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EDITORIAL
Yaacov Shavit

About two decades ago, I published my review of Kesher issues (10-14) from the years 1991-93. Under the critic's hat I commented that Kesher presented "a solid selection of observations of past and present journalism." I also noted that the relationship between the press and the field of historical research has two main facets. On the one hand, historians consider the press as a vast, almost singular, treasure that may inform them about cultures and societies. On the other hand, however, newspapers and periodicals have their own fascinating history that reflects the ongoing changes in cultures and societies.

Nowadays, under the hat of the Head of the Institute for Jewish Press Research, when I look back at the history of Kesher so far, I have no doubt that it continues to serve its cause successfully. Kesher has thereby become a leading platform that features studies and knowledge regarding the history of Jewish journalism since its early days in the 17th Century in general, and the press in Eretz Israel in particular. It also provides keen analyses of press coverage, of the press's impact on ongoing events and phenomena, and on the way the public views such subjects.

Kesher embarked on its journey and pioneered the transformation of journalism history and research into a significant academic discipline, which may be relevant not only to media scholars or journalists but also to the general public. The forty-three issues published to this day demonstrate that Kesher has become a main pillar in the field of media research in Israel and the Jewish world.

Two dedicated editors should be credited for this achievement: Kesher's founder and former editor Mordechai Naor and its recent editor Gideon Kouts.

When I wrote my review, the Institute for Jewish Press Research was still "under construction". Today, however, we celebrate 27 years of fruitful activity with Kesher being its main achievement. All we have to wish for nowadays is that Kesher will continue to be published on a regular basis and as such, immensely contribute to the study of a field which has become such an integral part of our lives.

INSIDE KESHER 43
ON PROTEST AND ITS COMMUNICATION: BETWEEN NEW AND OLD
Gideon Kouts

25 years are just a mere quarter of a century, but this short period may become a landmark in a periodical's history, which demonstrates its perseverance. Kesher has tried to appear regularly since May 1987, when it was first edited by Mordechai Naor (who tells his story in the next page) and succeeded in its effort except for a short hiatus in the activities of this Institute, its publisher. Such perseverance reflects a need for such publication, today maybe even more than ever, while in the crossroads between "old" and "new" media that compete fervently to participate in the life of the society and to express...
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About two decades ago, I published my review of Kesher issues (10–14) from the years 1991–93. Under the critic’s hat I commented that Kesher presented “a solid selection of observations of past and present journalism.” I also noted that the relationship between the press and the field of historical research has two main facets. On the one hand, historians consider the press as a vast, almost singular, treasure that may inform them about cultures and societies. On the other hand, however, newspapers and periodicals have their own fascinating history that reflects the ongoing changes in cultures and societies.

Nowadays, under the hat of the Head of the Institute for Jewish Press Research, when I look back at the history of Kesher so far, I have no doubt that it continues to serve its cause successfully. Kesher has thereby become a leading platform that features studies and knowledge regarding the history of Jewish journalism since its early days in the 17th Century in general, and the press in Erez Israel in particular. It also provides keen analyses of press coverage, of the press’s impact on ongoing events and phenomena, and on the way the public views such events.

INSIDE KESHER 43
ON PROTEST AND ITS COMMUNICATION: BETWEEN NEW AND OLD
Gideon Kouts

25 years are just a mere quarter of a century, but this short period may become a landmark in a periodical’s history, which demonstrates its perseverance. Kesher has tried to appear regularly since May 1987, when it was first edited by Mordechai Naor (who tells his story in the next page) and succeeded in its effort except for a short hiatus in the activities of this Institute, its publisher. Such perseverance reflects a need for such publication, today maybe even more than ever, while in the crossroads between “old” and “new” media that compete fervently to participate in the life of the society and to express the ongoing tides of history. So in this issue of Kesher we shall deal with such “recent history” from a media perspective: how to communicate a protest?

This spring’s warm tidings bring about the harbinger of social protests that invaded our streets and town squares last summer. The balance between the political culprits represented in our parliament tend to bring about such forms of public expression which may not be directly influenced by the recent “Arab Spring” waves or the international movement of “Indigndos”. A new protest may reflect a new character. Yet notwithstanding the short time that elapsed since the 2011 “Tent Protest”, this issue of Kesher is racing to the vanguard to discuss in depth the protest’s mediations aspects and compare it with other social upheavals throughout Israeli and Jewish history.

Dan Coilli opens the “Media and Social Protest” section and explores the impact of social protests on the media and its contribution to the media’s self criticism or rather, the criticism leveled at other media. And according to Coilli, protests pass but the criticism remains. Amir Mironi and Hila Lowenstein’s study was conducted in the “Tent compounds” and their survey dealt with the central issue that puzzles scholars of the media aspect of recent protest movements: the comparative roles of “new” versus “old” media, conventional and virtual. These authors conclude that in spite of the accepted views, the main information sources employed by the protestors were conventional. David Levin, who dealt with the wave of “Cottage Cheese Protests” triggered by online social media, found that the transition to actual protest activity in the street necessitated the use of “old” media and a corresponding adaptation of messages to it. Orly Tzafrir and Dalia Liran discuss the “framing” of the protest leader Dafni Lief’s image throughout the various online media and the choice of particular parameters reserved for women leaders.

We then embark on a journey into the media roots of Hebrew-Israeli protest. Gideon Kouts presents the media strategy of the First Hebrew-speaking Socialists in 1970’s Europe and their attempts to publish independent periodicals and infiltrate existing papers. Ruti Mamm restores the glory of the so called “mobijized press” of the early 1950’s austerity period, and proves that it nevertheless has aptly represented the social resistance against this government policy. The 1959 Wadi Salih events are considered as the classical case of Israeli social protest history. Ada Yurman reviews and analyzes the social responses, including media responses, to this ethno-social revolt, and differentiates “established” from alternative viewpoints. Tal Strasman-Shapira focuses on the coverage of these events and the social issues in the daily Maariv. She also deals with change that occurred in the character of such coverage, and interviews several reporters who covered these events and who are still living among us today. Elzbieta Kossowska tells the story of Od Nova, a journal of Jewish-Polish immigrant socialists published by the Magan party in the years 1958–1965. Od Nova focused on social issues. Several prominent journalists in the Hebrew press have embarked on their careers as Od Nova writers. Matan Abramot raises the question of the “entrepreneurial” value required for the production of social activism themed programs in the “old” commercial media channels and analyzes a popular TV program “What Would You Have Done?” anchored by the journalist Chaim Hecht. Among the protestors were also minorities oppressed for their sexual preferences for many years. Yoav Kanyas demonstrates “threats and oppression” and “intimacy” trends in a first ever discourse analysis of the Israeli Gay and Lesbian press. And what heffs a discussion of social protest better than a presentation of “currency” handbills used for social, political and commercial propaganda? Chaim Grossman tackles this in his unique way and presents his compelling visual demonstration. We shall continue the discussion of this theme in our next issue.

