-Arabic, popular in the Jewish communities of several other Arab countries, never took root in Egypt. The Arabic edition

of *Israel*, therefore, was aimed essentially at a non-Jewish audience or at Arabic-speaking Jews elsewhere in the Middle East. It also served the local Kara'ite community and the lower-class Jews of Cairo and Alexandria.

To what extent the Arabic edition was actually read by Arabs is unclear, but it constituted a vehicle for the defense and promotion of the Jewish community within its wider environment. Its circulation in the Jewish communities in other Middle Eastern countries, especially Syria and Iraq, rose during periods of significant events in Jewish life not reported in the general press, such as Nazi persecution of Jews in Europe, or events reported in a biased way in the local press, such as the Jewish-Arab conflict in Palestine. However, the newspaper was not welcomed by the leadership of these Jewish communities, which was conservative in nature and disapproved of airing internal debate in a public forum. Following Mosseri's death, Mathilda was able to recruit communal support to sustain the French edition but not the Arabic one, which closed after 14 years of publication.

Hebrew as a spoken language was limited in Egypt, although it was taught as a second language in Jewish community schools. Mosseri's motivation to publish a Hebrew edition was purely ideological, reflecting the Zionist aspiration to revive the Jewish national language. Although the Hebrew edition of *Israel* initially attracted a small readership, the paper was not viable, especially with growing competition from the emerging Hebrew press in Palestine after World War I. Hebrew newspapers from Palestine were readily available due to improved transportation links between the two countries, making the Hebrew edition of *Israel* redundant.

The closure of the Hebrew edition, however, did not signify an end to Mosseri's efforts to promote Hebrew, which he carried on through support for a Hebrew school and the establishment of Hebrew youth clubs.

THE CARROT AND THE STICK: ISRAELI NEWSPAPERS AND THEIR ATTITUDE TO THE ARABS OF ISRAEL DURING THE INTIFADA / Ilan Asya

The Intifada, which broke out in the territories on December 9, 1987, had an immediate effect on the Arab citizens of Israel, heightening their nationalist self-expression sharply. They announced a general strike on December 21, which soon assumed violent forms of protest – the blocking of roads with barriers of stones, setting tires on fire, stoning passing cars, writing nationalist graffiti, raising the Palestinian flag, damaging property, destroying crops and setting forest fires.

Only when the Arabs of Israel took up such violent protest did the Hebrew press begin covering the link between this sector of the population and the Intifada. During the first three years of the Intifada, press coverage centered on five main events: the solidarity strike of December 21, 1987, 12 days after the outbreak of the Intifada; the annual Land Day commemorations (marking government appropriation of Arab-owned land) held on March 30, 1988, and March 15, 1989; rioting and demonstrations following the murder by an Israeli in Rishon LeZion of seven Arab workers from the Gaza Strip on May 20, 1990; and the reaction to the incidents at the Temple Mount on October 8, 1990, in which 19 Arabs were killed by Israeli security forces during rioting by tens of thousands of Arab worshippers.

The newspapers covered in this survey were the three major independent dailies – *Ha'aretz*, *Ma'ariv* and *Yedi'ot Aharonot*, and two party-supported dailies (now defunct) – *Davar*, sponsored by the Histadrut, reflecting the Labor Party position, and *Al Hamishmar*, the organ of the leftist Mapam Party. An analysis of the coverage during the first three years of the Intifada (the uprising was to last a total of six years) led to the following findings:

1. Interest by the press in the positions of the Arabs of Israel regarding the Intifada was generally shown when this sector became actively involved in extremist protest activity, in disturbing the peace, or in hostile acts of varying severity.
2. The press in effect played the role of conduit for messages from the government and from the Jewish establishment to the Arabs of Israel. This phenomenon reflects the ongoing influence exerted by the hegemonic, or mainstream, Zionist ideology over journalists and editors, and the preservation of

the consensus regarding the justness of Israel's cause.

3. The model adopted by the newspapers in their treatment of the Arabs of Israel was more complex than that adopted in their coverage of the Arabs in the territories. The newspapers became a kind of educational tool in relation to the Arab citizens of Israel, operating to bring them back to the track of nonviolent activity and play by the rules. The newspapers' jointly held motive was preventing the carryover of the Intifada into Israeli territory proper. The means used were threats balanced by rewards. Warning messages, and at times veiled or open threats, were conveyed in the press by identified or unidentified official sources in parallel with editorial commentary and interviews of, or articles by, authority figures. These were balanced by empathetic articles describing the difficult condition of the Arabs in Israel.

4. While the editorial stance of the papers influenced their approach to some degree, it did not lead to any significant difference between them. *Ma'ariv* displayed the most rigid attitude toward the Arab sector, yet even the leftist *Al Hamishmar* took up the editorial mandate of preventing the Intifada from spilling over into Israeli territory. Its attitude toward restrained protest activity by the Arabs was positive and understanding, but violent acts and rioting were censured systematically and explicit threats were published in an effort at deterrence. The bluntest threat was a prediction of the emergence of a Jewish united front of both leftists and rightists against the Arabs and the prospect of the expulsion of the Arabs. The most widespread threat was loss of the attainments of the Arabs of Israel and a renewal of Israeli military governance, as had been the situation from 1948 until 1964.

The author highlights the "conscripted" aspect of the Hebrew press during the Intifada, i.e., the close link between the country's security demands and the editorial responses to them, particularly at moments when control over the Arabs appeared to be in danger. The press is shown to have been a willing partner in the effort to quell disturbances by means of warnings to the Arab population of Israel to use legal forms of protest only, such as parliamentary as well as media channels – i.e., to accede to the country's legal democratic processes. This

effort to "domesticate" the opposition can be seen as an attempt by the ruling hegemony to incorporate the Arabs of Israel without doing harm to itself. In this way it also entrenched the legitimate forms of opposition. Significantly, the ruling hegemony itself underwent change in order to remain in

control, for in the wake of violent protest by the Arab sector, and the fear of losing control over this population, the government began to show some interest in their problems. The domestication of this conflict was also economically inspired.

LOCATION AND IDENTITY IN TWO ISRAELI TV SERIES: "FLORENTINE" AND "BAT-YAM – NEW YORK" / Miri Talmon and Tamar Leibes

TV soap operas ranging from the prototype Dallas to The Young and the Restless or The Bold and the Beautiful have gained international popularity as a result of a blurring of specific locales and historic identities. Yet, media research has shown that home-grown TV drama series set in familiar locations and spoken in the audience's native language are generally more popular than foreign imports. Audiences tend to identify less with the imports, which they view as fantasies, than with locally produced series, about which they make value judgments. Paradoxically, the popularity of the local products is tied directly to its grounding in a well-defined and familiar time and place, as exemplified by the long-running British Coronation Street or Eastenders series.

