

# **The BBC Goes Native**

An Analysis of BBC Arabic

by

Trevor Asserson

and

Deena Pinson

bbcwatch  
March 2008

# The BBC Goes Native

An analysis of BBC Arabic

## I Introduction

The BBC has been broadcasting for some years in Arabic on radio. In March 2008 it will commence broadcasting in Arabic on television. This is likely to increase the impact of the BBC in the Arabic speaking world.

Our study of BBC Arabic radio broadcasts shows what a baleful influence that has been, providing the Arab speaking world with a 'respectable' platform for terrorist organizations, rogue states and those who hate the USA and Israel. We believe that BBC Arabic Television will follow the same pattern.

## II Methodology

We decided to conduct a study of BBC Arabic during the 2006 War between Israel and the Hizbollah in Southern Lebanon because the war presented a sizeable body of material about a single unfolding story.

We recorded, translated and transcribed the BBC's principal news analysis programme, Hadeeth Al-Sa'a, for a period of four weeks from 19 July to 20 August 2006. We analysed views expressed by the invited programme guests whose selection we believe is the weather vane of BBC attitudes.

We categorised all programme guests, based on what they said, as either neutral or likely to encourage support or antipathy for one of the warring parties. In order to lend depth to the categorisation, we graded their attitude as mild (1) or forceful (2). We also graded the likely impact of an individual guest based both on his status, the institution he represented and the nature of his argument and the manner of its conveyance. The aggregate words spoken multiplied by the attitude and impact grades provided a 'weighted word' count.

Our detailed findings are set out in the attached table at Schedule I.<sup>1</sup> We set out in Schedule II a summary of views expressed by individual programme guests together with selected quotations which we think indicate principal views held by the person quoted.

We have not considered the time given to individuals. What they say, rather than the speed at which they say it, appears to us to be a more sensible measure.

### **III BBC Obligations**

The BBC has an obligation to be fair and impartial. It fails time and time again, as our earlier reports have shown. The Independent Panel, set up by the BBC to analyse its Middle East broadcasts, recognised the systemic problem within the BBC and recommended that it set up a 'guiding hand' to monitor its programmes to ensure that it achieves its obligation of due impartiality.<sup>2</sup> The BBC refused and instead set Jeremy Bowen in charge of its Middle East broadcasts, despite there having been questions raised as to his impartiality.

The BBC guidelines explain that:

"...due impartiality does not require absolute neutrality on every issue or detachment from fundamental democratic principles".<sup>3</sup>

The BBC has always ignored our calls for it to explain how it interprets those words. In fact the BBC appears to ignore them. Thus it refuses for example to use the word 'terrorist' to describe the blowing up of a school bus full of children, because it wishes to remain "neutral".<sup>4</sup> This refusal was maintained notwithstanding a call from the Independent Panel to use the word terrorist more widely.<sup>5</sup>

Hizbollah is listed by the UK government, amongst many others, as a "terrorist organisation." This is the same UK government through whose laws the BBC was born and is sustained. Hizbollah is armed and trained by Iran, a country whose President has called for the total destruction of Israel.<sup>6</sup> This is a public call for genocide. Israel has a free press; an independent judiciary; and representative forms of Government. Iran and the Hizbollah do not. If the BBC had remained attached to democratic principles it should be more ready to give air time to the dilemmas of a democratic Israel than to its undemocratic enemies.

In fact we identified 17 spokespeople for Hizbollah and Iran amongst programme guests and only 5 for Israel.<sup>7</sup>

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the BBC has in fact become detached from democratic principles and has become a proactive participant in the war of ideas, reflecting back to the Arabic speaking world some of its nastiest views.

### **IV Overview of Findings**

We found that, excluding 'neutral' guests, some 82% of programme guests were pro Hizbollah and some 18% pro Israel.<sup>8</sup> Our analysis of weighted words produced identical results – 82% weighted words pro Hizbollah and 18% pro Israel.

In terms of attitudes to the 2006 War, our findings are alarming, but given our previous reports, unsurprising. The airtime given by BBC Arabic to the pro Hizbollah position outweighed that given to the pro Israel position by a ratio of some 4.5 to 1.

What was more surprising was the very marked anti American sentiment which we detected. Many programme guests expressed blatantly and viciously anti American positions, examples of which are set out below. While this unto itself may be acceptable and even desirable in a

free press, the latitude afforded to these guests in sharing their sentiments, the highly evident disproportion in the representation of such views and the relative absence of challenge of these views in a manner which would conform with journalistic principles of impartiality and balance prompt serious concern.

In addition we came across a number of quite extreme statements. For example we were told that the bombing of an electricity station was a “*crime*” which is “*unprecedented historically*”<sup>9</sup> and we learn that it is US policy “*to crush the Palestinians completely and to take all of their lands.*”<sup>10</sup> When comments as extreme as this go uncorrected and unchallenged, the BBC appears to have tossed its moral compass into the waves and completely to have lost its bearings.

What emerges is a BBC which is providing a solid and respectable platform for anti Western ideologues. Many of these people have respectable sounding titles and doubtless – on television – will be smartly turned out. However their words will support people seeking to undermine the social values of those who built the BBC and who continue to pay for it.

## **V Attitudes towards the USA**

The following is a selection of some of the statements made by various programme guests, indicating their attitudes towards the USA. The identity of the speaker and date of the interview are in the endnotes, together with a reference to the page in Schedule II where the full quotation can be found.

When reading these words it should be remembered that they were broadcast by the BBC, the incumbent national UK broadcaster, during a period when the UK had soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan fighting shoulder to shoulder with the USA against a threat of Islamist terrorism which had brought bloody death and destruction to the streets of both London and New York.

While some of the statements are by themselves innocuous, taken together they amount to a campaign to delegitimise and demonise the USA in the eyes of the Arabic speaking world.

*“...[we] are doubting their [America’s] sincerity and respect”<sup>11</sup>*

*“America has to change its politics and speak honestly”<sup>12</sup>*

*“That [Bush] government wanted to have complete control over the world”<sup>13</sup>*

*“...the world, which is controlled by the US”<sup>14</sup>*

*“...the main side of this conflict is the US”<sup>15</sup>*

*“As we all know on the Arab street, if your enemy is Israel or America, you are on the right side”<sup>16</sup>*

*“...the problem is not with Israel; it is with the American Government...American politics is a failure that has no logic”<sup>17</sup>*

*“This talk about the war being that of Iran and Syria is nonsense. However, it is true that this is an American war; that was stated clearly by Condoleeza Rice”<sup>18</sup>*

*“Hizbollah has been leading this fight with dignity and justice... the positions of Europe and America center on their own obsessions ... their war on terror... and they have considered Hizbollah a terrorist group, which is, of course, wrong”<sup>19</sup>*

*“...there is a kind of vision in the American government...to crush the Palestinians completely and to take all of their lands”<sup>20</sup>*

*“...the Americans constantly talk about breaking the hearts and minds of the Arabs and Muslims”<sup>21</sup>*

*“This new [American] strategy...is totally contrary to the principles of human rights”<sup>22</sup>*

## **VI Israel Demonised**

The 2006 War started when Hizbollah invaded Israeli territory, attacked an army convoy killing some Israeli soldiers and kidnapping two others. Israel responded with a massive bombardment of Hizbollah positions and economic targets in South Lebanon, being the area controlled by Hizbollah. This was followed by an invasion in the last days of the war. Hizbollah rained thousands of medium range missiles on Israeli civilian areas.

There were civilian and military deaths and destruction on both sides, although all agree that the Lebanese suffered more deaths and greater destruction. There were massive population evacuations in both Israel and Lebanon from the affected areas. Israel was criticised internationally for overreacting to the initial aggression. After the war Amnesty International accused both sides of carrying out indiscriminate attacks against civilians.<sup>23</sup>

The BBC Arabic gives little indication of the destruction, the evacuations and the deaths (often of Israeli Arabs), caused by the thousands of Hizbollah rockets fired into Israel. By contrast some of the language used to describe Israel is hysterical in tone and the translated transcript reads like an Islamist extremist tract. Here are some examples:

*Facing the “Israeli aggression”<sup>24</sup>*

*Israel is said to have “evil objectives... this way of twisting things and the aggressive attitude”<sup>25</sup>*

*“...the Israeli military machine...works to a great extent based on hatred”<sup>26</sup>*

*“Israelis, who are violating all international law”<sup>27</sup>*

*“...breaching all of the international laws”<sup>28</sup>*

*“The crimes that they are committing...a real crime, which contradicts all of the laws”<sup>29</sup>*

*“...barbaric Israeli attack”<sup>30</sup>*

*“...the barbaric Israeli army”*<sup>31</sup>

Lebanon is facing *“a barbaric war”*<sup>32</sup>

They are *“destroying villages completely”*; they are *“racist barbaric”*<sup>33</sup>

*“We are facing a monster who does not care about the law or about morals...a killer monster”*<sup>34</sup>

*“...Israel is the deadly monster...a destructive monster”*<sup>35</sup>

*“They are committing massacres”*<sup>36</sup>

*“... the atrocities in Lebanon that we have seen so far from Israel, including all of their massacres”*<sup>37</sup>

There is a need for an *“assurance against further [Israeli] massacres”*<sup>38</sup>

They refer to *“a month of killing our children”*<sup>39</sup>

There is reference to *“this ugly crime against the Lebanese and the Palestinian people”*<sup>40</sup> (notwithstanding that Israelis including Israeli Arabs were in fact being killed by Hizbollah rockets at the time.)