*Keiser, a scholarly journal devoted to the history of the press and media in the Jewish world and in Israel, is published twice yearly by the Andrea and Charles Bronfman Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications at Tel Aviv University. Kesher seeks to publish original research articles and academic reviews on all subjects relating to the history, endeavors, and influence of Jewish media and media people, from a multidisciplinary perspective. All articles are peer reviewed blindly by experts, members of the Journal’s Advisory Board and, if necessary, externally. Articles should be submitted in Word to press@aeus.tau.ac.il. A reply will be given within three months. Articles should not usually exceed 8,000 words. The bibliography and notes should appear at the end of the article. Citations should follow the conventions of your discipline.

The editorial board invites reviews of new books in the journal’s area of interest and proposes such reviews itself. Kesher also publishes a list of recently approved doctoral dissertations and master’s theses along with abstracts of no more than 250 words in length (for master’s theses) and 500 words in length (for doctoral dissertations).

I was privileged to witness the birth of several newspapers and periodicals and accompany them a few or many years later. Keshet was one of these periodicals, and while reminiscing about its beginnings I return to late 1986. At that time, Tel Aviv University sought to establish a school or department for journalism studies and research. This was not the first attempt to establish it, but this time one of the leaders of the pack was in charge: the great Shalom Rosenfeld who retired several years earlier from the position of Maariv Editor and was awarded the Israel Prize for Journalism.

At first, and with the assistance of the seasoned academic Yardena Ilar Orian, Rosenfeld established the program for journalism studies that enrolled dozens of students - professional journalists and others who wished to learn the profession. It was a single-year certificate program. Not a few of these students have been already employed in the press media. Others joined in upon graduation.

Shalom had a dream: to develop this program into an Institute, perhaps a leading research center for Jewish and Israeli press. To this end he labored and lobbyist in the camps. And eventually, he received the blessing of two university rector: Prof. Yoram Driemint and then, Prof. Itamar Rabinowitz. He undertook upon himself the entire administrative burden of a fledgling research institute and also embarked on fundraising tours in Israel and abroad. According to informal campus rumors, more than a million dollars donated by individuals and foundations were collected in two years of efforts by a special foundation dedicated to the realization of this dream.

The publication of a scientific periodical for media research was also a part of this quest. As a lecturer in the program for Journalism studies, a seasoned periodical and newspaper editor and an experienced radio station manager (the IDF radio channel Galay Teshuah), Rosenfeld thought I was qualified to join this adventure. One of these days he summoned me to his tiny office in the ground floor of the Gilman Humanities building and asked whether I could join him as editor and publisher in chief of a new periodical entirely dedicated to media issues with an emphasis on Jewish media in general and Israeli press in particular.

I consented and during the following months we planned the first issue of Keshet. This name seemed natural and commonplace to us, because what other Hebrew word may fit it better? Someone tried to discourage us by telling that there has been once a Tel Aviv taxi station named Keshet. But Shalom, who was an assertive, decisive person, said: “Keshet is a beautiful name. It is short and succinct. This is our name.”

At last, we pondered and weighed several possibilities about our periodical’s character. According to the strict academic standards we were supposed to take the paved road and the rigorous approach of typical scientific periodicals. We felt this was wrong and that we should find the proper balance between academic theory and journalistic practice. As an example, we had to decide whether Keshet should print journalists’ memoirs along with academic studies and reviews of publications? And what should be decided about photographs and illustrations? Several scholars resisted the inclusion of pictorial content and supposed that we should feature documents and texts only.

As head of the Journalism Studies program, Shalom Rosenfeld functioned as publisher and Editor-in-Chief of Keshet. I tackled the practical editing tasks. We both began our search for potential “victims” who might agree to write or may let us publish unpublished chapters of their studies that may be appropriate.

We found, for instance, Eliahu Rubinstein, recently a Supreme Court judge, who served as Chief Government Secretary at 1987. We were aware that Rubinstein has embarked on his doctoral dissertation about the attitude of the Jewish “Yishuv” leadership to the Arab issue during the British Mandate. A chapter in his work was dedicated to the press and also referred to the attempt to publish a Zionist Arabic language daily during the 1920’s and 30’s under the auspices of the Zionist establishment. Due to his public activities, Rubinstein stopped writing his study. He asserted to our request and permitted us to publish this chapter, so we had an opening chapter.

We contacted several other acquaintances, such as Dr. Memsha Gilboa, Dr. Gideon Kouts and the journalist Zvi Lavi who wrote an academic paper about the Editors’ Committee and agreed to expand it for our sake. Dr. Gilboa contributed the opening article of our first issue: “The Hebrew Press—The Early Days” and Dr. Kouts discovered the “The Lebanon File” in the French home office, a document which shed a new light on the journalistic activities of Yechiel (Bri) in Paris during the 1860’s. Bri had published Ha-Lebanon, the first Eretz
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I was privileged to witness the birth of several newspapers and periodicals and accompany them a few or many years later. Kesher was one of these periodicals, and while reminiscing about its beginnings I return to late 1986. At that time, Tel Aviv University sought to establish a school or department for journalism studies and research. This was not the first attempt to establish it, but this time one of the leaders of the pack was in charge: the great Shalom Rosenfield who remained several years earlier from the position of Maariv Editor and was awarded the Israel Prize for Journalism.

At first, and with the assistance of the seasoned academic Yardena Bar Orian, Rosenfield established the program for journalism studies that enrolled dozens of students—professional journalists and others who wished to learn the profession. It was a single year certificate program. Not a few of these students have been already employed in the press media. Others joined in upon graduation.

Rosenfield had a dream: to develop this program into an Institute, perhaps a leading research center for Jewish and Israeli press. To this end he labored and lobbed in the campus. And eventually, he received the blessing of two university rectors: Prof. Yoram Dinstein and then, Prof. Eitanah Rubinstein. He undertook upon himself the entire administrative burdens of a fledgling research institute and also embarked on fundraising tours in Israel and abroad. According to informal campus rumors, more than a million dollars donated by individuals and foundations were collected in about two years of efforts by a special foundation dedicated to the realization of this dream.

The publication of a scientific periodical for media research was also a part of this quest. As a lecturer in the program for journalism studies, a seasoned periodical and newspaper editor and an experienced radio station manager (The IDF radio channel Galay Tsahal), Rosenfield thought I was qualified to join this adventure. One of these days he summoned me to his tiny office in the ground floor of the Gilman Humanities building and asked whether I could join him as editor and publisher in chief of a new periodical entirely dedicated to media issues with an emphasis on Jewish media in general and Israeli press in particular.

I consented and during the following months we planned the first issue of Kesher. This name seemed natural and commonplace, because what other Hebrew word may fit better? Someone tried to discourage us by telling that there has been once a Tel Aviv taxi station named Kesher. But Shalom, who was an assertive, decisive person, said: “Kesher is a beautiful name. It is short and succinct. This is our name.”

At next, we pondered and weighed several possibilities about our periodical’s character. According to the strict academic standards we were supposed to take the paved road and the rigorous approach of typical scientific periodicals. We felt this was wrong and that we should find the proper balance between academic theory and journalistic praxis. As an example, we had to decide whether Kesher should print journalists’ memoirs along with academic studies and reviews of publications? And what should be decided about photographs and illustrations? Several scholars resisted the inclusion of pictorial content and supposed that we should feature documentaries and texts only.