In Israel, the media revolution that occurred in the 1990s ushered in the first Hebrew-language original TV drama series, each sited in defined settings. The pioneer Ramat Aviv Gimmel focused on images of the new Israeli arriviste elite – wealthy, materialistic and unfaithful – in the well-known north Tel Aviv neighborhood of the title. Two, more recent series – Florentine, and Bat-Yam – New York, are locations that suggest a quest for a more authentic Israeliness: multi-cultural, non-glamorous and unmoneyed.

Florentine, taken from the name of a decayed south Tel Aviv neighborhood of small workshops and petty commerce, is the location as well of an emergent young Tel Aviv subculture. Its ethnic old-timer population contrasts with the transience of the story's characters, twentysomethings taking time out from the normative middle class route. They live in a bohemian, non-committing milieu while searching for themselves far from the frenetic, success-oriented, alienating

world of their parents.

Bat-Yam – New York focuses on the ethnically and socioeconomically marginal milieu of the town of Bat-Yam and its second-generation Israeli heroes who seek upward social mobility in a diaspora across the ocean. Unlike the British drama series, in which traditional locales symbolize stability and continuity, Bat-Yam is depicted as a problematic base both for the refugee parent generation, who were uprooted from their country of origin (Iraq) and who never entered the Israeli mainstream, and for the second generation, who in turn have left for another place. The family tie is the only significant link, and the story explores the viability of this link when it is put to the test of geographic distancing.

The accelerated pace of change in the relationship between cultural milieu and locale that is engendered by globalization and the new communications technologies threatens communal traditions and the sense of local belonging. In the Israeli context, the link between group identity and place is particularly complex, for several reasons:

- The rooting of Israelis in Israel was impelled by an abstract idea – the Zionist idea of a physical return to the geographic entity referred to in ancient texts.
- The Israelis' identification with Israel consists, actually, of two distinct kinds of links: the spontaneous identification with native physical home, friends and childhood landscape; and Israel as a concept, as *ha'aretz* (the land), the place above all others (to which one "ascends" or from which one "descends"), the center of the Jewish people from time immemorial, transcending place and time.
- In recent decades, ideological and political debate in Israel

over the definition of the "legitimate" Israeli territorial expanse has lent weight to a questioning of the validity of the traditional Zionist "negation of the exile."

In short, the Israeli perception of social and national identity is no longer unified and no longer self-evident in a homogeneous history and geography. Israelis (and Jews throughout the world), as other dispersed populations, struggle to recapture imagined sources of identity. Ultimately, however, they must settle for an identity that is hybrid and eclectic, in the absence of a single legitimate, authoritative geographic, historic or social source.

In the Bat-Yam series, the immigrant parents in the marginal "southern" town struggle to retain their children's loyalty to ethno-familial tradition. Bat-Yam symbolizes this communal solidarity, while New York is the new world of the second generation which threatens the family's wholeness and traditions. New York represents a multi-cultural world that

embodies the prospect of emigration and exile, a world that the parents resist even though their own environment – Israel – denies the authenticity of *their* belongingness.

Florentine, symbolizing a young Tel Aviv subculture, is depicted as an alternative to the bourgeois/yuppie rat race. The old-time residents of the Florentine neighborhood, who constitute the backdrop to the heroes' story, represent ethnic tradition in a decaying milieu. The heroes act out their dramas in the neighborhood setting but are only transient and have no sense of belonging to it.

Both series represent different views of the Israeli story. The first deals with the pain of migration and the longing for family togetherness. The second portrays a generation longing for peace and normalization which would allow young people to focus on their private dilemmas, such as choice of career or of partner, rather than on the national agenda.

THE "KING OF THE JEWS" (HERZL) AS COMMUNICATIONS WIZARD / Ohad David

In the spring of 1893, the young journalist Theodor Herzl, Paris correspondent for the prestigious Viennese daily *Neue Freie Presse*, toyed with a plan that, he believed, would shock world public opinion regarding anti-Semitism and the "Jewish question" and would in a single stroke bring about an end to the suffering of the Jews. Herzl planned to challenge three prominent Austrian anti-Semites to a duel to the death. If he died, he reasoned, his death could at least serve as a lesson to mankind. If one of the anti-Semites died, the trial that would be conducted against Herzl would become a show trial exposing anti-Semitism; would give him a platform for influencing world public opinion; and would enhance the status of Jews everywhere.

Four years later, Herzl would stand at the head of the first congress of the Jewish national movement – Zionism, and with the passage of only a few years more, the Zionist movement was to become a world movement. This rapid progression of events, together with the detailed political program presented by Herzl at the first congress, and the seminal political pamphlet *The Jewish State* that he published (1896), were products of the vital importance that he attached to communications and its role in molding Jewish and world

public opinion. Despite his failures in the diplomatic arena, Herzl became "king of the Jews" because of his ability, *inter alia*, to mesmerize the masses, an ability supported by his well-developed organizational and propaganda sense combined with his talents as a dramatist and his rich linguistic facility. Herzl (1860-1904), in short, was an early public relations virtuoso.

Although his awakening to the Jewish problem is commonly attributed to the first Dreyfus trial of 1894, Herzl was troubled by the issue earlier. In 1882 he was shaken by the book by E. Duehring, *The Jewish Question as a Racial, Ethnic and Cultural Question*. In 1883 he resigned from a student society, Albia, because of anti-Semitism he encountered in it. Once appointed as a foreign correspondent in Paris in 1891, his encounter with anti-Semitism shifted from the intellectual realm to the real world. Covering events at which crowds shouted "Death to the Jews" impelled him to begin to express himself on the issue.

He also devised a series of plans (which were to prove unsuccessful) for solving the Jewish problem. An important turning point in his awareness of the centrality of public opinion was his play *The New Ghetto* (1894), which he hoped would be staged in major European theaters in order to arouse public

opinion to the only solution, in his view: breaking down the spiritual ghetto in which the Jews languished. This state, he asserted, must be altered not through assimilation but by group self-pride, the preservation of Jewish identity and courage in the face of anti-Semitism. No theater, however, was interested in staging the play.