*“...this is collective punishment, Nazi punishment”*<sup>41</sup>

## **VII Analysis of the Causes of the War**

Almost all commentators at the time agree that the initial Hizbollah incursion and kidnap of two Israeli soldiers caused the war. Without it there would have been no war. One obtains a very different view from listening to BBC Arabic:

*“...the kidnapping of the two soldiers was just an excuse”*<sup>42</sup>

*“I believe that the reason for this attack is not the two soldiers”*<sup>43</sup>

*“...we all know that this attack over the last three weeks has nothing to do with the release of the Israeli detainees...Israel wanted to destroy the infrastructure of Lebanon and this is part of historical revenge against the Lebanese people”*<sup>44</sup>

*“Olmert took...the kidnap of the Israeli soldiers as an excuse to invade, destroy and kill innocent people”*<sup>45</sup>

*“...I don't see any relationship between Israel's attacks on Lebanon and the existence of Hizbollah”*<sup>46</sup>

## **VIII Absurd Comments**

There are some comments made by programme guests which are so shrill and absurd that they should disqualify these guests from being given air time by any serious broadcaster. The BBC Arabic brings us the following gems:

*“Israel is a country that wants to expand and they have a plan to force on to the regions of Palestine, Lebanon or even Egypt”*.<sup>47</sup> (In fact, Israel has voluntarily withdrawn from territory in Gaza (Palestine), Lebanon and Egypt.)

*“...barbaric Israeli attack, which kills everybody everywhere”*<sup>48</sup>

*“We faced Israel in 1967 and won militarily”*.<sup>49</sup> Israel would doubtless be happy to suffer a repeat of its military defeat of 1967.

*“These are crimes unprecedented historically”*<sup>50</sup> (referring to the Israeli bombing of electricity stations).

*“Israel is extensively targeting every part of Lebanon”*.<sup>51</sup> In fact, Israel was targeting Hizbollah controlled South Lebanon. In Beirut people were sunbathing on the beach.

*“...it became apparent that Israel is targeting the entire Lebanon, its people, and infrastructure”*<sup>52</sup>

*“...all the massacres committed by Israel, like no one in history has seen something similar. It is even worse than what Germany committed”*<sup>53</sup>

## **IX Dangerous Comments**

UK and indeed Western foreign policy is presently pre-occupied with a belligerent Iran which is issuing blood curdling threats against the West, supporting terrorists who threaten the West – including Hizbollah – and is building a nuclear capability.

One would like to imagine that the BBC would be supportive of the intellectual battle which the West is fighting. At the very least, one would hope that the BBC would be balanced in its coverage of the issue. In fact the BBC appears to be lending support and providing a platform to those who legitimise Iranian aims and deprecate those of the West.

*“I hope that Iran has something to scare Israel, as an Arab citizen from the Middle East. I wish that all Arab countries would have nuclear weapons”*<sup>54</sup>

*“Iran’s opinion is rooted in morals and rules, legal and logical”*<sup>55</sup>

*“...claims of Iranian instigation are untrue”*<sup>56</sup>

Europe and America *“have considered Hizbollah a terrorist group, which is of course wrong”*<sup>57</sup>

The Hizbollah soldiers are referred to as *“martyrs...the honour resistance which does the utmost that any group can do...to defend their country”*.<sup>58</sup>

Calling the Lebanese who died in the conflict *“martyrs [whose] blood is still fresh”*.<sup>59</sup>

*“Hizbollah was clear that their operation...targeted military objectives, not civilians, as did Israel”<sup>60</sup>*

*“I will ask Iran, and every Arab country who can, to have nuclear weapons”<sup>61</sup>*

## **X Conclusion**

The BBC Arabic radio appears to be out of control. It is providing a platform for a wide range of anti Western and in particular anti American ideologues to express their nasty, at times absurd and sometimes dangerous views in a forum that is almost invisible to most Westerners. The often unchallenged broadcast of such views by the BBC gives those views a veneer of legitimacy and truthfulness.

Overall, in the 25 programmes analysed, there emerges an unmistakable identification with parties with whom Israel is in conflict. While most programs provided a forum for the expression of a variety of positions, the blatant disproportion, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in the voice afforded to the respective views points to an unequivocally biased programme to the detriment of the Israeli position. Frequently, programme hosts make no pretence at objectivity, and even when the questions posed by the host were relatively neutral, they were often tainted by clear animosity toward Israel and the West, while generally no attempts were made to challenge the virulently anti-Israel and anti-West views expressed.

The relative lack of Arabic speakers amongst those who pay for the BBC means that the BBC does not benefit from the criticisms of the general listening public as it does for its English speaking programmes. The corrective influence which those complainants normally provide is necessarily absent.

Having rejected the Independent Panel’s recommendation to appoint a “guiding hand” to monitor its Middle East output, the BBC has no systems in place to know what its own journalists think. We are not aware of any systematic method it has for monitoring programme content. It seems that the BBC has less control of its Arabic programmes than of any others, because it appears that relatively few of its senior staff speak Arabic.

We are left with the disturbing fear that the most powerful media organisation in the world has left the fox guarding the hen house.

TREVOR ASSERSON  
MARCH 2008

## Biographies

**Trevor Asserson** is a UK solicitor. Having been for many years head of litigation at one of the UK's leading law firms and subsequently a senior partner in one of the world's largest law firms, in 2005 Trevor started his own firm which he continues to lead.

**Deena Pinson** is a graduate of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She is a researcher and writer and has contributed to numerous academic publications.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedules are only available in the electronic copy of this document, available at [bbcwatch.com](http://bbcwatch.com)

<sup>2</sup> The panel recommended that "there should be a strong editorial 'Guiding Hand'. That requires a senior figure, with the clout to provide direction and resources, to give more secure editorial planning, grip and oversight." This will "ensure consistent full and fair coverage".

Report of the Independent Panel for the BBC Governors on Impartiality of BBC coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. April 2006. [www.bbcgovernorsarchive.co.uk/docs/reviews/panel\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://www.bbcgovernorsarchive.co.uk/docs/reviews/panel_report_final.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> BBC Editorial Guidelines. Section 4 "Impartiality and Diversity of Opinion".

[http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/assets/guidelinedocs/chapter\\_four.pdf](http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/assets/guidelinedocs/chapter_four.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> The BBC is entirely inconsistent in this respect, using the word 'terrorist' very freely and frequently when describing the bomb attacks in London on 7 July 2005.

See, for example Limbajee, Khevyn "London: Terrorist Attack" BBC News 8 July 2005.

<sup>5</sup> "We think they should call terrorist acts 'terrorism' because that term is clear and well understood". Report of the Independent Panel for the BBC Governors on Impartiality of BBC coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. April 2006.

<sup>6</sup> In October 2005 the Iranian President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, described Israel as a "disgraceful blot" that should be "wiped off the map".

<sup>7</sup> Schedule 1 "BBC 'Hadeeth' Table Breakdown".

<sup>8</sup> Schedule 1 "BBC 'Hadeeth' Table Breakdown".

<sup>9</sup> 3 August 2006. Musallam, Tal'at. Retired Egyptian Major General. [See page 80 in Schedule II]

<sup>10</sup> 20 August 2006. Hamada, Hassan. Lebanese Journalist and Political Commentator. [60]

<sup>11</sup> 27 July 2006. Gharib, Dr. Edmond. Lecturer, International Relations, American University, Washington DC. [59]

<sup>12</sup> 20 August 2006. Al-Barghouti, Dr. Mustafa. Director of Palestinian Media and Studies Institute, Member of Palestinian Legislative Council. [16]

<sup>13</sup> 8 August 2006. Al-Sayyed, Dr. Muhammad Sa'id. Deputy Director of Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies. [32]

<sup>14</sup> 8 August 2006. Al-Sayyed, Dr. Muhammad Sa'id. Deputy Director of Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies. [32]

<sup>15</sup> 8 August 2006. Shams al-Waizin, Masha Allah. Iranian Researcher and Specialist. [100]

<sup>16</sup> 20 July 2006. Awad, Dr. Muhammad. Cabinet Minister, PA. [41]

<sup>17</sup> 24 July 2006. Al-Nuyami, Dr. Musib. Editor in Chief of Al-Vefagh Daily Newspaper (Iran). [30]

<sup>18</sup> 16 August 2006. Izz al-Din, Hassan. Hizbollah Member. [67]

<sup>19</sup> 26 July 2006. Khan, Abd al-Wahhab Badr. Deputy Editor of Al-Hayan Daily Newspaper. [75]

<sup>20</sup> 20 August 2006. Hamada, Hassan. Lebanese Journalist and Political Commentator. [60]

<sup>21</sup> 25 July 2006. Atwan, Abd al-Bari. Editor in Chief of Al-Quds Al-Arabi Daily (London). [38]

<sup>22</sup> 29 July 2006. Fawzi al-Shuaybi, Dr. Imad. Director of the Center for Strategic Data and Studies, Damascus. [54]

<sup>23</sup> Amnesty International "Israel/Lebanon: Hizbullah's Attacks on Northern Israel" 14 September 2006. "During the recent 34-day war between Hizbullah and Israel both sides committed serious violations of international humanitarian law".

"Directing attacks at civilians or civilian objects is a violation of international humanitarian law".