As head of the Journalism Studies program, Shalom Rosenfield functioned as publisher and Editor-in-Chief of Kesher. I tackled the practical editing tasks. We both began our search for potential “victims” who might agree to write or may let us publish unpublished chapters of their studies that may be appropriate, We found, for instance, Eliyakim Rubinstein, recently a Supreme Court judge, who served as Chief Government Secretary at 1987. We were aware that Rubinstein has embarked on his doctoral dissertation about the attitude of the Jewish “Yishuv” leadership towards Arab uprisings during the British Mandate. A chapter in his work was dedicated to the press and also referred to the attempt to publish a Zionist Arabic language daily during the 1920’s and 30’s under the auspices of the Zionist establishment. Due to his public activities, Rubinstein stopped writing his study. He assented to our request and permitted us to publish this chapter, so we had an opening chapter.

We contacted several other acquaintances, such as Dr. Menachem Gilboa, Dr. Gideon Koots and the journalist Zvi Lavi who wrote an academic paper about the Editors’ Committee and agreed to expand it for our sake. Dr. Gilboa contributed the opening article of our first issue: “The Hebrew Press—The Early Days” and Dr. Koots discovered the “The Lehman File” in the French home office, a document which shed a new light on the journalistic activities of Yechiel Boll in Paris during the 1860’s. Brill had published Ha-Lehman, the first Eretz Israel Hebrew newspaper, in Paris (and elsewhere). But its publication continued over two decades in exile in several other European cities.

Journalists such as Aharon Even-Chen, Gabriel Tzefirin and Shalom Silva contributed to the first issue articles about forgotten newspapers such as Dvor Hashem and Dvor (which was printed in Latinized Hebrew) that were edited by Iamar Ben-Avi, and about the early days of cartoons in Eretz Israel. In addition to my role as Editor, I contributed two articles about “security” issues to the first issue of Kesher. The first told the story of Eschar, the most widely read underground paper of the 1940’s that was distributed among many thousands of Haganah members and was apparently the only underground paper ever read by paying subscribers. Another short article revealed the concealed details of a 1949 plan to publish an IDF daily.

In addition we featured some Jewish papers and periodicals published around the world, and told the tale of the Yiddish American monthly Der Zukunft that was published in New York City since 1892 and was still around in 1987. The author of this article was Dr. Israel Chaim Biletzki.

A fascinating story was written by the journalist Rahamim Elazar, an immigrant from Ethiopia who studied in our journalism program. Elazar featured “five Jewish writers” written by Ethiopian Jewry scholar Dr. Jacob Noah Feitlowitz in the early 20th Century and explained the circumstances in which they were written and published.

The first issue included a dozen of studies and articles along with several short items printed in the section “Me-Ad Le-Ad” (from time to time) about press and journalism in Israel and abroad. One of these articles described the history of the oldest Jewish paper published—the Jewish Chronicle which is published intermittently since 1841 in London. We also told the tale of Ha-Hayil, an enlisted and uniformed newspaper that accompanied Jewish Eretz Israeli volunteers during their WW2 service in the British army. In the heydays of the Jewish Yishuv’s struggle against the British mandate, this paper voiced such protests against the government that financed its publication...

Shalom Rosenfield opened this issue with words of introduction that have become a Kesher tradition as years passed: a brilliant essay about a media related issue. In his first issue he dealt with the unique relationship between the People of Israel and the printed word. Rosenfield noted: “It may be that we brought this legacy with us from Mt. Sinai where our forefathers saw Moses... In the mouth of a Jew ‘black and white’ is not a cliché or literary phrase. It is taken for what it is an incontrovertible fact. The people- of the -book are also the people- of the newspaper,” he wrote.

Two other traditions began with the first issue. The cover of each issue was printed in color and featured either a portrait of a known journalist or editor, or an image which relates to a notable media event. All issues present English abstracts of the articles featured inside.

The release of the first issue published and distributed in May 1987 was cheered on and out of our campus. And then we stood to the real challenge: the publication of the second issue. It has always been much easier to publish a gala issue which rides the wave of excitement, than to enter the mundane everyday process of the second issue.

But the task was much easier than we thought, because our periodical’s design and of course, the contents, served as the best imaginable advertisement and led many prospective contributors to our fold. The scope of our interests expanded: which was the first Jewish newspaper? Was it the Gazetze or the Courant? (both appeared in 17th Century Amsterdam) Who should watch the watchdogs? Nahum Sokolow and the “official function” of the Hebrew press? A Jewish journalist and Hitler’s patch. Passages from the history of unionization among journalists development in Eretz Israel 1933-36; The Jewish press in Varna; The first periodical by Holocaust survivors in Germany; The Jewish press in Hungary; El Paso Temps; A Ladino Humoristic paper: Israel- a Zionist journal in Cairo, and many other subjects.

We also covered the fiery debate between two papers thought as controversial at the time: the radical rightist Haaretz Ha’Am and its leftist radical opponent Kol Ha’Am. We discussed a fascinating media phenomenon: “a one man paper” written and edited by one individual. We featured two such personal periodicals published by the poets Izzy Manger and Uri Zvi Greenberg. Upon the release of our second issue, it was reviewed by Maariv’s Gabriel Strassman who wrote: “You do not need to be gifted in history or Judaism in order to enjoy this breathtaking, fascinating variety of articles about generations of Jewish journalists...” (Kesher, A Periodical about Periodicals, Maariv, 27/11/1987).

Kesher has since become a leading media periodical. Two issues are regularly published every year. As years passed, Kesher has published numerous scholarly studies, articles, journalists’ memoirs and book reviews. Several issues were dedicated to single topics such as the economic basis of newspaper publication. Some space was also dedicated to a disquieting issue: the demise of papers that disappeared as we watched. Hashazot (closed in 1993), Al Ha-Mishmar (1995), Davar (1996) among others.
I retired from my activities at Kesher in 2003, with the 33rd issue. Kesher was not published for several years. But nowadays it has started anew under the guiding hand of a new editor, Prof. Gideon Koush, and is still going strong this day.
The Heads of the Institute for Journalism Research (known today as the Bronfman Institute for Jewish Press and Media Research) have also played a key role in the history of Kesher: the founder Shalom Rosenfeld and his successors Prof. Michael Kerem, Prof. Yosef Gorny and today, Prof. Yaacov Shavit.

KESHER FRONT PAGE
MEDIA AND SOCIAL PROTEST


Despite the significant role of media coverage in the 2011 summer social protests, it seems that the media suppressed protests turned against it, particularly regarding the issue of media centralization. This article examines the difference between the suppressed coverage of protest activities and the generous coverage of negative criticism leveled against the media. To this end, we propose that one should initially distinguish between positive and negative criticism of the media and journalistic practices. On the one hand, the media chooses to feature criticism that praises its actions despite of its seemingly negative facets. When such criticism may bolster the media’s power and contribute to its influential status. However, any criticism that may mar the media’s image as an influence generator is most likely to be suppressed and go uncovered. Due to similar reasons, protests against media centralization could never properly respond.