Herzl then proceeded along another avenue to reach the public – the political pamphlet, setting out his political program and its operative plan in *The Jewish State*. It was through this vehicle that he achieved a breakthrough to Jewish public opinion. In it he articulated his conviction, arrived at in stages, that the solution to anti-Semitism had to be nation-based, namely, the resettlement of all Jews in a single territory that would constitute their own state. Earlier, he had posited an “aristocratic” *modus vivendi* to achieve this aim, namely funding by wealthy Jews to underwrite the purchase of such a territory from one of the great powers, rather than a mass movement initiated by the people. This position changed when his approaches to Baron Maurice de Hirsch and the Rothschilds were unproductive. He decided, thereafter, to address the masses directly, through the vehicle of the pamphlet.

The Jewish State is divided into two parts, theoretical and practical. The latter, longer section is minutely detailed, with an emphasis on implementation, reflecting Herzl’s desire to demonstrate that the program was not utopian. He discusses plans for housing and work, describing three organizing bodies that will administer the emigration of the Jews from their native countries and their resettlement in their sovereign country: the “Jewish Association” (the founding authority), the “Jewish Company” (in charge of the economic aspects of resettlement) and the “Local Associations” (the immigrants’ social framework). Other elements of the new state discussed in the pamphlet were its legal system, language, flag, religion and army.

The pamphlet quickly became a topic of discussion. The general press mostly dismissed it or mocked it, calling Herzl the Jewish Jules Verne. Herzl, however, viewed the exposure as a positive attribute. The reaction within the Jewish community was more complex. The East European Jewish press criticized Herzl for ignoring existing Zionist efforts (the Hovevei Zion societies in Eastern Europe) and distancing himself from Hebrew culture, but most especially for his grandiose conception and public style. By contrast, however, he evoked wide support by the masses in Eastern Europe.

While the pamphlet itself reached only a small readership, word of Herzl spread rapidly. Millions of Jews living in distress believed that the messiah had come, that a “new Moses” had arrived. Herzl had succeeded in fleshing out the abstract idea of Zionism and shifting it from an ideal to a practicable program.

The next communications format that he chose in order to forge a national movement and a breakthrough to world public opinion was the international congress, an idea he first raised in 1896. From then until the actual convening of the congress, in August 1897, he called on Zionist activists to circulate mass propaganda through demonstrations, meetings, wall posters and publicly issued documents in order to elicit wide Jewish support. His aim was to attract as many delegates to the congress and from as many communities as possible. Announcing the agenda of the congress in the London-based *Jewish Chronicle*, he shook the organized Jewish communities of both Western and Eastern Europe, each with their own theological, national and social sensibilities and fears.

To neutralize this opposition, Herzl operated along two communications tracks: he addressed the Jews of Western Europe over the heads of their communal leaders directly, through a newspaper that he founded, *Die Welt* (“The World”); and he reached the Jewish masses of Eastern Europe through itinerant propagandists whom he recruited to travel from town to town and hold public gatherings.

These feverish activities proved productive. The first Zionist Congress, held in Basel in August 1897, was attended by 197 delegates from all parts of the world. Herzl’s conviction of the propaganda value of the congress was borne out as well. Major newspapers, both Jewish and general, sent correspondents to cover the event; an impressive hall was rented; and a gala opening ceremony was arranged, providing an effective venue for Herzl’s theatrical persona and enhancing the importance of the occasion. The delegates were requested to dress in formal attire, official invitations were distributed, and abstracts of the relevant portions of the speakers’ texts were disseminated.

Herzl himself, in his opening address, emphasized the importance of public opinion and public exposure. The results of the congress were indeed a public relations success. The event constituted the first occasion in modern times for public dialogue in the entire Jewish dispersion throughout the world. It also established formal contexts for ongoing communication

through the establishment of a Zionist organizational body and the public election of delegates. It accepted the Basel Plan, which defined the goal of the Zionist movement as settling the Jewish people in Eretz Yisrael, thereby unifying broad sectors in the Jewish world while focusing the Zionist message. Through the congress, Herzl also succeeded in establishing a political and a communications agenda which was reported worldwide. Lastly, the congress provided a vital forum for two-way communication between Herzl and the people, especially the delegates of the Eastern European Jewish community, with whom this was his first encounter.

Less than a year later, he began planning for a second congress, insisting, despite opposition to the focus on public tumult, that tumult was the essence of politics, although the politician must always see it for what it is. Propaganda, he knew, could not replace the political essence. His eventual shift of the venue of the congress from Basel to London (1900) was another example of a public relations move designed to broaden exposure as well as gain the support of a great power.

On another track, his acquisition of the weekly *Die Welt* gave him a functional journalistic platform to disseminate the ideas of the congress and his vision of the Zionist movement as essentially politically oriented. In it he reported continuously

on the activities of the movement, thereby maintaining a link with the broader public. At the same time, he debated with opposing Zionist currents, editorialized, and advanced projects that he favored, particularly the establishment of the Jewish Colonial Bank.

Among his many communications talents was his oratorical skill. Some of his greatest moments as a leader occurred during his stirring speeches, which could convince opponents and excite supporters.

The failures of his diplomatic efforts to acquire sovereign settlement rights impelled him to pursue other avenues which would continue to give hope to the Jewish masses while reinforcing his own convictions. One such direction was his novel *Altneuland* ("Old-New Land," 1902), a utopian tale in a style fashionable at the time, featuring a blend of liberal and republican principles with socialistic ideas and the use of modern technology for the advancement of both the individual and society, in this case in Eretz Yisrael. Although the book was criticized in some Jewish circles for its cosmopolitanism and its lack of specific Jewish content, it reveals Herzl the man as a leader superior to most contemporary heads of national movements and most utopians as well.

"AL HAMISHMAR": THE ANATOMY OF A PARTY-SPONSORED NEWSPAPER / **Yariv Tsfati**

Al Hamishmar ("On Guard"; at first, *Mishmar*) first appeared as the organ of the leftist Hashomer Hatza'ir movement (later, the Mapam Party) in pre-state Israel in 1943. It was engendered primarily by disappointment with the editorial stance of the Histadrut-sponsored daily, *Davar*, which, the Hashomer Hatza'ir movement felt, ignored opposition views within the labor movement and promoted the mainstream Mapai position only.

Analyzing textual differences between the party-sponsored press and the commercial press in the early years of Israel's statehood, the author focuses on three newspapers during January 1953, while also surveying them more broadly through the 1950s and '60s. He finds that the agendas of these newspapers differed vastly: they covered national, ideological and international developments through entirely different

prisms, thereby creating different realities.