<sup>24</sup> 17 August 2006. Naila Muawad, Lebanese Minister. [79]

<sup>25</sup> 19 August 2006. Bu'zenab, Ghalib. Senior Hizbollah Member. [48]

<sup>26</sup> 5 August 2006. Al-Naggar, Ahmad. Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies; "Al-Ahram" Newspaper, Cairo. [27]

- 
- <sup>27</sup> 25 July 2006. Atwan, Abd al-Bari. Editor in Chief of Al-Quds Al-Arabi Daily (London). [38]
- <sup>28</sup> 12 August 2006. Nafi'a, Dr. Hasan. Dean of Political Science, Cairo University. [85]
- <sup>29</sup> 30 July 2006. Saraya, Usama. Editor in Chief of Al-Ahram Daily, Cairo. [95]
- <sup>30</sup> 20 July 2006. Abu Zayd, Hikmat. Journalist, political analyst and former PR officer of former Lebanese PM Salim al-Huss. [10]
- <sup>31</sup> 8 August 2006. Khan, Abd al-Wahhab Badr. Deputy Editor of Al-Hayan Daily Newspaper. [76]
- <sup>32</sup> 8 August 2006. Khouri, Rafiq. Editor in Chief of Al-Anwar Daily. [77]
- <sup>33</sup> 9 August 2006. Bishara, Dr. Azmi. Israeli Arab Member of Knesset. [48]
- <sup>34</sup> 20 July 2006. Nafi'a, Dr. Hasan. Dean of Political Science, Cairo University. [83]
- <sup>35</sup> 27 July 2006. Nafi'a, Dr. Hasan. Dean of Political Science, Cairo University. [84]
- <sup>36</sup> 23 July 2006. Rahal, Dr. Hussein. Hizbollah Spokesperson. [90]
- <sup>37</sup> 25 July 2006. Hamzawi, Dr. Amr. Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington. [62]
- <sup>38</sup> 14 August 2006. Suwailem, Hussam. Retired Egyptian Major General. [111]
- <sup>39</sup> 17 August 2006. Al-Mussawi, Nawwaf. Hizbollah Representative. [24]
- <sup>40</sup> 2 August 2006. Ashki, Dr. Anwar. Director of the Middle East Center for Strategic and Legal Studies, Saudi Arabia. [36]
- <sup>41</sup> 31 July 2006. Al-Himali, Ahmad. Israeli Affairs Commentator. [22]
- <sup>42</sup> 22 July 2006. Shlala, Rafiq. Lebanese Government Spokesperson. [104]
- <sup>43</sup> 22 July 2006. Sidqian, Dr. Saleh. Director of the Arab Institute in Teran. [104]
- <sup>44</sup> 3 August 2006. Ghanem, Dr. Asad. Department of Political Science, The University of Haifa. [58]
- <sup>45</sup> 15 August 2006. Duri, Latif. Secretary for the Committee for Israeli-Palestinian Dialogue, Meretz Political Party. [52]
- <sup>46</sup> 19 August 2006. Nafi'a, Dr. Hasan. Dean of Political Science, Cairo University. [82]
- <sup>47</sup> 20 July 2006. Nafi'a, Dr. Hasan. Dean of Political Science, Cairo University. [83]
- <sup>48</sup> 20 July 2006. Abu, Zayd, Hikmat. Journalist, political analyst and former PR officer of former Lebanese PM Salim al-Huss. [10]
- <sup>49</sup> 2 August 2006. Ashki, Dr. Anwar. Director of the Middle East Center for Strategic and Legal Studies, Saudi Arabia. [36]
- <sup>50</sup> 3 August 2006. Musallam, Tal'at. Retired Egyptian Major General. [80]
- <sup>51</sup> 13 August 2006. Salman, Talal. Editor in Chief of Al-Safir Daily Newspaper, Beirut. [94]
- <sup>52</sup> 2 August 2006. Saraya, Usama. Editor in Chief of Al-Ahram Daily, Cairo. [96]
- <sup>53</sup> 20 August 2006. Hamada, Hassan. Lebanese Journalist and Political Commentator. [60]
- <sup>54</sup> 24 July 2006. Al-Khazen, Jihad. Journalist. [21]
- <sup>55</sup> 24 July 2006. Al-Nuyami, Dr. Musib. Editor in Chief of Al-Vefagh Daily Newspaper (Iran). [30]
- <sup>56</sup> 24 July 2006. Al-Sayyed, Dr. Muhammad Sa'id. Deputy Director of Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies. [31]
- <sup>57</sup> 26 July 2006. Khan, Abd al-Wahhab Badr. Deputy Editor of Al-Hayan Daily Newspaper. [75]
- <sup>58</sup> 30 July 2006. Khalil, Anwar. Lebanese MP, Beqa Valley. [74]
- <sup>59</sup> 30 July 2006. Saraya, Usama. Editor in Chief of Al-Ahram Daily, Cairo. [95]
- <sup>60</sup> 31 July 2006. Ahmad, Dr. Ahmad Yusuf. Director of the Institute for Arab Research Studies, Cairo. [12]
- <sup>61</sup> 31 July 2006. Al-Khazen, Jihad. Journalist. [22]

---

# The BBC Goes Native

## SCHEDULE I

Each programme guest was categorised as either neutral or likely to encourage support or antipathy for Israel. 1 indicates the programme guest was mild, while 2 indicates s/he was more forceful. The likely impact level of the guest was graded according to their position. For example, a Government minister would have an impact level of 3, while an ordinary member of the public 1. The weighted words is a multiplication of the impact level and the words spoken, which was then multiplied by the attitude. A table at the end of the Schedule summarises the findings.

### BBC 'HADEETH' TABLE BREAKDOWN

#### Summary

	<b>No of People</b>	<b>% of People</b>	<b>No of Words</b>	<b>% of Words</b>
<b>Pro Hizbollah</b>	60	64%	55,863	67%
<b>Pro Israel</b>	13	14%	12,353	15%
<b>Neutral</b>	21	22%	15,372	18%

#### Excluding 'Neutral' Guests

	<b>No of People</b>	<b>% of People</b>	<b>No of Words</b>	<b>% of Words</b>	<b>No of Weighted Words</b>	<b>% of Weighted Words</b>
<b>Pro Hizbollah</b>	60	82%	55,863	81.9%	210,915	81.9%
<b>Pro Israel</b>	13	18%	12,353	18.1%	46,632	18.1%

**Pro Hizbollah Position**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Attitude</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Words</b>	<b>Weighted Words</b>
Abd al-Fattah, Dr. Mutaz Billah. Department of Political Science, Cairo University	30 July	2	3	790	4,470
Abd al-Qadar, Nazir. Lebanese Military Expert	1 August	1	3	471	1,413
Abu Daib, Khattar. Lebanese-French International Relations Expert	29 July	1	2	310	620
	30 July	1	3	179	537
	31 July	1	3	586	1,758
Abu Taleb, Hassan. Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo.	20 August	1	3	860	2,580
Abu Zayd, Hikmat. Journalist, political analyst and former PR officer of former Lebanese PM Salim al-Huss.	20 July	2	2	358	1,432
Ahmad, Dr. Ahmad Yusuf. Director of the Institute for Arab Research Studies, Cairo.	31 July	2	3	1,562	9,372

Al-Ahmar, Dr. Akram. Syrian Political Analyst	17 August	2	1	674	1,348
Al-Ashal, Dr. Abadallah. Former Deputy Foreign Minister; Lecturer of International Relations, Cairo University.	7 August	2	2	1,324	5, 296
Al-Barghouti, Dr. Mustafa. Director of Palestinian Media and Studies Institute, Member of Palestinian Legislative Council	20 August	1	3	803	2,409
Al-Himali, Ahmad. Israeli Affairs Commentator	23 July	2	2	446	1,784
Al-Khazen, Jihad. Journalist	24 July	2	2	765	3,060
	31 July	2	2	963	3,852
Al-Muslimani, Ahmad. Journalist and writer.	25 July	2	2	1,357	5,428
Al-Mussawi, Nawwaf. Hizbullah Representative	17 August	2	2	732	2,928
Al-Naggar, Ahmad. Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies; "Al-Ahram" Newspaper, Cairo	5 August	2	3	1,727	10,362

Al-Naqash, Anis. Coordinator of Al-Aman Network for Strategic Studies, Beirut.	25 July	2	1	1,154	2,308
	30 July	2	2	237	948
Al-Nuyami, Dr. Musib. Editor-in-Chief of Al-Vefagh Daily Newspaper (Iran)	24 July	2	2	711	2844
Al-Sayegh, Wissam. BBC Correspondent, Beirut	23 July	2	3	236	1, 416
Al-Sayyed, Dr. Muhammad Sa'id. Deputy Director of Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies	24 July	2	3	706	4,236
	8 August	2	1	883	1,766
Al-Sudeiri, Dr. Turkey. Editor-in-Chief, "Al-Riyyad" Daily Newspaper	27 July	2	2	438	1, 752
Ali, Mustafa al- Hajj. Hizbollah Party Member and Legislative Representative	3 August	2	1	1, 044	2, 088
Ashki, Dr. Anwar. Director of the Middle East Center for Strategic and Legal Studies, Saudi Arabia	2 August	2	1	966	1 ,932
	7 August	1	2	640	1, 280

Atwan, Abd al-Bari. Editor-in-chief of Al-Quds Al-Arabi Daily (London)	25 Jult	2	3	664	3, 984
	30 July	2	2	212	848
	2 August	2	2	1, 060	4 ,240
Awad, Dr. Muhammad. Cabinet Minister, PA	20 July	2	1	152	304
Ayoub, Charles. Editor-in-chief "Al-Diyyar" Lebanese Daily	1 August	2	2	507	2,028
	14 August	2	2	744	2,976
Azur, Jihad. Lebanese Finance Minister	27 July	2	3	620	3 ,720
	5 August	2	3	829	4,974
	13 August	2	2	392	1,568
Bishara, Dr. Azmi. Israeli Arab Member of Knesset.	9 August	1	3	659	1, 977
Bu'zenab, Ghalib. Senior Hizbullah Member	19 July	2	2	377	1,508
	20 July	2	2	684	2,736
Darwish, Adel. Journalist, London.	29 July	1	2	387	774
Duri, Latif. Meretz Political Party and Secretary of Committee for Israeli-Palestinian Dialogue.	15 August	1	2	424	848