OLD OR NEW? THE MEDIA CHOSEN BY THE ISRAELI “TENT PROTEST” MOVEMENT /Amir Hetsron and Hila Lowenstein

This study is based on a survey (N=142) conducted face to face with individuals at the Israeli social protest movement’s Tel Aviv Rothschild Boulevard tent compound during the summer of 2011, in order to determine the type of media that provided information to the protestors, and detect potential differences in the commitment and activities of protestors who chose “old” media and interpersonal communication and those who used online social networks. Authors’ findings demonstrate that despite the notion that this protest was conceived and developed in online social networks, the protestors’ main sources of information were rather traditional. In addition, protestors (about a third of the surveyed group) who relied on Internet social networks were significantly more involved in activism, and were more supportive of the protest movements’ causes (although the last trend was not as statistically significant). Only 5% of the respondents, however, relied on interpersonal communication as a source of information. Among the control variables, which impact on activism and involvement was evaluated, it was found that socio-demographic background and religiosity of individuals did not consistently affect their involvement or activism. A socialist worldview was significantly related to both of these variables.

THE COTTAGE CHEESE BOYCOTT: “INTERNET LOGIC” MEETS “MEDIA LOGIC” / David Levin

The political roles and the impact of the Internet in general and particularly, of social media applications, is a key subject thoroughly studied and reported in the research literature in the last three years. Many scholars do not hesitate to proclaim a revolutionary transformation in the ability to tap the public agenda and reach decision-making hubs. The Israeli consumers’ protest deemed “the cottage cheese boycott” may thereby be viewed as an appropriate test case through which we may gauge
I retired from my activities at Kesher in 2003, with the 33rd issue. Kesher was not published for several years. But nowadays it has started anew under the guiding hand of a new editor, Prof. Gideon Kozis, and is still going strong to this day. The Heads of the Institute for Journalism research (known as the Bronfman Institute for Jewish Press and Media Research) have also played a key role in the history of Kesher: the founder Shalom Rosenfeld ZL and his successors Prof. Michael Keren, Prof. Yosef Gonty and today, Prof. Yaakov Shavit.

**KESHER FRONT PAGE**

**MEDIA AND SOCIAL PROTEST**


Despite the significant role of media coverage in the 2011 summer social protests, it seems that the media suppressed protests turned against it, particularly regarding the issue of media centralization. This article examines the difference between the suppressed coverage of protest activities and the generous coverage of negative criticism leveled against the media. To this end, we propose that one should initially distinguish between positive and negative criticism of the media and journalistic practices. On the most part, the media chooses to feature criticism that praises its actions despite of its seemingly negative facets when such criticism may bolster the media's power and contribute to its influential status. However, any criticism that might mar the media's image as an influence generator is most likely to be suppressed and go unanswered. Due to similar reasons, protests against media centralization could not properly resound.

**OLD OR NEW? THE MEDIA CHOSEN BY THE ISRAELI “TENT PROTEST” MOVEMENT /Amir Hetroni and Ilana Lowenstein**

This study is based on a survey (N=142) conducted face to face with individuals at the Israeli social protest movement's Tel Aviv Rothschild Boulevard tent compound during the summer of 2011, in order to determine the type of media that provided information to the protestors, and detect potential differences in the commitment and activities of protestors who chose “old” media and interpersonal communication and those who used online social networks. Authors' findings demonstrate that despite the notion that this protest was conceived and developed in online social networks, the protestors’ main sources of information were not different traditional. In addition, protestors (about a third of the surveyed group) who relied on Internet social networks were significantly more involved in activism, and were more supportive of the protest movements’ causes (although the last trend was not as statistically significant). Only 5% of the respondents, however, relied on interpersonal communication as a source of information. Among the control variables, which impact on activism and involvement was evaluated, it was found that socio-demographic background and religiosity of individuals did not consistently affect their involvement or activism, but a social-media worldview was significantly related to both of these variables.

**THE COTTAGE CHEESE BOYCOTT: “INTERNET LOGIC” MEETS “MEDIA LOGIC” / David Levin**

The political roles and the impact of the Internet in general and particularly, of social media applications, is a key subject thoroughly studied and reported in the research literature in the last three years. Many scholars do not hesitate to proclaim a revolutionary transformation in the ability to tap the public agenda and reach decision-making hubs. The Israeli consumers' protest deemed “the cottage cheese boycott” may thereby be viewed as an appropriate test case through which we may gauge the Internet's power in comparison to older mass communication media considered as the traditional platform for public agenda formulation.

This analysis, which is based on 140 news items published by two Israeli online newspapers: The Marker and Ynet- that covered this protest and covered its events vigorously, examined two dimensions: (1) the compared contents of online messages and printed media messages; (2) the impact of both messages on the public agenda.

This analysis utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods and has led to the following conclusions:

a) Due to the typical “media logic” of older media (i.e. news value, media availability patterns) we found essential differences between online and printed media messages.

b) Politically and economically motivated movers and shakers participated in the formulation of media messages in order to promote their agendas and interests. They sought to portray protestors as voiceless, emotional and disadorned individuals who lived in poverty, in need of assistance and representation. Due to this fixed mythological image, protest organizers lost media visibility and have become weaker participants in the relevant rational discourse.

d) The public discourse that emerged in the wake of this protest hinged on the most part on rebashed and processed messages. This was demonstrated by: (1) that protests themselves did not define the beginning and ending of their activity or the way it was to be ended; (2) that the discourse related to Cottage cheese and dairy products only; (3) Protesters did not partake in relevant politico-economic decisions. This analysis therefore reflects the ongoing prominence of older media and their central role in the formulation of Israeli public agenda. It exemplifies the sheer ability of powerful and organized actors that tend to dominate media coverage and the contribution of journalists and editors who safeguard the established social order. According to the current analysis, the Internet’s revolutionary potential should be reevaluated and seen in a different light.

**DAPHNE’S LAURELS: MEDIA REPRESENTATIONS OF A SOCIAL PROTEST LEADER IN THE ISRAELI ONLINE PRESS / Dalia Liran-Alper and Orly Tsarfaty**

The popular social protest campaign of summer 2011 is portrayed as a constitutive event in the history of Israeli protest. This protest was characterized by two salient features: on the one hand, the protest movement belonged to the younger generations and was led by students who were the most prominent activists. It also used the most innovative media. On the other hand, the involvement of women activists who also fervently led this protest, was outstanding.

This article focuses on the media framing of protest leader Daphne Lief. It exposes the media framing paradigms used by the press along with their variety of patterns used in the construction of Daphne Lief's media image. Our evidence was gathered through an examination of leading Israeli news websites such as wafis and Ynet and two web economic publications, Globoz and The Marker in July-October 2011.

Research regarding the media representations of women has reached general conclusions according to which, symbolic annihilation is engaged when women are represented. This might lead to diminished, distorted or negative representations and may even stop their construction altogether. When women act in the public sphere, practices such as inclusion and exclusion often emerge in their media coverage.

The findings of this study demonstrate that the press coverage of Daphne Lief's activity was remarkable and mostly sympathetic. The media framing of Lief in the online press did not correspond with established gender definitions in all cases. In some respects, non-gender discourse may have influenced this representation. According to the media, the legitimacy of Lief’s leadership stemmed from the valid and justified claim for a new social order in Israel, which also requires alternative leadership and a new distributive hierarchy for power and resources. Therefore, this media framing may have ushered in a novel approach to women leaders.