Al Hamishmar typically highlighted troublesome economic topics in January 1953 (delays in payment of public sector salaries; unemployment) but downplayed the show trials of Jewish doctors then being held in the Soviet Union; *Davar* avoided domestic economic problems and focused on foreign news; while *Ma'ariv*, a commercial paper, dealt with non-ideological national news (rainfall; the construction of a major new roadway).

Al Hamishmar underscored news events with ideological connotations not only domestically but in its international reportage, for example, in its criticism of the sale of arms by Britain to Arab countries or its prominent coverage of the Rosenberg trial in the US, both of which reflected its anti-West and pro-Soviet point of view. Prime of place, however,

went to socioeconomic issues, which typically took up at least half of every page one. The editorial pages consistently attacked Mapai policy, while also carrying on sharp ideological debates with other newspapers.

The guiding principle of "democratic centralism" in the conduct of the Mapam Party – *Al Hamishmar*'s sponsor – was that while decisions were made following open debate, once made they were binding on all members and could not be questioned, including in *Al Hamishmar*. The newspaper thus served as a tool of the party leadership in facing not only external but also internal challenges. Not surprisingly, *Al Hamishmar* campaigned single-mindedly for Mapam at election times.

Another prominent category of news reports was the achievements of the movement, its kibbutzim and its other institutions, for example, agricultural innovations or an award granted to its youth movement. These news items were not, of course, reported in *Ma'ariv* or *Davar*. Additionally, the contribution of the movement and of well-known figures in it to the establishment of the state was emphasized, reinforcing the distinctiveness of the movement and unifying its members around its symbols and myths. This was particularly pronounced on national holidays, such as Independence Day, when the role of the Palmach in the War of Independence was highlighted and articles by prominent movement personalities were featured. Similarly, on Holocaust Remembrance Day, the role of Hashomer Hatzza'ir and its leader, Mordechai Anilewitz, in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising was a central theme. By contrast, other newspapers featured the national ceremonies and character of these commemorative events. In its particularist approach, *Al Hamishmar* created a kind of alternative heroic narrative of the country's national symbols and myths.

The May 1st editions of *Al Hamishmar* (which appeared a day earlier, as the newspaper was closed on International Workers Day) during the 1950s and '60s were devoted entirely to marking this occasion, both in content and in size of the newspaper (12 pages instead of the usual 4), displaying a remarkable similarity in conception and format to the Independence Day editions. Parades and demonstrations by the movement were highlighted, while those of Mapai and the Histadrut were portrayed as lesser or as imitative of Mapam events. The occasion was used for ideology-bashing of other parties in the editorial pages. The irreconcilability of worker-

employer and proletarian-bourgeois conflicts was emphasized, with Mapai stigmatized as having sold out to "representatives of the propertied class." *Davar*, for its part, accused Mapam editorially of splitting the working class. As time went by, however, *Al Hamishmar* became less vituperative, in light of its co-option into the government (in 1958) alongside Mapai. Only in 1966 did the lead article on May 1st deal with a topic other than International Workers Day, for the first time ever.

Other special holiday editions were published in the early 1950s on the anniversaries of the Russian Revolution and of Lenin's and Karl Marx's deaths. Stalin's death in March 1953 was treated much more prominently than in any of the other newspapers, with considerable space devoted to the life story of the admired leader.

Not only were different topics covered by *Al Hamishmar* from those that appeared in the rest of the press, but a different reality was conveyed for the same event covered elsewhere. An example is the contrasting treatment by *Al Hamishmar* and *Davar* of the Ein Harod affair of January 1953. Kibbutz Ein Harod, as other kibbutzim, witnessed a grave internal ideological split over loyalty to the purist Mapam vs. the more moderate Mapai world view. As a result, housing and other communal property was divided up between "loyalists" and "breakaways." Both *Davar* and *Al Hamishmar*, in covering an incident of a violent takeover of a home during the crisis, ascribed it to the other's sponsoring movement. Each paper also threatened to sue the other for libel.

Many of the founding journalists of *Al Hamishmar* were typified by its first editor, Mordechai Bentov, a member of Knesset representing Mapam, a signatory of the Declaration of Independence, and a government minister. Born in Eastern Europe, Bentov played a founding role in the Hashomer Hatzza'ir movement and in the establishment of the kibbutz in which he was a lifelong member (Mishmar Ha'emek). He and his colleagues identified themselves not only, or even primarily, as journalists but as activists in their movement with a mission to reinforce it, side by side with an intense belief in and commitment to kibbutz life. Generally, they had no formal higher education or journalistic training, yet they were drawn to matters of the intellect and were persuasively articulate.

Their tie to the kibbutz exerted a certain restrictive influence on them as journalists, for they instinctively avoided from the firmly entrenched, socially sanctioned kibbutz principles. For them, the kibbutz was both a physical and an ideological home. Establishing *Al Hamishmar* was perceived as a mission

required of them by their movement, and their role in it as spokesmen for the workers.

A system of strict editorial censorship, combined with extensive rewriting, extended to every facet of the paper. The party line was followed both in news coverage and in the editorial pages. Writers who deviated were reprimanded and in some cases dismissed.

Party leader Meir Ya'ari was in close contact with the editors and writers through critical letters. Increasingly, party leaders sought exposure in the paper. The kibbutzim, too, wanted to promote or protect their interests. These pressures had a restrictive effect on the scope of the paper. Nevertheless, an identity of interest existed between the newspaper and the movement during most of *Al Hamishmar* existence.

In the 1980s, however, the tone of the paper changed. By then, the commercial press had grown, while the political press showed signs of weakening. Several politically sponsored pa-

pers closed down. The rhetoric in *Al Hamishmar* became more apologetic and attempted to blend in with liberal journalistic discourse. It emphasized the point that no newspaper was truly independent, and that the only difference between *Al Hamishmar* and the other newspapers was that the Mapam organ did not conceal its identity.

Al Hamishmar began to publish internal criticism in its editorial pages in the mid-1980s. It also enhanced its format and broadened its range of coverage, a reflection of the flight from ideology in the kibbutz movement generally. None of these efforts, however, succeeded in restoring the paper to a firm footing. Steeply rising publishing costs, the loss of vitality of the political press in an age of mass communications, and the economic crisis of the kibbutz movement, which could no longer subsidize the paper, resulted in its closure in 1995. It was one of the last secular party-sponsored newspapers in Israel.