Fawzi al-Shuaybi, Dr. Imad. Director of the Center for Strategic Data and Studies, Damascus.	29 July	1	2	652	1,304
	7 August	1	2	788	1,576
	17 August	2	1	167	334
Ghandour, Subhi. Executive Director, Al- Hewar ("Dialogue") Institute (Washington).	29 July	2	2	862	3,448
Ghanem, Dr. Asad. Department of Political Science, The University of Haifa.	3 August	1	3	578	1,734
Gharib, Dr. Edmond. Lecturer, International Relations, American University, Washington D.C.	27 July	2	3	931	5,586
Hamada, Hassan. Lebanese Journalist and Political Commentator	20 August	2	1	695	1,390
Hamzawi, Dr. Amr, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.	25 July	1	3	1,073	3,219

	12 August	1	3	689	2,067
Hanna, Elias. Retired Lebanese Brigadier General.	26 July	1	3	792	2,367
Hassan, Dr. Hussein al-Hajj. Hizbullah MP representative.	31 July	2	2	325	1,300
Izz al-Din, Hassan. Hizbullah Member	16 August	2	2	387	1,548
Jabour, Dr. George. Member of Syrian Parliament and Academic Political Analyst	26 July	2	2	845	3,380
	2 August	2	2	850	3400
	20 August	1	2	407	814
Jallul, Faisal. Journalist, Paris.	8 August	1	2	450	900
Khalil, Anwar. Lebanese MP, Beqa Valley.	30 July	2	2	169	676
Khan, Abd al- Wahhab Badr. Deputy Editor of Al-Hayat Daily Newspaper	26 July	2	2	685	2,740
	8 August	1	2	511	1,022
Khoury, Rafiq. Editor-in-chief, "Al-Anwar" Daily	8 August	2	2	603	2,412
Mansour, Khaled. UN Spokesperson in Lebanon.	5 August	1	3	473	1,419
Naila Muawwad, Lebanese Minister	17 August	2	2	191	764
Musallam, Tal'at. Retired Egyptian Major General.	3 August	2	2	804	3,216
	13 August	1	2	425	850

Nafi'a, Dr.Hasan, Dean of Political Science, Cairo University.	19 July	2	2	1,281	5,124
	20 July	2	2	1,001	4,004
	27 July	2	2	1,671	6,684
	12 August	2	3	926	5,556
Qisbar, Rafiq. Economic Expert, Beirut.	24 July	1	3	145	435
Rahal, Dr. Hussein, Hizbullah Spokesperson	23 July	2	2	650	2,600
	20 July	2	3	430	2,580
Rizqa, Dr. Yusuf. Palestinian Minister of Information	30 July	2	2	465	1,860
Safadi, Muhammad. Lebanese Minister of Transportation	16 August	1	3	541	1,623
Saraya, Usama. Editor-in-Chief, "Al-Ahram" Daily, Cairo.	2 August	2	2	1,251	5,004
Saad, Edmond. Editor-in-Chief, "Al-Nahar" Daily Newspaper, Lebanon	13 August	2	1	266	532
	7 August	2	2	327	1,308
Shayyeb, Akram. Member of Lebanese Parliament	16 August	2	2	536	2,144
Shams al-Waizin, Masha Allah. Iranian Researcher and Specialist	8 August	2	1	486	972

Shlala, Rafiq. Lebanese Government Spokesperson	19 July	1	3	353	1,059
	22 July	2	3	955	5,730
Sidqian, Dr. Saleh, Director of the Arab Institute in Tehran	22 July	2	1	563	1,126
Salman, Talal Editor in Chief , "Al-Safir" Daily Newspaper, Beirut	13 August	2	2	102	408
Suwailem, Hussam, Retired Egyptian Army General	14 August	2	2	613	2,452
Zabib, Muhammad. Economic Analyst, Lebanon.	5 August	2	2	136	544

### Pro Israel Position

Name	Date	Attitude	Impact	Words	Weighted Time
Avidar, Eli. Israeli Foreign Ministry Spokesperson	14 August	2	2	828	3,312
Binur, Yoram. Israeli Television Journalist	9 August	1	2	394	788
Cohen, Meir. Israeli Radio Journalist	22 July	1	2	436	872
Edrei, Avihai. IDF Spokesperson	23 July	2	3	791	4,746
Elad, Moshe. Retired IDF Colonel, Haifa.	9 August	2	2	333	1,332

Hasson, Yisra'el. Israeli Member of Knesset, "Yisrae'l Beitenu" Party	15 August	2	3	573	3,438
Keidar, Dr. Mordekhai. Bar Ilan Univesity, Israel.	25 July	2	2	773	3,092
	9 August	2	2	555	2,220
	14 August	2	3	268	1,608
Menashe, Dr. Sha'ul. Israeli Political Commentator on Arabic Issues	19 July	1	2	832	1,664
Nissan, Eli. Israeli Television Journalist	20 July	2	2	312	1,248
	30 July	2	2	1,013	4,052
	31 July	2	2	1,053	4,212
	13 August	2	2	200	800
Shaked, Roni. Israeli Journalist	9 August	2	2	672	2,688
	15 August	1	2	571	1,142
Shilo, Nili. Israeli Foreign Ministry Spokesperson	1 August	2	3	704	4,224
Stern, Yoav. Israeli Journalist, "Ha'aretz" Newspaper	24 July	1	2	724	1,448
	12 August	1	2	759	1,518
Weissbrod, Amir. Israeli Foreign Ministry	15 August	2	2	562	2,248

### Neutral Position

Name	Date	Attitude	Impact	Words	Weighted Words
------	------	----------	--------	-------	-------------------

Abd al-Fattah, Dr. Mutaz Billah. Department of Political Science, Cairo University	22 July	---	3	908	
Abd al-Gawwad, Dr. Gammal. Al-Ahram Centre for Strategic Studies, Cairo	17 August	---	3	817	
Abd al-Qadar, Nazir. Lebanese Military Expert	3 August	---	3	269	
Abd al-Samad, Nada. BBC Correspondent, Beirut	2 August	---	1	687	
Abu Daib, Khattar. Lebanese-French International Relations Expert	19 July	---	2	429	
Abu-Zeid, Nahed. BBC Journalist	26 July	---	1	497	
	27 July	---	1	519	
Al-Budeiri, Ahmad. BBC Correspondent, Jerusalem	23 July	---	1	939	
	26 July	---	1	534	
	29 July	---	1	715	
	1 August	---	1	528	
	2 August	---	1	296	
	9 August	---	1	510	
Al-Hajj, Adnan. Economic Editor, 'Al-Safir,'Beirut	16 August	---	2	186	
Al-Mawri, Munir. Journalist, Washington	26 July	---	2	727	

Alima, Eyal. Israeli Radio Journalist	1 August	---	2	319	
	5 August	---	2	108	
Binur, Yoram. Israeli Television Journalist	20 July		2	153	
Cohen, Meir. Israeli Radio Journalist	29 July	---	2	510	
Fares, Amin. Economic Analyst, Musawa Center, Jerusalem.	5 August	---	2	144	
Fawzi al-Shuaybi, Dr. Imad. Director of the Center for Strategic Data and Studies, Damascus.	12 August	---	2	568	
Hamzawi, Dr. Amr. Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.	19 July	---	3	321	
	22 July	---	3	468	
Kabha, Dr. Mustafa. University of Be'er Sheva	23 July	---	2	106	
Mustafa, Dr. Hala. Editor-in-Chief, "Al- Dimuqratiyya" (The Democracy) Quarterly	29 July	---	2	1,120	

Said, Dr. Abd al-Munim. Director of al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo.	3 August	---	2	739	
Salam, Muhammad. Political Analyst	16 August	---	1	201	
Stern, Yoav. Israeli Newspaper Journalist	13 August	---	3	760	
	20 August	---	2	473	
Suwailem, Hussam. Retired Egyptian Major General.	1 August	---	2	1,560	

---

# The BBC Goes Native

## SCHEDULE II

### BBC "HADEETH AL-SA'A" RADIO PROGRAM GUEST AND CONTENT ANALYSIS

#### Guest:

Abd al-Fattah, Dr. Mutaz Billah. Department of Political Science, Cairo University

#### **Program Participation:**

- (1) 22 July 2006 - Visit of US Secretary of State & Israel's Military Operation in Gaza

#### Summary:

The US seeks to manipulate internal Arab and Lebanese political arenas to the benefit of their political objectives, which prominently includes support of Israel. Lebanon is divided and there is resentment against Hizbollah within the country.

Israel seeks to eradicate the resistance mentality and should not logically be interested in a ceasefire, rather in obstinately eradicating Hizbollah and the resistance mentality present throughout Arab world with its military.

The international community is punishing Hizbollah and Lebanon, not without cause; The US' objective in proffering 'green light' to Israel is to enable eventual Lebanese control of Lebanon.

#### Quotes:

"The U.S. always makes it clear that you are either with them or against them. In Lebanon, they would not talk with the resistance, but they do want to talk with the government. Likewise, in Palestine, they won't talk with the Hamas, but they will talk with Mahmoud Abbas. This is in a sense dividing the Arabs with politics, which is exactly what the U.S. wants... I see the situation from a different angle, the whole international community and not only Israel is punishing the Hizbollah and Lebanon, but the punishment is not without crime and the crime does not go uninvestigated, but in this international community there is no investigator. I don't want to sound as though I'm defending Hizbollah or Israel but I want to say that the origin of the relation between Lebanon and Israel is very complicated as someone mentioned before. Israel has many voices but one weapon but Arabic countries have many voices and many weapons. Therefore we all see that Hizbollah will look like they are not of the same opinion as the Lebanese government; they work outside of the Lebanese government circle. They dragged the country into war, which it was not expecting. So the US is suggesting giving full control to the Lebanese government. The idea behind giving a green light to Israel is that Israel will occupy Hizbollah areas and then give them over to the [control of the] Lebanese army or international forces."