This study also indicates that young women leaders tend to form and adopt a new pattern of activity. Social media and online resources might help them avoid the traditional media gatekeepers during the critical initial phase in which a political movement breaks, enters public consciousness, and presents its messages.
THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES OF THE FIRST HEBREW SOCIALISTS IN EUROPE / Gideon Kouts

The middle seventies of the nineteenth century were a time of crisis for the Hebrew press, which did not fulfill the expectations of its reading public and did not gain new readers. This is usually attributed to its failure in dealing with the existential and ideological questions that troubled Russian Jewry towards the end of the Hashkalah period: the escalation of anti-Semitism among intellectuals, the expansion of the Socialist movement and the beginnings of nationalist ideology; the attempts to raise productivity among the Jews and integrate them within the economy by encouraging their occupation in agriculture and teaching them industrial trades. On the international level - the war that broke out between Russia and Turkey brought about a thirst for information that was often blocked by the Russian censorship. Existing newspapers did not deal adequately with current problems, despite the ideological model they adopted. *Ha-Zefra* concentrated on the popularization of science while *Ha-Levannon* represented an orthodox point of view. *Ha-Melit* was temporarily shut down and *Ha-Shahar* appeared only once a month.

Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that, on the part of the readers, the crisis could be no other than a crisis of confidence. The Hashkalah press has cultivated hopes and expectations about the liberalization of Czar Alexander II, which were proven false. It encouraged Russian patriotism and did not foresee the emerging crisis. The problem was, therefore, not only that new ideologies were ignored. Readers were wary of old ideologies and of the press's ideological function. They were also disappointed with the Russian press, because of its anti-Semitic publications. There was a crying need for a "new" Hebrew journalism.

The choice of Hebrew as the language of the first Jewish socialist journals in the 1870's Central and Eastern Europe could be rather surprising for the press's and social movements' historian. This holy tongue, which had just entered a slow process of secularization, has apparently represented conservative and traditional values which young revolutionaries sought to oust. Its surprising destiny is linked to the romantic and legendary personality of Aaron Shneur Lichtenber, the founder of the Jewish and Hebrew Socialist movement. Lichtenber, born in 1845 in Lithuania, was a rabbinic school student and teacher who joined the Russian socialist movement at a very young age. He fled the Czarist police to Berlin, where he founded the Jewish section of the Socialist International, and later moved to London, where he worked with the famous revolutionary journalist Lavrov. Lichtenber published his first articles in several Hebrew journals. But in 1877 he founded in Vienna, under the false identity of "Arthur Freiman" the first Hebrew socialist monthly *Ha-Emet* ("The Truth"), and persuaded several famous Jewish-Russian intellectuals such as the poet Yehuda Leib Levin (Yehuda Leib), or the writers Lilienblum, Witschewsky (Ben Netz), Kaminski, O'R and Dr. Kaminer to join his pioneering enterprise. For Lichtenber, Hebrew was a rich, intellectual language in which he could explain "complicated" ideas to the public. But it was also a good means for secret conspiracy communication... Subversive messages were exchanged using "Biblical" codes. The socialist writers were ideologically opposed to "purist" language. Articles were never signed (officially in order to avoid "personalization and quest of glory") of the writers to the benefit of the Idea, but also to avoid police scrutiny,*Ha-Emet* was read mainly by the Jewish youth of Russia, into which the journal was smuggled while struggling with the Czarist censorship. *Ha-Emet* had thus become a smashing hit and the most popular Hebrew journal in Russia. Its first issue was reprinted in three editions, but only three issues were published before Lichtenber was arrested. In 1890 he committed suicide in New York. In 1894 a New York anarchist Hebrew journal took the name of *Ha-Emet* as a tribute to A.S. Lichtenber.

But the success of *Ha-Emet* persuaded other Hebrew editors who sought to popularize their journals to employ socialist writers for commercial rather than ideological reasons: P. Smolenskin in *Ha-Shahar* (Vienna, 1868-1884), and M.L. Rodkinshon in *Ha-Kol* (Königsberg, 1876-1889).

Rodkinshon hired the socialist writer and activist O'R (Eliahoua Wolf Rubinowitz) as acting Editor-in-chief of his journal. O'R devoted himself to what, according to his words, was his main reason for joining the editorial offices - spreading the word of the Hebrew socialist movement. O'R published in *Ha-Kol* his first openly socialist article: "The Question of Workers in the United States". Rodkinshon wished to court the *Ha-Emet* subscribers and attract young readers to his paper. He offered a platform to fellow socialists, like Ben Netz, and prepared an additional foundation to absorb the refugees from *Ha-Emet* - his monthly *Asafet Chakhim* ("Meeting of Wise Men", Königsberg, 1877-1878), edited by Ben Netz, that would become the second socialist periodical. Publishing articles that interpreted current events from a Marxist standpoint was done cautiously, always keeping an eye on censors, and burying such articles within other contents. Socialists could be proud of their "Trojan horses".
THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES OF THE FIRST HEBREW SOCIALISTS IN EUROPE / Gideon Kouts

The middle seventies of the nineteenth century were a time of crisis for the Hebrew press, which did not fulfill the expectations of its reading public and did not gain new readers. This is usually attributed to its failure in dealing with the existential and ideological questions that troubled Russian Jewry towards the end of the Hasidah period: the escalation of anti-Semitism among intellectuals, the expansion of the Socialist movement and the beginnings of nationalist ideology, the attempts to raise productivity among the Jews and integrate them within the economy by encouraging their occupation in agriculture and teaching them industrial trades. On the international level - the war that broke out between Russia and Turkey brought about a thirst for information that was often blocked by the Russian censorship. Existing newspapers did not deal adequately with current problems, despite the ideological model they adopted. Hasidah concentrated on the popularization of science while Hasidah represented an orthodoxy point of view. Hasidah temporarily shut down and Ha-Shahar appeared only once a month.

Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that, on the part of the readers, the crisis could be no other than a crisis of confidence. The Hasidah press has cultivated hopes and expectations about the liberalization of Czar Alexander II, which were proven false. It encouraged Russian patriotism and did not foresee the emerging crisis. The problem was, therefore, not only that new ideologies were ignored. Readers were wary of old ideologies and of the press’s ideological function. They were also disappointed with the Russian press, because of its anti-Semitic publications. There was a crying need for a “new” Hebrew journalism.

The choice of Hebrew as the language of the first Jewish socialist journals in the 1870’s Central and Eastern Europe could be rather surprising for the press’s and social movements’ history. This holy language, which had just entered a dow period of secularization, has apparently represented conservative and traditional values which young revolutionaries sought to out. Its surprising destiny is linked to the romantic and legendary personality of Aaron Shmuel Lieberman, the founder of the Jewish and Hebrew socialist movement. Lieberman, born in 1845 in Lithuania, was a rabbinic school student and teacher who joined the Russian socialist movement at a very young age. He fled the Czarist police to Berlin, where he founded the Jewish section of the Social Democratic International, and later moved to London, where he worked with the famous revolutionary journalist Lavrov. Lieberman published his first articles in several Hebrew journals. But in 1877 he founded in Vienna, under the false identity of ‘Arthur Freeman” the first Hebrew socialist monthly Ha-Emet (“The Truth”), and persuaded several famous Jewish-Russian socialist intellectuals such as the poet Yehezkiel Leib Levin (Yehezkiel), or the writers Lilienblum, Wintchenkow (Ben Netz), Kaminski, O’R and Dr. Kanizer to join his pioneering enterprise. For Lieberman, Hebrew was a rich, intellectual language in which he could explain “complicated” ideas to the public. But it was also a good means for secret communication...Subversive messages were exchanged using “biblical” codes. The socialist writers were ideologically opposed to “purist” language. Articles were never signed (officially in order to avoid “personalization and quest of glory” of the writers to the benefit of the idea, but also to avoid police scrutiny). Ha-Emet was read mainly by the Jewish youth of Russia, into which the journal was smuggled while struggling with the Czarist censorship. Ha-Emet had thus become a smash hit and the most popular Hebrew journal in Russia. Its first issue was reprinted in three editions, but only three issues were published before Lieberman was arrested. In 1880 he committed suicide in New York. In 1894 a New York anarchist Hebrew journal took the name of Ha-Emet as a tribute to A.S. Lieberman.