CONVERGENCE AND DISTANCE IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CENTER AND THE PERIPHERY IN JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE / Oren Sofer

The question raised by this article is whether the relationship between the center and the periphery in journalistic discourse is one of convergence (i.e., an interpersonal communications context parallel to a subject-subject relationship) or of distance (parallel to a subject-object relationship). A distant relationship with the periphery, which the author likens to the "I-It" relationship in the Buber context, reflects the usage made by the center of the periphery in order to define itself. In such a situation, the attitude toward the periphery is that of the "other," reflecting a deviation from acceptable or worthy norms. By contrast, a relationship of convergence – the "I-Thou" relationship in the Buber context – points to partnership and dialogue between the center and the periphery, and of social commitment and mutuality. A survey of the Israeli press on the topic of the "Yemenite children" affair provides an opportunity to test these relationships.

The media both contribute to the buildup of society's central value system and at the same time reflect this system. In the "I-It" type of journalistic discourse, the periphery is treated as an object, with no convergence on the part of the reporter. The "I" becomes the subject and the center of the world.

Anyone surrounding the "I" is evaluated in terms of the "I"'s value system. An "It" attitude is adopted toward the periphery, typified by judging the periphery according to the value system of the center. The "It" attitude also reflects a utilitarian approach, i.e., the "I" makes use of the "It." A journalistic report of the periphery, in this context, draws on images of the periphery that are entrenched in the central value system. The new elements in the report are enveloped in perceptions familiar to the audience. In essence, by comparing, inverting or rejecting the attributes of the other, what emerges is a definition of the "I."

Reports in the press of the periphery use various journalistic techniques aimed at highlighting the other-ness of it, such as stereotypical pictures, direct (unedited) quotes giving the impression of speech idiosyncrasies, the bunching of similar events identified with the periphery without differentiation, and a technical rather than personal treatment. By contrast, the "I-Thou" relationship preserves the subjectiveness of each party during an encounter. Journalistic coverage based on such convergence seeks to absorb the true essence of the interviewee and to empathize with him/her based on a premise of equality.

Such reports emphasize the uniqueness of the subject.

The journalistic treatment of the "Yemenite children" affair lends itself to an analysis in this context because it involves a social issue related to the periphery that challenges the basic values accepted in Israeli society. Moreover, it has surfaced in the public agenda periodically from the 1960s until the present, allowing for an exploration of changes in the relationship between center and periphery over time.

The affair originated with the massive immigration to Israel in the early years of the state. As many newcomers from various countries then, the immigrants from Yemen were temporarily housed in hastily constructed tent camps or transit camps that could barely provide for their most minimal needs. As a result, many of the immigrant children were in poor health. Some were separated from their families and taken to communal creches or hospitals for care. In many cases, when the parents came to collect their children, the children were not there and the parents were informed that they had been transferred elsewhere or that they had died.

The immigrants' peripheralism in terms of distinctive customs and appearance, and their resettlement in remote areas, resulted in social and geographic isolation from the center. Complaints about the disappearance of children from hospitals voiced by leaders of the Yemenite community as early as 1950 seemed to have been ignored. In 1966, the press launched a systematic survey of the affair, which led to a debate on the subject in the Knesset and the formation of an investigative commission. This seemed to have calmed the Yemenite community for some 20 years, although complaints by individual families continued to reach the authorities. The affair flared up again in the mid-1980s and was covered extensively in the press. Under public pressure, a second investigative commission was appointed (1988). The developments of the 1960s and the 1980s are dealt with in the article, although a third official investigation, mounted in the 1990s, is not covered.

The phrase "Yemenite children affair" became a highly charged code for discriminatory veteran-newcomer and inter-ethnic relations. On a deeper level, the author points out, the use of the collective word "children" represented the lumping together of the world of the "It," which is kept at a distance. No effort was made to examine each individual case; all collectively became undifferentiated objects. This perception contrasts vividly with the press treatment of the case in the

1960s of Yossele Shumacher, an (Ashkenazi) child spirited away from Israel by his Orthodox relatives, whose story was reported by the press in detail and whose name became well known to the public. The perpetual adherence of the depiction "Yemenite" to the children's cases underscored their otherness, relegating them immutably to the periphery.

Such distancing was reinforced by headlines which blurred the actual cause of the affair, referring to the Yemenite children in the passive tense as "lost" or "disappeared." Furthermore, a large proportion of the articles on the subject were brief, even telegraphic, items. The longer articles were often characterized by bunching several cases together with no individual focus, thereby reinforcing the "I-It" perception. The Yemenite background, moreover, was presented stereotypically through "typical" attire, faltering command of the language, implied doubt as to parental competence, the depiction of hygienic practices as primitive, and repeated distinctions between the geographic periphery and the center.

While the conflict during the 1960s was portrayed essentially as between immigrant and veteran resident, by the mid-'80s the "I-It" duality had metamorphosed into an ethnic Ashkenazi-Sephardi clash, i.e., the "white" Ashkenazi establishment was accused of kidnapping "black" Sephardi children. Another difference in presentation involved journalistic style: the "new journalism" that had become popular in the 1980s favored an emphasis on emotions, conflict and human interest. Articles typically focused on personal stories. Moreover, the periphery by then was viewed more neutrally, which also diminished the role of the reporter as spokesperson.

The "I-Thou" relationship, however, was still absent, conceivably because the writers, however, empathetic, could not truly comprehend the condition of their subjects. Additionally, new journalism tended to focus on the surface and the trivial, dealing with areas that were familiar. The "I-Thou" relationship cannot be created in such conditions.

Ultimately, the question that is asked is whether an "I-Thou" discourse is possible at all in the journalistic format. Conceivably, the only way to attain such a level is through polyphony – multiple voices recorded in journalistic discourse, each articulating its own authentic perceptions. This relates to the notion of a transparent society, in which each grouping has access to channels of communication with the public, thereby creating a multi-cultural society.

ADVERTISEMENTS IN THE ISRAELI PRESS DURING THE 1970S: FROM THE YOM KIPPUR WAR TO THE PEACE AGREEMENT WITH EGYPT / Yarden Vatikai

An analysis of newspaper advertisements can serve as a useful tool to illuminate important social developments not revealed in history books or in literature. The period under review – from the Yom Kippur War of 1973 until the signing of the peace agreement with Egypt in 1979 – may be seen as exerting a significant influence

on social, political and security perceptions in Israel to this day. It was also a transitional period from a low to a high point in the country's history.