#### Program Word-Count:

908

---

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Attitude: Neutral. Impact: 3 (academic who presents his dispassionate opinion well)]

(2) 30 July 2006 – Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

Summary:

The U.S.' approach to the conflict is informed by their vision of a newly-fashioned Middle East. However, their interest in seeing Nasrallah destroyed has not been actualized at all. The U.S. is very much responsible for the casualties in Lebanon as they gave Israel 'the green light' to destroy the Hizbollah militarily, without any consideration of international law or morals – in utter contrast to their declarations about peace and democracy in the Middle East. The US is using Israel as an agent of its objectives and is demonstrating hypocrisy by sending humanitarian aid to Lebanon.

Israel has, since its existence, disguised its deliberate civilian-killing in claims of targeting soldiers. Their actions invite attacks from Palestine and Lebanon, even though these would hypocritically be considered terrorist attacks. Israel is antithetical to peace and is drawing the progressive enmity of its Arab neighbors.

Both the Israeli and Arabic sides have grown more fanatic and extremist. Neither side can be expected to respect international laws and the prospects of peace are dim, although Israel looks stronger with its support from the US.

Quotes:

"It is a classic excuse that Israel has used many times, since the first day of their creation. They say that they want to hit fighters and soldiers and they hit civilians... anyone who follows the news will see that they kill civilians, destroy bridges and TV and radio stations, which gives cause to anyone from Palestine and Lebanon to attack Israeli institutions. And then we can't talk about terrorists, because in that case we would all be terrorists. We are facing a serious problem in the Middle East... first of all because Israel's arrogance precludes the idea of peace... they will never relax and they are unfortunately enlarging their ugly image as an enemy to all of the people of the area..."

Word Count:

790

Micro Classification:

Likely to excite **animosity toward Israel and the U.S.**, particularly as couched in academic analysis and interspersed with more neutral-sounding analysis. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3]

Guest:

Abd al-Gawwad, Dr. Gammal. Al-Ahram Centre for Strategic Studies, Cairo

**Program Participation:**

---

(1) 17 August 2006 – Politics of War in Lebanon and Elsewhere

Summary:

Both within Lebanon and Syria there were reasons for abstaining from political statements during the war and for engaging in them following its end. Lebanon wanted to avoid internal divisions during the Israeli aggression, while Syria has managed only to ride on the coattails of Hizbollah's brilliance following the war's close.

Hezbollah effectively had no choice but to accept Resolution 1701. While it will have the positive effect of ending the war, it has its definite weaknesses with respect to sustainability.

Lebanon is in a difficult strategic disposition, at once unable to agree to peace with Israel owing to its central function in numerous other conflicts and strategic dynamics in the Arab world and also however rejecting war.

The war in Lebanon was essentially one manifestation of a long-standing regional conflict between radical and moderate regimes that will likely erupt into full-scale conflict at some point.

Syria is the cause for Iran's support of the resistance; Iran, however, remains the leader. By attacking Lebanese opposition to Hizbollah, the Syrian president sought to reap the gains of the resistance, however the strategy backfired.

There is no proof that the war on Lebanon was pre-planned, however Israel may have taken advantage of circumstances that enabled them to engage in war while blaming Hizbollah.

Syria will not allow the Lebanese to determine their politics independently. Lebanon is diverse politically and some of its factions clearly clash with Syrian interests.

Quotes:

"A bilateral peace is not achievable. Lebanon is the center stage for a lot of Arab conflicts and is under the influence of Syria, which has land under Israeli occupation. The situation in Lebanon is tied to the Syrian and Palestinian struggles. And I believe Lebanon will be the last to sign a peace agreement with Israel. I do agree...[that] Lebanon is in no situation to sign a peace deal, but on the other hand, does not accept war either...the war in Lebanon is more or less a conflict between the U.S. and Iran. It is ultimately a regional conflict much like what was going on in the 50's and 60's. The conflict has taken many forms, but the struggle was always between the radical and compromising regimes...The conflict was never truly resolved and I foresee a major regional war at some point. Until then we will be faced with minor wars...Lebanon is a diverse community, which is its magic and at the same time its problem...Syria is not with all of the Lebanese; they are with some of its people and not with the rest and that is a problem."

Word Count:

Micro Classification:

**Neutral Attitude; Impact: 3** (Academic offers sound and convincing strategic analysis, which although including occasional indications of anti-Israel affections, remains neutral for the most part.)

**Guest:**

Abd al-Qadar, Nazir. Lebanese Military Expert

**Program Participation:**

(1) 1 August 2006 - Israeli Objectives in Lebanon

Summary:

Clearly, there is confusion within Israeli leadership, which is reflected on the ground. It is rooted in faulty military assumptions with respect to Hizbollah's military capabilities. Furthermore, Hizbollah managed to draw Israel into fighting in inhabited areas, which is the most difficult type of combat, and which has worked to the advantage of the Hizbollah. However, this does not lend confirmation to Israeli accusations of Hizbollah exploitation of civilians, since Hizbollah fighters are inhabitants of the towns and Israel's response is not proportional to Hizbollah's detention of two soldiers after waiting three years to receive its own prisoners from Israel. Posits that the Israeli operation was in fact preventative and directed against a potential Iranian attack on Israel, since Iran cannot directly attack the US.

Quotes:

"...the Israeli military leadership made wrong assumptions about Hizbollah's fighting and confrontational capabilities...My strategic analysis is that the most effective military response will be from South Lebanon. I say that this operation has nothing to do with breaches or terrorism, but is in fact an operation a preventative operation...related to a possible Iranian attack on Israel..."

Word Count:

471

Classification:

Likely intended to **incite hostility toward Israel**, although portions of text are relatively absent of blatant personal expressions of identification with or antipathy toward either party. [**Anti Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** (expert from Lebanon whose value judgments are given more credence owing to the overarching "reasonableness" of his claims).]

(2) 3 August 2006 - Divergent Hizbollah and Israeli War Tactics

Summary:

---

From both ends, the war has ceased to have any logic nor aim toward any political achievement, while civilians on both sides are suffering. Hizbollah was surprised by Israel's calculations which dictated a preventative war to destroy the borders established by Iran through Hizbollah.

Quotes:

"I think that this war has lost its reasonable logic from both sides. We are now facing an exchange of violence, without any direct or indirect political aims on the horizon...We are witnessing an escalation on both sides, as if we entered an underground war witnessed in the Second World War. The citizen, whether in Israel or Lebanon is paying the price as a result..."

Word Count:

269

Micro Classification:

**Not likely to excite identification** or sympathy **with either party** to the conflict.

[Neutral Attitude; Impact: 3 (above)].

Guest:

Abd al-Samad, Nada. BBC Correspondent, Beirut.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 2 August 2006 – Arab Positions Toward War in Lebanon

Summary:

Consensus has been reached within Lebanon, mainly concerning the restoration of the 1949 ceasefire agreement and the disarmament of all militias (practically: Hizbollah), which should be a basis for a ceasefire agreement with Israel. Hizbollah is not fully prepared to accept it as is, following "Qana Massacre." Majority in government called, prior to Israeli operation, for politicization of Hizbollah, deployment of Lebanese army and liberation of Sheba Farms via diplomatic means. While there is considerable criticism toward the Hizbollah within Lebanon and Lebanese ranks of government, there is consensus that it should be considered only upon conclusion of Israeli offensives.

Hizbollah has, in principle, agreed to the objectives outlined by the government but has also stated the need for further discussion.

Criticism toward Hizbollah, including from Egypt and Saudi Arabia, has been contained in favor of ceasefire discussions.

Quotes:

"...The Lebanese are all united in their confrontation of the Israeli attack, [but] divided over the performance of Hizbollah. There is a large number of officials calling for the politicization of Hizbollah, the deployment of the Lebanese army and the liberation of Sheba Farms through diplomacy and not through weaponry...there are positions that sharply criticize Hizbollah, criticize its operation and its military performance, accusing it of being a Syrian and Iranian tool. However, at the same

---

time, the same officials called for postponing this discussion until after the Israeli military attack..."

Word Count:

687

Micro Classification:

Largely neutral, descriptive analysis. **Does not provoke identification or sympathies** with either party to the conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1 (BBC journalist reporting descriptively; absent of charged value judgments. Same below.)].

**Guest:**

Abu Daib, Khattar. Lebanese-French International Relations Expert

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 19 July/ August 2006 - The Challenges of International Force Deployment in South Lebanon.

Summary:

Posits causes for French concern with involvement in PKO, which in his view are to be attributed to both parties to conflict.

Quotes:

"France thought differently this time. The Lebanese government decision created a conflict for the French and today Israel violated Resolution 1701, exacerbating French concerns. What I am trying to say is that the French are concerned about the action of both sides."

Program Word Count:

429

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2].

- (2) 29 July 2006- US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

With respect to European involvement in the conflict, France, Spain and Italy's attempts to push for a ceasefire and achieve a solution are counterbalanced by the German government, while the German public opposes US support of Israel's aggression. Britain is historically conflicted between aligning itself with Europe versus with the US. The EU is still incapable of conducting international politics on its own.

France is correct to reject the transmission of a European-led PKO. Any prospective PKO should be UN-led and should meet Lebanon's needs, not only Israel's. The leading country must understand the politics of the region and work according to a novel and clear political strategy.

---

Quotes:

"...the only effective peacekeeping force would have to be supervised by the UN and...meet Lebanon's needs, not only Israel's. This force should give Lebanon its sovereignty and be agreed upon politically."