But the success of Ha-Emet persuaded other Hebrew editors who sought to popularize their journals to employ socialist writers for commercial rather than ideological reasons: P. Smolenski in Ha-Shahar (Vienna, 1868-1884), and M.L. Rodkina in Ha-Kol (Königsberg, 1876-1889).

Rodkinsohn hired the socialist writer and activist O’R (Elyahu Wolf Rahmenitz) as acting Editor-in-chief of his journal. O’R devoted himself to what, according to his words, was his main reason for joining the editorial office - spreading the word of the Hebrew socialist movement. O’R published in Ha-Kol his first openly socialist article: “The Question of Workers in the United States.” Rodkinsohn wished to count the Ha-Emet subscribers and attract young readers to his paper. He offered a platform to fellow socialists, like Ben Netz, and prepared an additional foundation to absolve the refugees from Ha-Emet - his monthly Asofo Chahkunik (“Meeting of Wise Men”), Königsberg, 1877-1878, edited by Ben Netz, that would become the second socialist periodical. Publishing articles that interpreted current events from a Marxist standpoint was done cautiously, always keeping an eye on censors, and burying such articles within other contents. Socialists could be proud of their “Trojan horses.”

THE AUSTERITY PERIOD: “MOBILIZED PRESS” IN SUPPORT OF THE CITIZENS’ PROTEST / Rafi Mann

Until recently, the term “social protest” was used in Israel almost exclusively to characterize demonstrations or other dissenting activities carried out by the low income segments of society. Such were, among others, Hafia’s Wadi Salib riots in 1959 and the awakening of a “Black Panthers” movement in Jerusalem in 1971. Those events were mostly portrayed by the mainstream media in Israel as unlawful outbursts of violence, which threatened the public order.

But this traditional categorization shifted in summer 2011, when the “social justice” flag was raised in Tel-Aviv and in other cities by a protest movement, of which most of its activists did not come from lower socio-economic background. Most of the movement leaders, as well as many of the protesters, came from the country’s middle class. One of their main demands was to reverse the process which eroded the economic status of this class. Most of Israel’s media supported this social protest, and the nature of its coverage was highly positive. Against this background, this article offers a new observation of the ways the Israeli press covered the Austerity Period in Israel, mainly in 1959 and 1951, under the rubric of social protest. Based on newspaper reports and government documents, this article describes and analyzes the supportive position of the media towards the public protest against the government.

Three major newspapers, Ma’ariv, Haboker and even Davar criticized either the government’s economic policy, or its failure to provide for the basic material needs of the “average citizen”, to eradicate the black market and to fight the corruption in various public institutions. Such media attitudes stand in sharp contrast to the prevalent characterization of the Israeli press in the post-independence years as “drafted” or “mobilized” to the service of the government.

THE SOCIAL REACTION TO THE WADI SALIB RIOTS (1959) / Ada Yurman

The distinction between political activity and deviance is not always clear. Deviance may become political when groups such as drug addicts organize in order to seek recognition. However, political deviance emerges as a reaction to the existing consensus. To be defined as deviant, a group must have a political aim and act in a deviant way.

Researchers who studied the social reactions to groups that act unconventionally have found two central patterns: the first correlates personal characteristics with deviant behavior, and the second claims that society should be blamed for deviant behavior. The establishment usually tends towards the former notion and thus disclaims any responsibility for the distress of the underprivileged, while it is usually those who oppose government policies who believe that the fault lies with society. The purpose of this study was to examine social reactions to the Wadi Salib riots that occurred in Haifa in 1959. These riots represented the first ethnic protest of Israeli society, which was concerned with the ideology of the ingathering of the exiles. The central question was whether this ideology has contributed to the development of a different reaction in comparison to similar events abroad. This question was examined by analyzing articles published in the Israeli press of that period.

The Israeli press that establishment view of events. There were at least 80 per cent of the riots were criminals whose objective was to obstruct the development of society. The leaders of opposition parties, however, claimed that such events showed that Israel was living in poverty due to the government’s policies. An analysis of press reports on the Wadi Salib riots indicates a correspondence between the reaction to these events and similar events abroad. Nevertheless, the reaction to the Wadi Salib riots did not only express a conflict between different political camps, but also different symbolic universes. Each group exploited the Wadi Salib events to prove the legitimacy of their ideology.
THE WADI SALIB EVENTS AND THE REFLECTION OF ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN ISRAEL: MAARIV CORRESPONDENTS REPORTING, JULY-AUGUST 1959/Tal Strasman-Shapira

This article focuses on the Wadi Salib events coverage in the Tel Aviv daily Maariv. It reviews several articles about ethnic affairs and a series of five stories consecutively published in the weekend issues of Maariv for five weeks, beginning on 24 July 1959. This series, called “The Poorhouses of Israel”, was written by Menahem Talmi. In each story, Talmi described a visit to a poor and decaying neighborhood and depicted his harsh, vivid impressions in detail. His accounts of shock and distress were picturesque and were presented in a tangible, dramatic style. In addition, are featured interviews with the journalists Menahem Talmi and Aharon Dolev, that demonstrate how the press coverage of the ethnic issue had been minimal until the Wadi Salib riots. But since these events, the discussion of ethnic issues has always remained in the headlines.

FROM ICONOCLASM TO ZIONISM: THE POLISH PERIODICAL OD NOWA PUBLISHED BY MAPAM IN THE YEARS 1958-1965 / Elzipta Kossevska

The periodical Od Nowa was established in 1958 by leftist Polish immigrants of the "Gomulka Aliya" and was published under the auspices of the Israeli United Workers' Party (Mapam). Its editor-in-chief was Israel Isserles; the editorial secretary was Felicia Manska. Many contributors to this periodical, such as Rani Kislev, Roman Frister, Victor Zigelman, have eventually joined Hebrew language Israeli papers. Ida Fink has published her first stories in it.