The author explores how contemporary ads in the Israeli press reflected society's coping with the trauma of the Yom Kippur War and the changes that occurred in the transition from the shadow cast by the war to the hopefulness engendered by the peace agreement with Egypt. The first of five phases designated by the author is the wartime phase, which lasted until the end of 1973 and is characterized by military themes in the ads. Numerous products are depicted in an army context, ranging from a deodorant for feet shown in conjunction with an army boot to a dry-cleaning ad featuring military uniforms. Male images are dominant both as soldiers and civilians. Extensive use is made of the battlefield as a backdrop – soldiers smoking Dubek cigarettes, soldiers eating Elite chocolate, and groups of soldiers (rather than individuals) – tapping into the idealized perception of soldiering by the Israeli public. The soldiers are posed in a way that conveys optimism. Advertisers offer prizes and discounts to soldiers. A dominant theme is the dissolution of tension following the war. Another theme is thriftiness.

The second designated phase is 1974-early 1975. Ads use models with a European appearance shown in a chic milieu suggesting an international or American environment. Many ads appear for air travel abroad. Varied civilian figures are projected – retirees, homemakers, farmers, businessmen. Soldiers are noticeably absent, though only months previously they had dominated the ads. Leisure situations in the home are depicted frequently, projecting an aura of comfort. Male-female pairs and sexuality are highlighted.

The third phase, from mid-1975 to early 1977, focuses on a motif of "beautiful people" both textually and graphically. Hippie-style twenty-somethings with long hair and a flower-

child look project serenity. Many of the ads feature Israeli entertainment stars for the first time in Israeli advertising. The European look of the models is replaced by a Mediterranean look. The future is portrayed as more promising than ever before, often linked with technological innovations. Balancing out the beautiful people is a conservative projection of the ideal family. Curiously, the motif of the allure of "abroad," so prominent in the preceding period, is absent.

The fourth phase, from mid-1977 to the end of 1978, features ads for specific men's products and specific women's products. The ads targeting men project a macho, chauvinist image – authoritative, tough, surrounded by an admiring woman or women. The ads targeting women promote, in addition to specifically women's products, items that are not gender-oriented, such as new career opportunities or banking programs. Teenagers are featured in connection with various products. The banks launch an intensive public relations campaign to promote their image.

The fifth and last phase, covering the year 1979, is typified by a campaign encouraging settlement in development towns; a motif of economic and technological growth; a theme of tradition; and the return of international motifs. Surprisingly, the theme of peace with Egypt is nearly absent.

An analysis of the first phase reveals a total identification by the civilian audience with the war effort, typified by a pronounced tendency to soften the blow of the war and project optimism. Emphases on thriftiness and serenity reflect the effort to restore and rejuvenate home life after the war.

The ads of the second phase reflect a flight from the difficult political and economic postwar reality to an imaginary world of glamour devoid of soldiers. The Labor-dominated government has lost a significant amount of support for the first time in Israel's history; Prime Minister Golda Meir is forced to resign; and the findings of a commission of inquiry on the conduct of the war engenders the resignations of Chief of Staff David Elazar and Intelligence Chief Eli Ze'ira. Protest movements surface in 1974. A bloody war of attrition is waged against Israel by Egypt and Syria, while Palestinian terrorism intensifies. Inflation nears 40%. The settlement movement in the territories emerges.

The ads of the third phase emphasize a liberated civilian society building a future that appears more promising than previously. The Israeli lifestyle appears desirable, peopled by truer images of Israelis, reflecting a transition from dream to reality. The ads also reflect a transition from national collectivism to a more hedonistic individualism in the focus on leisure, youth and beauty. Israel seems to want to move toward normalization. Indeed, the period is one of dramatic change. The Israeli-made Kfir fighter plane is unveiled; the Suez Canal reopens; Hadassah Hospital on Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem, reopens after its forced abandonment since 1948; and the daring rescue of Israeli hostages in Entebbe occurs in 1976. Other developments, however, are harsh: ongoing terrorist acts, physical and political confrontations over the settlement issue, a sharp attack against Israel in the UN, and galloping inflation.

The fourth phase continues previous trends. The role of women is in transition, teenagers come into their own as individuals, and army inductees are no longer viewed in the collectivist national sense but are targeted as a consumer population. The troublesome economic situation prompts banks to try to win the confidence of the public. These issues include a tumultuous period for the Labor Party, culminating in the resignation of Prime Minister Rabin; the first-time-ever victory of the Likud under Menahem Begin; galloping inflation; and the settlement movement vs. the Peace Now movement.

Ads for the year 1979 ignore the motif of peace with Egypt almost completely, focusing rather on a blend of Israeli self-definition and an international motif, along with increased targeting of traditional and religious audiences. Although inflation continued to soar, the year did not witness any major political upheavals. The explanation for the absence of the peace motif may be linked to the discomfort many Israelis felt over the evacuation of Sinai necessitated by the peace agreement, while the fruits of peace still appeared distant.

Four main trends in Israeli society emerge from this analysis:

A search for a defined Israeli self-identity.

An effort by society to consolidate and define itself, yet without cutting itself off from international influences, whether in consumer terms or in terms of values.

A transition from national collectivism to hedonistic individualism; from traditional patriarchalism to a feminist stance; from a pure Ashkenazi image to a multi-ethnic one; from a hierarchical to a liberal family; and from the image of the soldier as belonging to the nation to the soldier as belonging to mom and dad.

Society as an "interrupted system," i.e., palpable postwar confusion and loss of stability followed by a return to previous norms.

With this, many of the influences of the traumatic war continue to be felt in various areas of Israeli life. Significantly, no official history has been written about this war.

RABIN'S MURDER THROUGH THE HAREDI (ULTRA-ORTHODOX) PRISM / Chagit Mes-Tsfati

Israeli society, although factionalized and sectorial, never anticipated the possibility of the assassination of a public personality for political reasons. The ongoing effort to grasp the significance of the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on November 4, 1995, includes the present analysis of an aspect of the split in Israeli society between the religious and the secular: the haredi point of view.

Haredi society is separated from secular Israeli society by its interpretation of individual and collective reality; its reliance on sources of authority other than the state juridical system; and especially its non-participation in the secular Zionist Israeli

dialogue. The haredi interpretation of Rabin's assassination, its perception of the assassin, and the messages conveyed in its press following the murder highlight this distinctiveness.