Word Count:

310

Micro Classification:

Likely to excite **moderately hostility toward Israel and the U.S.** [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact:2].

(3) 30 July 2006 – Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

Summary:

The international community, the UN and the US, are responsible for not putting a stop to the massacres in Qana. The present conflict is a test of Europe's willpower against the US, who shamefully kills civilians under the guise of a fight against terrorism.

Quotes:

"...there is little difference between UK opinion and the rest of Europe regarding this conflict...now is a test for the EU to play the role of the middle man. If there was a president of the US unlike Bush now, who talks about freedom to fight terrorism. It's shameful...the Lebanese people [rather than Hizbollah] were the ones who were affected."

Word Count:

179

Micro Classification:

Likely to evoke **hostility toward Israel and the U.S.** in the mind of the listeners. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3]

(4) 31 July 2006 – Political Resolutions to Conflict

Summary:

As the US has refused to condemn Israel in the Security Council, they will advocate a particular political resolution. It is not clear whether Europe, with France at the helm, will join the US in support of a political resolution as Europe is particularly concerned with an immediate ceasefire. Any PKO should protect the border from both directions, to prevent Israel from doing whatever it pleases as it has done in the past.

The European opinion is more balanced than the American one. The French opinion, which sees the need to include Hizbollah in the dialogue as part of the Lebanese government has proven more correct than the American-Israeli position. Israel is not honest and after the events in Qana village, likely not truly interested in peace.

---

Military power will not achieve peace, rather the right-of-return to the Palestinians and demonstration of Israeli interest in peace.

Quotes:

"...France is still calling for passing this resolution through the Lebanese, through national Lebanese dialogue, through having Hizbollah in the government. But America and Israel imagined for some time that they could take away Hizbollah's arms, which might even cause a civil war in addition to the current Israeli attacks on Lebanon. Now, 20 days after the start of the war, it is becoming clearer that the French opinion is more correct...when Israel attacks Hamas, they create more fanatics and when they attack Hizbollah they create more radicals. The most important thing is to give the Palestinians the right-of-return and to convince the neighbors that Israel wants to live in peace..."

Word Count:

586

Micro Classification:

Likely to **stir animosity toward Israel**. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3 (academic analysis that is relatively moderate and yet clearly points to Israeli guilt – particularly on humanitarian issues.)]

Guest:

Abu Taleb, Hassan. Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 20 August 2006 – Actual Prospects for Peace in the Middle East

Summary:

Peace would require preparation to bridge the gaps between very different perspectives held by different involved parties on the regional Middle Eastern conflict and its roots. The war did not pave the way for negotiation in the traditional manner of war and thus requires the roots of the conflict to be addressed. In the Arab world this means the absence of justice in there being no Palestinian state, while for Israel it means dealing with terrorism. Generally negotiations follow war, although the Lebanon situation is not ideal in this respect as no clear objectives were achieved by either side. Peace will require international effort and cooperation as well as Arabic vision and the Palestinian struggle and Lebanese political difficulties will need to be addressed as well. American conduct under George Bush may temporarily preclude peace, as it paralyzes the international community from taking a stand and indicates that the US doesn't want peace.

The war has heightened the importance of regional players such as Iran and Syria, owing to their ties to Hizbollah within Lebanon, but it has also complicated prospects for peace.

---

In Sadaat's time there was serious inquiry into Israel's actual interest in peace, which cannot be replicated in this era.

Quotes:

"Lebanon's war proved to everybody that in small and large countries alike, there is no choice but to go back to the roots of this conflict and the roots here are different for the different sides. For example, for Palestine and the Arabic world the roots of the Palestinian conflict are in that the problem in Palestine is not solved yet because there is no justice and no Palestinian country for Israel to play a role as a normal country in the region. There is the other side with a different point of view. For example, for Israel, the problem is the terrorism and of course they agree with the US and they call every Palestinian resistance organization terrorist...we need other elements to refresh and urge the peace process...there are actions that need to be taken relating to the Palestinian struggle ...this needs special Arabic vision for the region. Also [there is a need to] attract more international support. I can't ignore what's happening inside America...that there is no chance to enter...a massive peace process, to attract countries like Syria and to discussed issues as Iran, while America puts forward only more pressure on the sides..."

Word Count:

860

Micro-Classification:

**Anti-American/Israeli Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** (Egyptian academic for the most offers neutral analysis, however emerges from anti-American premise that is that much more effective owing to the overarching neutrality, academic dispassion, and to the constant appeals for 'peace'.)

**Guest:**

Abu Zayd, Hikmat. Journalist, political analyst and former PR officer of former Lebanese PM Salim al-Huss.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 20 July 2006 - Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

Asserts that the Lebanese are united behind Hizbollah, against Israeli "barbaric" aggression and American allowance of it.

Quotes:

"In hard times the Lebanese people unite, as they are united, even if they belong to different political parties or to different religions. None of them want Israel to defeat the Hizbollah...we are all against this barbaric Israeli attack, which kills everybody everywhere..."

Program Word-Count:

358

---

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative image of Israel and the U.S.** and **Identification** with Hizbollah in the mind of the listener. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (position is extremely hostile and is also a very emotional pseudo-humanist appeal. However, guest does not have an official government or academic position and extremity of position may have reverse effect of the one intended)].

Guest:

Abu-Zeid, Nahed. BBC Journalist

**Program Participation:**

(1) 26 July 2006 – Rome Summit and Siniora's Call for End to War

Summary:

Reports on developments at Rome Summit. Informs of Siniora's demands that Israel compensate Lebanon for damages, retreat from Sheba Farms, and agree to a prisoner exchange. Likewise, of US' insistence that cease-fire be part of an overall remedy to the current Middle East crisis. Reports on prospects for transmission of international force to Lebanese-Israeli border, stating that Israel opposes UN-controlled force and supports NATO-supported force, in opposition to the desire of the Europeans. Further reports on covert negotiations at summit and on various countries' approach to the creation and transmission of peacekeeping force to Lebanon.

Quotes:

Not Applicable.

Word Count:

497

Classification:

**Does not effectively incite sympathy or identification** with either party to the conflict. [**Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1**]

(2) 27 July 2006 – Failure of Rome Summit and US Policy

Summary:

The Rome Summit, although achieving minimal results, has had some positive effects for Lebanon in opening lines of communication and enabling better humanitarian aid. In many respects, it was destined to fail owing to exaggerated expectations.

Quotes:

Not Applicable.

Word Count:

519

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite identification or sympathy** with one party to the conflict. [**Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1**]

---

**Guest:**

Ahmad, Dr. Ahmad Yusuf. Director of the Institute for Arab Research Studies, Cairo.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 31 July 2006 - Political Resolutions to the Conflict

**Summary:**

The U.S. has begun to consider a cease-fire as they have grown cognizant, along with Israel, of Israeli inability to soundly defeat the Hizbollah and of Arabic and European pressure for a cease-fire following the "war-crime" in the Qana Village.

There is cause for pessimism with respect to the future and the situation is fraught with contradictions. Arabs consider Hizbollah a resistance movement, while Israel considers it a terrorist organization; resistance movements historically reside amongst the people, which explains Hizbollah's usage of human shields. Following Israel's actions and initiated attacks on civilians, there are no longer internal divides within Lebanon.

Hizbollah rockets are fired as a function of the Israeli occupation of Arab lands.

The American vision for the Middle East has since WWII fueled regional politics and events. Their desire to overpower any form of resistance to their vision is responsible for the absence of an American desire for a ceasefire in Lebanon. The solution should be an end to Israeli occupation and a bilateral return of prisoners, which would allow Hizbollah to transition into a political movement and allow the entry of international PKO to ensure the peace for both sides.

There are variegated currents of thought within Europe, but for the most part the European Union is much better aligned with the Arab view of international politics and the Middle East conflict than is the U.S. Performance of Hizbollah on the battlefield strengthens the otherwise limited influence of the European position. Unfortunately, there is not either a unitary Arabic opinion or force of influence and the official positions of some Arabic countries even included condemnation of the Hizbollah's actions.

**Quotes:**

"...we look at Hizbollah as a resistance organization and a freedom movement...there are thousands of Lebanese prisoners and Arabs. Hizbollah was clear that their operation - which is assumed to have sparked everything - targeted military objectives, not civilians as did Israel...I see that everything was very clear there is first of all a massive American vision for the region and the truth is that American politics since the Second World War don't see a future for this region unless it advances American entrance [into it]...the key to the situation in on the battlefield. As long as Hizbollah is resisting...I don't know how you can throw Hizbollah out of Lebanon...as long as Hizbollah withstands these attacks, the French and European voice will be heard more."

**Word Count:**

---

1,562

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to **evoke hostility toward Israel and the U.S. and sympathy toward Hizbollah**. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (harsh attack against Israel that is particularly difficult to contest as it employs classic catch-words and appeals to the emotions, even if misleading and/or patently false + academic title)

Guest:

Al-Ahmar, Dr. Akram, Syrian Political Analyst

**Program Participation:**

(1) 17 August 2006 – Politics of War in Lebanon and Elsewhere

Summary:

Syria's absence of conflict with Israel is strategic and will be altered in proper time. Syria is paying a heavy price for its position in support of the resistance, while some hypocritical Lebanese factions oppose Syria while also trying to make political gains off of Hizbollah's victory. In fact, the resistance could not have achieved its victory without Syria's support.

The vibrant Lebanese people will successfully rebuild from the destruction of the war.