Isserles's journalistic and political experience has led him naturally to the establishment of a paper that may help Polish born intellectuals of a leftist orientation to cope with essential issues they had to withstand. It was a platform that opposed obsolete political values, espoused new ideas and settled accounts with the past. Isserles thought that Israeli Worker Party (Mapai) followers, who were veterans of the communist government apparatus, and other communists loyal to such methods, could not appropriately cope with such issues. Od Nowa focused on ideological thought and profound discourses that were characteristic of Mapam. But the freedom of expression espoused by Od Nowa did not conform to the typical party informational policy and did not bfit the typical pragmatic attitude expected from a simple immigrant newsletter. Od Nowa has nevertheless fulfilled all its tasks. Its contributors dealt with issues that mattered to the "Gomulka Aliya" immigrants and unlike other Polish language publications such as Nowiny i Kursier, it avoided political or party dictates. Od Nowa was a proper manifestation of the best traditions of Polish-Jewish journalism in Israel and become an active participant in the Israeli political game. And it played this game with prowess. Thus, according to the author, Od Nowa and its contributors published a paper that soared above and beyond all other Polish-Israeli periodicals and was succinct in its attempt to circumvent their sensational-driven attitude. Od Nowa has served as a thoughtful, profound and historically conscious sentinel for Polish communists who turned into Israeli skeptics.

ENTERTAINMENT AS SOCIAL ACTIVISM / Matan Aharoni

The article examines how social activist journalism acts in the Israeli commercial television and entertainment milieu, and specifies an array of tools, which are available to Israeli activist journalists. The study focuses on the TV program "What Would You Do?" a documentary-social activism show hosted by Haim Hecht, a prominent Israeli journalist. This program demonstrated how innocent bystanders cope with various moral problems. It related to the issue of national identity and offered a potential meta-identity: the morally sound Israeli individual. Five diverse television mechanisms were used in order to motivate viewers and involve them in moral issues raised during the show. Solutions proposed by the program have thereby encouraged viewers to engage in moral action. This program used the generic characteristics of candid camera programs in order to substantiate the development of the reality TV genre. It aspired to be innovative in a medium in which the needs for change and entertainment are constant. This process has also led the viewers to reflect on their own
THE WADI SALIB EVENTS AND THE REFLECTION OF ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN ISRAEL: MAARIV CORRESPONDENTS REPORTING, JULY-AUGUST 1959/Tal Strasman-Shapira

This article focuses on the Wadi Salib events coverage in the Tel Aviv daily Maariv. It reviews several articles about ethnic affairs and a series of five stories consecutively published in the weekend issues of Maariv for five weeks, beginning on 24 July 1959. This series, called “The Poorhouses of Israel”, was written by Menahem Talmi. In each story, Talmi described a visit to a poor and decaying neighborhood and depicted its harsh, vivid impressions in detail. His accounts of shock and distress were picturesque and were presented in a tangible, dramatic style. In addition, they feature interviews with the journalists Menahem Talmi and Aharon Dolev, that demonstrate how the press coverage of the ethnic issue had been minimal until the Wadi Salib riots. But since these events, the discussion of ethnic issues has always remained in the headlines.

FROM ICONOCLASM TO ZIONISM: THE POLISH PERIODICAL OD NOWA PUBLISHED BY MAPAM IN THE YEARS 1958-1965 / Elzbieta Kossevska

The periodical Od Nowa was established in 1958 by leftist Polish immigrants of the “Gomulka Aliya” and was published under the auspices of the Israeli United Workers’ Party (Mapam). Its editor-in-chief was Israel Isserles; the editorial secretary was Felicja Manaca. Many contributors to this periodical, such as Ran Kislev, Roman Frister, Victor Zeligman, have eventually joined Hebrew-language Israeli papers. Ida Fink has published her first stories in it.

Isserles’ journalistic and political experience has led him naturally to the establishment of a paper that may help Polish born intellectuals of a leftist orientation to cope with the essential issues they had to withstand. It was a platform that opposed obsolescent political values, espoused new ideas and settled accounts with the past. Isserles thought that Israeli Worker Party (Mapai) followers, who were veterans of the communist government apparatus, and other communists loyal to such methods, could not appropriately cope with such issues. Od Nowa focussed on ideological thought and profound discourses that were characteristic of Mapam. But the freedom of expression espoused by Od Nowa did not conform to the typical party informational policy and did not fit the typical pragmatic attitude expected from a simple immigrant newsletter. Od Nowa has nevertheless fulfilled all its tasks. Its contributors dealt with issues that mattered to the “Gomulka Aliya” immigrants and unlike other Polish-language publications such as Nowiny i Karier, it avoided political or party dictates. Od Nowa was a proper manifestation of the best traditions of Polish-Jewish journalism in Israel and became an active participant in the Israeli political game. And it played this game with prowess. Thus, according to the author, Od Nowa and its contributors published a paper that soared above and beyond all other Polish-Israeli periodicals and was succinct in its attempt to circumvent their sensation-driven attitude. Od Nowa has served as a thoughtful, profound and historically conscious sentinel for Polish communists who turned into Israeli skeptics.

ENTERTAINMENT AS SOCIAL ACTIVISM / Matan Aharoni

The article examines how social-activist journalism acts in the Israeli commercial television and entertainment milieu, and specifies an array of tools, which are available to Israeli activist journalists. The study focuses on the TV program “What Would You Do?” a documentary-social activism show hosted by Haim Hecht, a prominent Israeli journalist. This program demonstrated how innocent bystanders cope with various moral problems. It related to the issue of national identity and offered a potential meta-identity: the morally sound Israeli individual. Five diverse television mechanisms were used in order to motivate viewers and involve them in moral issues raised during the show. Solutions proposed by the program have thereby encouraged viewers to engage in moral action. This program used the generic characteristics of candid camera programs in order to substantiate the development of the reality TV genre. It aspired to be innovative in a medium in which the needs for change and entertainment are constant. This process has also led the viewers to reflect on their own actions and situated them on the scene of the featured moral and social problems. Individuals of the audience could thus adapt common moral ideas through their exposure to emotional and pedagogic rituals.

Furthermore, the program dealt with the issue of the other and otherwise by raising ideological ideas relevant to the avoidance of being tagged as the other and about taking responsibility for, or being accountable to the other. It encouraged para-social interaction between spectators and the program host. Through this emotional involvement, Hecht convinced viewers to deal with moral issues demonstrated on TV, and promoted his personal concept of an appropriate Israeli moral identity.

“CRUISING” BETWEEN THE LINES: A DISCOURSE OF OPPRESSION, DANGER AND INTIMACY IN THE ISRAELI GAY PRESS / Yoav Kanyas

From a historical perspective, there are several indications within Israeli gay press discourse that point to the formation of a “counter public” (Warner, 2002) with common cultural characteristics and diverse ideological manifestations. This complexity is missing from the mainstream media’s gay and lesbian coverage and the general Israeli public discourse.

This research analyses the ideological role of such discourse in forming the gay press readers’ identity and public image. It also examines this medium according to existing community and alternative press models (Aron, 2002; Capps & Ellis, 2008).

The common expression “gay community” could signify a homogenous, ideologically united public, which participates in the media and the public discourse. But an interpretive semiotic analysis of written and visual contents published by Israeli gay papers such as Chayal, Nativ Nofai and Haiman Havrot reveals ideological diversity. Interviews with the papers’ editors outline the ideological interests according to which, each paper promoted a particular discourse. Such a discourse may contribute to a certain ideological consciousness and public image; either to an ideology that cultivates accommodation of the readers to the dominant society, or to one that cultivates separation and endorses an alternative social order (Orbe, 1998).