In as much as most of haredi society shuns the electronic media, its print media play an important opinion-molding role. Three newspapers are published in the haredi community: *Yated Ne'eman* (an acronym for Daily Torah and Knowledge, followed by the word "Faithful"), a daily representing the militant "Lithuanian" camp headed by Rabbi Eliezer Schach; *Hamode'a* ("The Herald"), a daily sponsored by the Agudat Yisrael Party under the leadership of the Gur Rebbe, which

has the largest circulation of the three; and *Yom Leyom* ("Day by Day"), a weekly sponsored by the Shas Party led by Rabbi Ovadiah Yosef. The author's analysis is based on reports and columns that appeared in these newspapers during approximately a month following the assassination.

The haredi camp, while shocked by the assassination, viewed the spontaneous and widespread manifestations of mourning that followed, and the mythic significance of this mourning, strictly from the sidelines. The haredi press presented its own interpretation of the event, which reflected its perception of the root cause of all tragedies that befall the State of Israel: the moral decline of Israeli society. The mourners for the slain prime minister were depicted as lost souls who refused to understand the divine significance of all events.

With this, Rabin's image was not portrayed monolithically. The total distancing of this trend from the Israeli national arena translated itself into non-participation in the collective mourning and non-identification with the myth surrounding Rabin that was rapidly evolving. *Hamode'a*, displaying a more restrained approach, than *Yated Ne'eman* in effect held the same positions. *Yom Leyom* was the closest to the Israeli center. It

portrayed Rabin as a friend. His ties with the Shas leadership were highlighted. The Shas movement, whose political platform reflects penetration into, rather than seclusion from Israeli society, understood the secular mourning for the slain leader and even shared it. Broadly, the more seclusionist the trend, the more pronounced the message of non-identification in its print organ.

Significantly, *Hamode'a* and *Yom Leyom* took more moderate positions during the first few days after the assassination, becoming more extremist later on. Conceivably, this reflected a defensive posture in reaction to anger within the secular population at the role of religion in the assassination.

All three newspapers sketched a similar portrait of Yigal Amir, the assassin, who was religious. He represented the failure of the synthesis between Zionism and Judaism. His act, in the haredi perception, was proof of the validity of the rejection of the State of Israel as the first stage of redemption of the Jewish people. In the haredi view, the false messianic approach of the national religious right toward the Zionist enterprise from the very start (i.e., its support of the Zionist idea even before the establishment of the State of Israel) led, ultimately, to the inevitable baseness of Yigal Amir.

"GREENINKEH BAIMELEKH" (GREEN BUSHES) – A YIDDISH JUVENILE NEWSPAPER IN VILNA / Adina Bar-El

Founded in 1914, *Greeninkeh Baimelekh*, a title taken from a popular poem by Hayim Nahman Bialik, was the first sustained juvenile newspaper in Yiddish. It began as a biweekly, published by Vilner Farlag (Vilna Publishers) operated by Boris Klatchkin, and after irregular intervals resumed in 1926 until its last issue of June 1939.

The initiative for the venture apparently came from the Vilna branch of the Society for the Diffusion of Enlightenment, an organization founded in Petersburg in 1863 that promoted modern Jewish education and culture and was responsible for establishing the first Yiddish schools in Vilna for girls (1912) and boys (1915). The decision to establish a Yiddish juvenile newspaper was made at a conference of the Society in 1911, and subsidization from it was allocated to *Greeninkeh*.

The paper first appeared several months before the outbreak of World War I, when Vilna was under Russian control.

Publication ceased when war broke out but was resumed four months later and continued until the summer of 1915. It was then closed by Russian military order prohibiting publishing in Hebrew and Yiddish, and remained closed during the German occupation of the city (1915-1918). Shortly after the Lithuanian Soviet takeover of Vilna (December 1918), publication was resumed under the aegis of the Commissariat for Peoples' Education, which adopted a policy of subsidization of all educational and cultural institutions in the city. This brief period ended, however, with the Polish conquest of Vilna in April 1919 and subsequent violent acts against the Jewish population.

A conference of Yiddish educators in Warsaw in October 1919 devoted to coordinating Yiddish schools of all trends in Poland established a Central Yiddish School Organization, which became the guiding force behind *Greeninkeh* when it

reopened in December 1919 under the editorship of Shlomo Bastomski. It published 44 issues from then until 1922 during a period of shifting takeovers of Vilna from Polish to Lithuanian and back to Polish control. In May 1922 the newspaper closed down once again, this time for four years, conceivably as a result of the formal annexation of Vilna to Poland and the restrictive policies of the Polish government toward minority school systems.

Reopening in 1926, *Greeninkeh* appeared as a biweekly from then until June 1939 – a total of 241 issues – again under Bastomski's editorship. The revival of the newspaper in 1926 may have been related to the takeover of the Polish government by Marshal Pilsudski, which gave rise to an expectation by the Jews of an improvement in their condition. Indeed, Yiddish schools received some government subsidization, although this ultimately ended. However, municipal subsidies were forthcoming, especially in localities where Jews and Socialists constituted a majority, such as Vilna. Moreover, Bastomski, a teacher and publisher of Yiddish textbooks and readers, played an important personal role in reviving the newspaper. In this he was assisted by his wife, Malka Hayimson, a teacher and translator who worked side by side with him in their publishing ventures. Significantly, Janusz Korczak began publishing a juvenile supplement in Polish at this time, which may have prompted the Central Yiddish School Organization to fill a vacuum that existed for the young Yiddish readership.

Geared to an audience aged approximately 9-12,

Greeninkeh in its early years was made up of some one third translated or adapted texts, primarily from Russian sources, reflecting the important cultural influence of Russia on Vilna then. Most of the content was literary, with a small proportion of informative article and games and riddles. No reference at all is made in the content to current events, for example, the war, in whose wake a large influx of Jewish refugee children arrived in Vilna and were placed in institutional residences set up for them. The texts seem to have been selected with the aim of distancing the young readers from the difficult events surrounding them. Themes are most often imaginary, with happy endings, or if realistic, such as stories of contemporary Jewish family life and holidays, they project an atmosphere of serenity. Eretz Yisrael as a topic is conspicuously absent.

Later, in the 1920s, the newspaper reached out more directly to its audience, publishing letters and compositions by readers, including readers abroad, a reflection of the spread of Yiddish socialist schools in North and South America during the 1920s and '30s. Riddles, games and other leisure-time pursuits gained more prominence, along with Yiddish lyrics of songs printed with music notes. The number of articles on general knowledge and popular science also increased.

Undoubtedly, the publication of a juvenile Yiddish newspaper in Vilna during the World War I period was an important milestone and served as a basis for the development of a multi-faceted Yiddish juvenile press during the interwar period.