The Israeli aggression will catalyse an intensification of the Syrian-Lebanese relationship and the division of Lebanon into 'noble' and 'non-noble,' consisting of patriotic and selfish individuals. Syria saved Lebanon and has supported the resistance from the outset. Those who oppose it will meet retribution, while Syria will continue to support Lebanon in whatever it decides. Arab nationalism is the remedy for regional problems. Syria supports the united Lebanon that resists the occupation, not the hypocritical factions who support the Americans and indirectly Israel. However, American policy was ultimately beneficial as it exposed Israel's weakness and the true intentions of the international community and certain factions within Lebanon.

Quotes:

"...peace is a strategic position of Syria...the resistance is one way to get there...resistance takes many forms and for those who want to open that front for resistance I would only say that everything has its right moment...With all my respect for the resistance, if it weren't for Syria it would have been nearly impossible to achieve that victory...I assume that the Israeli aggression will strengthen the relations between [Syria and Lebanon]...Now is the time to distinguish between the noble people of Lebanon from...the opposite...In Syria we did not change our position regarding the resistance and time will hold accountable those who choose to take the opposite side...At the moment what is needed from us is to stand next to the resistance in any part of the world...We will support Lebanon with whatever its people decide...the 14 March movement should come to its senses and Arab nationalism and that will solve the problems...We will stand next to the Lebanese people who are resisting the occupation, the Lebanese who are united...But we will

---

not support people who stand up for Condoleeza Rice after she supports Israel with its offensive. I have to say that we are thankful to American policy for not stopping the Israeli aggression because it showed who is the loser and who is the winner and uncovered the true intentions of the international community..."

Word Count:

674

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1** (Extremity of position espoused and blatant self-contradiction likely to severely compromise effectiveness).

**Guest:**

Al-Ashal, Dr. Abadallah. Former Deputy Foreign Minister; Lecturer of International Relations, Cairo University.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 7 August 2006 – Arab Foreign Ministers Summit

Summary:

Asserts that the outcome of the Summit cannot yet be predicted, although there are a number of possible outcomes. The Arab populous has ceased to trust its governments and Arab media outlets, which have become Zionist mouthpieces. Hizbollah has been more successful in its warfare against Israel than were the Arab armies in the past, even managing to kill Israeli civilians. Professes concern over self-interested individual Arab state action (if I understood correctly) and states that the developments on the Lebanese-Israeli front will be of consequence for Arab-Israeli relations at large. Arab leaders, who failed to assist Lebanon militarily should minimally support it politically. The Arabic resolution should minimally address the declared needs of the Lebanese government; Iran and Syria have both agreed to do so. Israel is attempting to damage the Lebanese as much as possible and foster civil war so as to damage Hizbollah. The Arab world should counter this with a unified appeal to the superpowers. Arab countries, particularly Egypt, have effectively authorized the Israeli attacks on Lebanon by their lack of demonstrated resistance. It is unfathomable that friendly diplomatic relations have persisted between Egypt and Israel in spite of the barbaric killing of Lebanese. A proper Egyptian approach would be effective in mobilizing the entire Arab world to action against Israel, as Egypt has a chief role in the region.

It appears that Hizbollah does not have expectations of the Arab Summit or of anybody except god. The combat essentially concerns the entire region, not just Lebanon and Arab leaders should recognize the colossal importance of assisting the Lebanese government.

Quotes:

"...What is going on in Lebanon now will decide the future in Israel and Israel's control in the Arabic region. If some Arabic presidents want to be friends with Israel and share the Arab world with them, this is a different case. But I can't imagine any real Arabic leader thinking that he would be dishonest for the benefit of his

---

country... This kind of war, Israel is trying to damage Lebanon as much as they can, even after the fighting... the fighting now is fighting for the map of the area, it is not only fighting for Lebanon. If Lebanon succeeds in stopping this aggression, they will be the leader of the Arabs and will a symbol of freedom. But I think the victory that Hizbollah achieved is a victory for the entire Arab world..."

Word Count:

Translation is missing portions of text. Word count stands somewhere above 1,324.

Micro Classification:

Emerges from a **classic Arab anti-Israel premise** that borders on sheer propaganda. Extremity of position may in fact have the **reverse intended effect** with respect to certain listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Fanaticism may harm credibility of stance, although it is clearly quite venomous and also originating with academic and former government official).

**Guest:**

Al-Barghouti, Dr. Mustafa. Director of Palestinian Media and Studies Institute, Member of Palestinian Legislative Council

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 20 August 2006 - Actual Prospects for Peace in the Middle East

Summary:

An international conference styled after the Madrid Conference should be convened to the end of achieving peace. It would provide a forum for the Palestinians to present their point-of-view and remedy the occupation, which is the root of the conflict.

Europe is not pro-Arab in its policies, it is simply less pro-Israel. The American and Israeli lobbies have arrested the development of Europe's partiality to the Arabs. An international peace conference might change that and alter the failed schemes of the US to aid Israel in the guise of advancing peace. European coalescence with the Palestinians and Arabs could generate sufficient pressure to prevent the US from acting upon its partiality to Israel or minimally prevent Israel from entering into peace agreements with individual Arab countries. The Arabs must formulate and abide by a plan for defense against Israeli and American policy. It would primarily dictate pushing all UN Security Council resolutions - firstly the end to the Israeli occupation - and secondly calling for an international peace conference, which would compel the US to change its policy with respect to the Middle East.

The Lebanese resistance is a lesson for Palestine in the unity it must cultivate and in turn prove to Israel and its allies that its military power is limited.

Quotes:

"I don't think we need a regional conference; we need an international conference and we need a conference to revisit everything that was broached at the Madrid Conference...and to discuss all the peace resolutions, all of which clearly stated that

---

the occupation should stop, because the occupation is the reason for all of the fighting and the conflicts...I think that the EU is crippled in the Middle east. They had a very interesting opinion when they were rejecting the war in Iraq and after that everything was crippled because of the pressure o American lobbying and Israel...we can create major pressure, the Palestinians, the Arabs and Europeans to pressure America to stop taking sides with Israel or at least to make Israel stop making separate deals with different countries...America has to change its politics and speak honestly; we need to take the initiative and come up with something...After this great stand from the Lebanese resistance, it was clear that the whole picture of Israel being the big military body in the region, it was challenged. After the people of Lebanon succeeded in being united, this is a big achievement. If this were hand-in-hand with what we are trying to achieve in Palestine to make one Palestinian union stand, this will stop anything coming from Israel and its allies." "

Word Count:

803

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** [Palestinian academic presents view highly critical of Israel and the US and closely identifying with the Palestinians and Hizbollah, although he refrains from explicit hostility and presents his view in academic, western-friendly terms - bolstering the effectiveness of the presentation.]

**Guest:**

Al-Budeiri, Ahmad, BBC Correspondent, Jerusalem

**Program Participation:**

(1) 23 July 2006 - Hizbollah's Media War

Summary:

Discusses war from a journalistic perspective. War always entails government supervision and restrictions; Israel has not prevented any transmission of information. There are basic guidelines with respect to journalism that always apply in Israel. Israel restricts filming of rocket landings for security purposes. Conditions are dangerous for reporters in Northern Israel owing to Hizbollah attacks. Journalist must attempt to maintain personal safety and neutrality. Situation is by far better journalistically than it is in Iraq. However, journalists can't accompany Israeli soldiers and sources of information are problematic (IDF and Hizbollah). Journalists are vulnerable to danger.

Quotes:

"There is a general feeling amongst a number of journalists that this is a lack of information on the front line...The journalists in Northern Israel are Arab, Jewish, and Western and are all working under difficult circumstances. There are rockets falling...There is danger. But it is our duty to give our listeners the new and different opinions...We don't want to be an element of the story. We only want to cover the news."

Word-Count:

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1]

## (2) 26 July 2006 – Rome Summit and Siniora's Call for End to War

Summary:

The US has adopted the entirety of the Israeli position -- with the exception of Israel's desire to continue to destroy Lebanese infrastructure – and has translated it into a new set of rules for the region. The Israeli public is convinced of the sincerity of Nasrallah's threats to bomb beyond Haifa. Israel's position does not depend on the Rome Summit; it depends on the continuing casualties of the war, Hizbollah's threats, and international opinion.

Quotes:

"I think that Israel is not interested in participating in this summit [in Rome] and explaining the Israeli position. The Israeli opinion is now represented by the Americans, who agree completely with the Israeli opinion..."

Word Count:

534

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathy or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1]

## (3) 29 July 2006 – US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

Reports on the imminent visit of the US Secretary of State to Israel. States that the US still considers itself the authoritative superpower in the region and that Israel will need to present it with a plan. States that Israel, Hizbollah and Lebanon have low expectations of the results of the American efforts.

Israel has opted for an international force in light of its military failure, although it insists that such a force be capable of protecting it from Hizbollah. Israel further rejected a UN-proposed ceasefire that would have sent humanitarian aid to South Lebanon, insisting on an overall solution to the conflict prior to accepting a ceasefire.

Quotes:

"...Israel also failed to accept the ceasefire proposed by the UN, which was mainly suggested to send humanitarian aid to South Lebanon. But Israel keeps refusing and pretending to allow humanitarian aid to reach the South. They say that they will not accept a ceasefire until a final solution is reached in the region. This solution, in their opinion, is to send the international peacekeeping force to South Lebanon..."

Word Count:

715

---

Micro Classification:

Largely descriptive analysis is mostly **neutral**, although portions would likely excite **moderate antipathy toward Israel**. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1]

(4) 1 August 2006 – Israeli Objectives in Lebanon

Summary:

The political, intelligence and military institutions within Israel are in disagreement with respect to managing the combat.

Quotes:

"It is clear that there is not a unified vision between the political institution, the military institution and the security institution within Israel with regard to the management of this war... There has not been a unified security political vision in Israel until now..."