The study distinguishes between three discourse layers. Each layer embodies different themes that help to identify the ideology of each paper at different periods.

1. Oppression and protest – a discourse which focuses on the integration of the gay and lesbian public within the establishment. Some papers concentrate on the struggle for equal legislation through cooperation with the establishment, while others cultivate a militant discourse that uses subversive terminology and visuals, thus cultivating ownership of the degrading badge associated with the gay and lesbian identity.

2. Danger – a discourse which is composed of themes that might threaten the social order (such as: HIV, dirt, sleaze), which are usually not covered by mainstream media, or portrayed as dangerous. Some papers preserve such threatening representations, while others discuss them on a deeper level, in an attempt to challenge the norm.

The intrinsic discourse – brings on the nature of intimate relationships among “counter public” individuals and power relations between gay men and lesbians. In some papers, representations of monogamous relationships intimacy are salient, while others stress an intimacy that tends to separate sex from feelings, and praises young, well shaped, bodies that dominate the papers’ visual content. The papers’ discourse reveals an ideological conflict between gay men and lesbians regarding the dominance of such homoerotic images, as opposed to the united gay community concept, which signifies the mutual struggle of gay men and lesbians against heterosexual normative oppression.

ABOUT MONEY: “BANKNOTES” FOR SOCIO-POLITICAL AND COMMERCIAL PROPAGANDA / Haim Grossman

Banknotes-like handbills used as a promotional means in various political or economic contexts were a common advertisement gimmick in Israel since its establishment. In their attempt to maintain contact with potential voters before general elections, political parties and social organizations sent messages in support of their platform, and particularly in opposition to the ruling government, rival parties or their leaders. “Banknotes” were commonly used because of their visibility and potential to attract public attention. As such, banknotes are regarded as efficient “conveyors” of ideological messages. Consider as an example, the half-lirot bill issued in the late 1950’s, which portrayed an IDF female soldier on one
side and biblical images on the other.

In general, all such "banknotes," except one distributed by a ruling party were created by the opposition in order to criticize existing socio-economic policies and garner the voters' support for their agendas. During the 1990s, the use of banknotes in political campaigns has sharply declined, but their style has become increasingly blatant and violent style and was directed against specific political organizations and politicians who were explicitly besmirched. The commercial use of banknote handbills, however, still continues due to the idea that they are "interesting," inexpensive and communicative means which is suitable for street advertisement. But even in such contexts, banknotes have gradually become less popular and are replaced by more modern means. Banknotes have even become scarcer in the late 1990's and during the turn of the new millennium and were typically replaced by bumper stickers. So the era of handbills was shorter than the era of posters and fliers posted on bulletin boards and walls. The only remaining relics are banknote business cards which are distributed in some Tel Aviv quarters and feature enticing attractive women.

**BIKUREI TOELET: THE BENEFIT, TRUE KNOWLEDGE AND AESTHETIC PLEASURE EMANATING FROM THIS PUBLICATION / Moshe Pelli**

The publication of the periodical Bikurei Toellet in 1820 signals the culmination of the activities of the "Toellet society," an Amsterdam Haskalah Jewish enlightenment group established in 1815. The publication of this periodical followed the demise of the first Hebrew periodical of the German Haskalah, Hami'aaf (1783-1811), and preceded the publication of Bikurei Ha'Tenim (1820-1832), the Hebrew journal of the Haskalah in Galicia. This publication may have represented the Maskilim's desire to revive the first periodical. Yet the character and the orientation of Bikurei Toellet as an organ of the "Toellet society," were much different than those of the older German periodical.

Firstly, the general outlook of the Amsterdam society was much more moderate than that of the German Maskilim, especially among the young generation following the "founding fathers" of German Haskalah. Secondly, the contents of the Amsterdam journal reflect the readings and discussions conducted in the group's meetings. Thus, it lacks the overall professional "journalistic" and "periodical" character of a timely journal, and may be seen as a local, somewhat limited, anthology of articles, essays, poems, and sermons.

This periodical aspired to teach the basic aspects and tenets of the Haskalah cultural movement: to spread wisdom and reason, eradicate ignorance, benefit its readers by bestowing intellectual and aesthetic pleasure, and spread Hebrew language and literature. Yet it also advocated instilling the "fear of God" among its readership and did not attempt to confront the religious establishment like the German Maskilim. The editor, Shmuel Mulder (1792-1862), aimed to present to his readers the literary, cultural and intellectual achievements of the Amsterdam society and its members.

The article delineates the contents of the periodical and its various sections. The poetry section included on the most part religiously oriented texts and occasional poems concerning life experiences, weddings and deaths. The prose section was mostly fables or moralistic stories; some were translated from German in an attempt to demonstrate the adaptability and flexibility of the Hebrew language. A poetic drama, didactic like the stories, was also published. Sermons published in the periodical called for morality and observance of the Jewish tenets but also promoted the worldview of the Haskalah, that may lead the readers to self-fulfillment and happiness.

Sixteen writers contributed to the periodical and presented the "Bikurim" - the first fruits, of the Amsterdam Haskalah center in the second decade of the 19th century, which were read at the meetings of the society prior to publication.
A TALE OF AN UNBORN LAW: HOW WAS AN ISRAELI REGIONAL RADIO AUTHORITY ALMOST ESTABLISHED? / Yehiel Limor, Tzipi Israeli

At first, the idea was to establish two independent supervisory authorities: one would have been responsible for the second TV channel, and the other should have supervised the erection and activities of regional radio stations. But eventually only one authority, known as the ‘second authority’ for TV and radio broadcasting, was established in order to supervise both commercial TV channels (2 and 10) and regional radio. This article describes the circumstances in which Israeli regional radio was born. It is based on archival materials that were never examined until today and in-depth interviews with key personalities involved in the transformation of regional radio from a mere idea to a lively, vibrant medium.

The history of Israeli regional radio consists of five distinct phases:

In the first phase (1979-1984), the potential need for regional radio was "written on the wall" though no real action was taken yet. Awareness was raised by the "Kubersky Committee" that examined the issue of establishing a second TV channel in Israel but noted in its final report that due to the establishment of such a channel the public might also demand regional radio stations.

During the second phase (1984-1986), the law regarding the second authority for TV and regional radio broadcasting was formulated and thus both were to be controlled by a single authority.

The third phase (1986-1990) was marked by political debates between the major parties that led to the Knesset’s approval of the second authority law and paved the road to establishing a new TV channel and regional radio broadcasting.

In the fourth phase, the political establishment sought to formulate a specific law in order to split the “ministerial responsibility”: one minister would supervise the second TV channel and another, regional radio broadcasting. This legislative thrust was halted almost reached its final phases when general elections were called that eventually led to the formation of a new government, which thereby cancelled the plans for a separate regional radio law.

The fifth phase (1993) highlights a personal struggle between two ministers who wished to control regional radio. One minister who was responsible for the implementation of the second authority law argued that regional radio must be controlled by the second authority. The other, who served as minister of communication thought that regional radio should be independent from second authority supervision and should rather be under her own responsibility. In the wake of this political conflict, the legal status quo remained intact. Regional radio is still supervised by the second authority to this day.

And thus an independent regional radio law was never enacted in Israel.
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