CHANGES IN THE ISRAELI JUVENILE PRESS, 1950s-1990s /

Irit Cohen and Dvora Feingoz

Although the first Hebrew-language children's newspaper in the Jewish yishuv in Eretz Yisrael appeared as early as 1893 (*Olam Katon* ["Small World"], edited by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, Yehuda Grazovsky and David Yudelevitch), it was not long-lived and its successors were to emanate mainly from Eastern Europe. With the expansion of the yishuv in the 1920s, the genre shifted to Eretz Yisrael, represented primarily by *Ha'aretz – Shavu'on Liyeladim* ("Ha'aretz Children's Weekly"), *Latalmid* ("For the Pupil"), *Alumot* ("Sheaves"), *Ben Artzi* ("Native Son"), *Olam Hayeladim* ("Children's World") and *Hatsir* ("The Messenger").

The early 1930s saw the founding of *Itoneinu* ("Our

Newspaper"), which ran for several years. The leader in the field, however, was *Davar Liyeladim* ("Davar for Children"), begun in 1931, which would appear for over 50 years and would inspire a series of juvenile papers similarly published by daily parent newspapers, both political and independent. These included *Mishmar Liyeladim*, *Haboker Liyeladim*, *Hatsofeh Liyeladim* and *Ha'aretz Shelanu*. The authors focus on a comparison between *Davar Liyeladim*, the archetype of the first generation, and a paper that appeared much later, in 1985 – *Kulanu* ("All of Us"), which is still ongoing. Three years were singled out for analysis: 1955, 1985 and 1997.

Davar Liyeladim, begun (1931) initially as a monthly

supplement of the Histadrut-sponsored daily, *Davar*, was to exert a distinctive influence on the tastes and outlook of an entire generation of young readers, instilling in them both the motivation to express themselves in writing and an awareness of literary and journalistic standards. It soon became a weekly supplement and in 1936 a separate magazine. Edited by Yitzhak Yatsiv, it was the brainchild of *Davar*'s Bracha Habas, the first woman journalist and editor in Eretz Yisrael. Artist Nahum Gutman was co-opted as illustrator. Poet and educator Aaron Ze'ev and other writers joined the staff. The content consisted of literary work; current events; education in values, including knowledge about sites and landmarks of the country, hiking and nature; popular science; school activities; recommended cultural events; riddles, puzzles and games; and readers' letters. The linguistic level was high. Contributors included Hayim Nahman Bialik, Lea Goldberg (as editor as well as writer), Zalman Shneour, Jacob Fichmann and Miriam Yalan-Stekelis.

Children looked forward to receiving their issue each Tuesday, eagerly scanning the names of winners of riddles, reading the new installment of the serialized story, and checking whether a letter or picture sent in was published. Few changes in conception were made during the first 20 or 25 years: the magazine remained educational and instructive. During the 1960s and '70s, however, a new approach gained popularity: the magazine was to be not only *for* its readers but *by* them. A sizable proportion of the content was devoted to contributions by the readers. The target age group was 8-12.

Financial difficulties led to a merger in 1985 between *Davar Liyeladim*, *Mishmar Liyeladim* and *Ha'aretz Shelanu* to form a new magazine – *Kulanu* ("All of Us"), whose emphasis was heavily on what children themselves considered interesting. Educational messages were implanted only subliminally, if at all. The use of slang became pervasive. Criticism was voiced of this non-educational and non-value-oriented approach and

the magazine's low intellectual level. The publishers maintained that marketability dictated the content and style.

The authors, surveying 60 issues of the two papers under discussion (30 issues of *Davar Liyeladim* in 1955, 15 issues of *Kulanu* in 1985, and another 15 issues of *Kulanu* in 1997), found that the 1955 issues contained approximately half the number of pages as the later ones but the pages were crammed with content, no space was wasted, and advertising was practically nonexistent. *Kulanu*, by contrast, was filled with advertisements, the text was set in larger type and headlines were prominent and spread out. Additionally, *Kulanu*'s better-quality paper, use of color and stylish graphics reflected technological advances, the rise in level of expectations of a more affluent public, and competition for the consumer's leisure time activities. Notably, while *Davar Liyeladim* used a large proportion of vowelized text, *Kulanu* had no vowelizing, a difference that has two possible explanations: the older magazine was more pedagogic in approach, and it was published during a period of large-scale immigration when Hebrew was not yet read easily by all children.

Significantly, the content of the covers of both *Davar Liyeladim* in 1955 and *Kulanu* in 1985 were devoted to local landscapes, animals, nature and holidays, in comparison with approximately three-quarters of the covers of *Kulanu* in 1997, which featured local entertainment stars. This shift, in the authors' view, reflected the change in societal norms from nationalistic to individualistic, a metamorphosis illustrated equally explicitly in the shift of the entire content of the magazines from instructive, value-oriented and socially conscious to entertaining and individualistic.

By 1997, *Kulanu* was infused with English-language phrases, slang and content that centered on pop culture, comics, TV-related features and questionnaires on personal interests and preferences.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Prof. Michael Keren: Head of the Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications, Tel Aviv University.

Justice Elisheva Barak: National Labor Court, Jerusalem.

Dr. Moshe Zuckerman: Head of the Institute for German History, Tel Aviv University.

Dr. Hagar Hillel: Curriculum development, Jews in the Islamic lands, Open University, Tel Aviv.

Dr. Ilan Asya: Head, Communications Trend, Emek Yizra'el College.

Prof. Tamar Leibes: Department of Communication and Journalism, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Dr. Miri Talmon: Researcher, communications and popular culture, Open University, Tel Aviv; lecturer, Department of Film and TV, Tel Aviv University.

Ohad David: Graduate, Departments of Political Science and

Psychology; master's candidate, School of Education, Tel Aviv University.

Oren Sofer: Research student, Department of Political Science, Hebrew University of Jerusalem; law student, Tel Aviv University.

Yariv Tsfaty: Research student, School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Chagit Mes-Tsfaty: Master's candidate, Department of Political Science, Tel Aviv University.

Yarden Vatikai: M.A., Political Science, Tel Aviv University; spokesman and media consultant.

Adina Bar-El: Research student, the Hebrew and Yiddish juvenile press in Poland between the world wars, Hebrew University of Jerusalem; lecturer, Ahva Academy College; author, juvenile books.

Dvora Feingoz: Graduate, special education, Beit Berl College.

Irit Cohen: Graduate, computer education, Beit Berl College