Word Count:

528

Micro Classification:

**Does not excite identification** with either party to the conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1]

(5) 2 August 2006 – Arab Positions Toward the War in Lebanon

Summary:

Israel monitors the Arab position as consisting of disparate units. They were pleased by Saudi reservations about Hizbollah's actions and hold Egypt and Jordan to be partners in the region, while not having expectations of Maghreb states and considering Yemen and Syria to be supporters of terrorism.

Quotes:

Word Count:

296

Micro Classification:

Neutral description. **Does not excite identification or sympathies** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 1]

(6) 9 August 2006 – Israeli War Conduct

Summary:

Discusses internal politics of IDF in light of developments in Lebanon and of discord within the political ranks of government and its military inexperience.

Quotes:

---

"The Israeli army has always taken responsibility for Israel's security, but with respect to this war in particular, the problem is that there is a political, diplomatic war and failure on the battlefield as well..."

Word Count:

510

Micro Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies** or identification **with either party** to the conflict.

[Neutral Attitude- 0; Impact: 1]

Guest:

Al-Hajj, Adnan. Economic Editor, 'Al-Safir,' Beirut.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 16 August 2006 - The Internal Lebanese Arena

Summary:

Astronomical numbers of houses have been destroyed by Israel during the war plunging the country into dire economic straits.

Quotes:

"We have to be sure that in the coming renovation campaign we are very strict on how we handle the donations because there is no space for them to be mishandled. I assume that the total amount this is needed to get the country back on its feet is around 7.5 billion dollars."

Word Count:

186

Micro Classification:

**Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2** (Economic journalist expounds upon statistics of damage within Lebanon).

Guest:

Al-Himali, Ahmad. Israeli Affairs Commentator

**Program Participation:**

(1) 23 July 2006 - Hizbollah's Media Warfare

Summary:

Hizbollah leads successful psychological warfare against Israel because of the composure and charisma of Nasrallah, while Israel fails to turn the Lebanese public against Hizbollah and is frightened militarily and politically. Israel's failures motivate their offensives against Lebanese media outposts.

---

Quotes:

"I think that Hizbollah has succeeded completely in the psychological war against Israel this time. This war is very different than all the other wars Israel has with other Arab peoples...They're succeeding in the psychological war because the leaders of Hizbollah are people with self-control, calm and patience. Hassan Nasrallah has succeeded in directing this psychological war to Israel. They have succeeded by continually hitting Israel with rockets...Hassan Nasrallah is an inspiration of power to his fighters and the Lebanese people...and we have to give credit to Nasrallah for managing this battle so calmly...the failure of Israel on the battlefield and with the media leads them to attack Lebanese media sites. They exaggerate force because of their failure to deal with the situation."

Word-Count:

446

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Negative image of Israel** and **Identification with Hizbollah** in the mind of the listener and emerges from a blatantly anti-Israel premise. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (neither government official nor academic assumes a transparently pro-Hizbollah position, which may harm his highly charged monologue)].

Guest:

Al-Khazen, Jihad. Journalist.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 24 July 2006 - Israeli Attack on Lebanese Economy and Other Aspects of Israeli War in Lebanon

Summary:

All of Israel's actions are revenge against Lebanese civilians and an attempt at reaching Iran through the Hizbollah. They are deliberately killing civilians, as Hizbollah has no bases in Lebanon. Hizbollah does not fire rockets from civilian homes. Israel is simply trying to find excuses to cover up for its deliberate killing. Hizbollah will not be defeated as they have support from many ethnic and Arab groups, including Iran and have mobile bases. Israel's motivation for attacking Lebanon lies in its inferiority complex as Lebanon is a neighboring country that is more progressive and popular.

Professes hope that Iran has nuclear weapons with which to scare Israel and belief that all Arab countries should have nuclear weapons, as Israel is the sole bearer of nuclear weapons and has aggressive, expansionist aims.

Israel cannot handle wars that last more than two or three weeks, while popular Hizbollah resistance can.

The American government is fraught with foolish fanatics.

Quotes:

"They (Israel) are targeting Hizbollah and Lebanon because Lebanon is popular...all Arabs like you and me like to visit Lebanon. So there's a big competition between

---

Lebanon and Israel. The Israelis themselves said they wanted to bring Lebanon back 20 years. Lebanon as a county is more popular and more 'cool' than Israel, and the Israelis know this. They are trying to present the Arabs and Muslims as terrorists that want to fight the world. Lebanon presents a contrary picture and Israel doesn't was to see this example close by...I hope that Iran has something to scare Israel, as an Arab citizen from the Middle East. I wish that all Arab countries would have nuclear weapons. But Israel has nuclear weapons and has expansionist intentions. So I wish that every country would have nuclear weapons to face up to Israel..."

Word Count:

765

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **massive hostility toward Israel**, although extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Patently ludicrous allegations against Israel are nonetheless aided by cloaking issues in humanitarian guise)].

(2) 31 July 2006 - Political Resolution to the Conflict

Summary:

Israel is the criminal party, akin to Nazis, and can blame no one but itself for its travails.

The US proposal for PKO deployment is a good one, however peace will take a long time, which means Israeli destruction will continue. Israel is the terrorist, not Hizbollah, as it kills civilians from Gaza to Lebanon on a daily basis. The most recent U.S. proposition, put forth by Secretary of State is the best American formulation yet.

The Israeli occupation, rather than the Iran-Hizbollah-Syria connection, is the primary problem. The Iranian menace is by far more minimal than the Israeli one. Arab citizens cannot feel reassured until Israel is rid of nuclear weapons and the US should work toward that objective rather than investing in an endless series of follies in the region.

France has historically supported Lebanon, but as the US position is perfectly aligned with the Israeli one, French and EU attempts at stopping the killing and destruction in Lebanon are obstructed.

Quotes:

"...Israel represents the crime; they can't blame anybody. We are the ones blaming them after Qana yesterday...this is collective punishment, Nazi punishment...as long as Israel has these kinds of weapons (nuclear) and as long as they are attacking civilians, I will ask Iran and every Arab country who can to have nuclear weapons..."

Word Count:

963

Micro Classification:

---

Clearly intended to elicit **massive hostility toward Israel**, although extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Viciously anti-Israel position is aided by humanitarian sentimentalist appeals, however possibly harmed by degree of fanaticism and not aided by journalist position)].

**Guest:**

Al-Mawri, Munir. Journalist, Washington

**Program Participation:**

(1) 26 July 2006 – Rome Summit and Siniora’s Call to End War

**Summary:**

Iran leads the Hizbollah struggle as part of its overarching ideological struggle with Israel. The conflict is both ideological and military and any prospective cease-fire would have far-reaching effects for the overall resolution of the conflict and would not simply give Hizbollah time to recover and regroup. The position of the US is perfectly clear and is not perfectly aligned with Israel’s position, but rather seeks to resolve conflict fully and finally.

Israel is not America’s pawn, but is rather seeking to defend its own interests, which may well be the interests of other countries, including Arab countries. The US is interested in seeing Arab countries send troops to international PKO, which should work very efficiently. There is not disagreement between the US and Egypt. The Arab world often comes too readily under the influence of emotions, while the current situation demands logical consideration of the consequences of the war.

The resistance should serve the interests of the Lebanese government and the whole region, not Iran.

It is not clear why the Americans and Israelis attack Lebanon and not Syria.

**Quotes:**

“...Hizbollah's struggle is led by Iran. And now Iran has entered into an ideological struggle with Israel and the Iranian president has recently admitted that he wants to wipe out the presence of Israel. This ideology explains the struggle of Hizbollah, under the shadow of a difficult regional conflict that has pushed Israel to respond in such an aggressive way...I don't see any contradiction in the position of the US and I don't think they are totally supporting Israel. On the contrary, Israel is trying to evade the US and their decision to pressure them for a cease-fire....I don't think that Israel is executing the American plan for a new Middle East. I think that Israel is executing an Israeli plan...which might be to the advantage of many other countries, including Arab countries...Public opinion in the Arab world is so much taken by emotions and influenced by the media, which is its right. But what we need right now...is some logic...We sympathize with the deadly situation in Lebanon and Palestine, but we should deal with the issue in logical and cautious fashion. The consequences of this war are going to affect everybody. ”

---

Word Count:

727

Micro Classification

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Presents sound argument; absent of high emotional charge; journalist)].

**Guest:**

Al-Mussawi, Nawwaf. Hizbollah Representative.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 17 August 2006 - The Politics of War in Lebanon and Elsewhere

Summary:

Some Arab countries are essentially responsible for the bloodshed in Lebanon, as they allowed Israel to wage war through their political statements. The war was the result of Israeli-American joint scheming, similar to America's evil actions in Vietnam and Abu Ghraib prison. Internal objections to Hizbollah are unfounded and hypocritical. Hizbollah as well desires state-building for Lebanon, however it rejects the corruption and betrayal of those parties who object to it. Although there may be retribution on the Arab countries who did not support Hizbollah, the highest priority is confronting the Israeli threat and rebuilding after the destruction. The political leaders who should be criticized are the evil Americans and the international community who passively allowed Lebanese children to be murdered. The international media and BBC are hypocritical and immoral and passively watched the murder of innocent people. Lebanon must engage in internal dialogue above all else.

Quotes:

"...It started when some Arab leaders gave Israel the green light and turned their eyes to what was going to happen. And it happened...I truly believe that the only reason that the war kept going for so long was those few Arab speeches at the beginning of the war...This political bickering did not remain political; it caused us a lot of destruction and blood. It is not logical to say that this war was caused by the kidnapping of two soldiers by Hizbollah...what is now a big lie is the perception of the international community headed by the US that cares so much about Lebanon and its people...the war is sponsored by US. George Bush needs to be prosecuted for all the havoc he has caused in Iraq and Lebanon and no one knows where will be next...If we want to criticize what President Assad said, why don't we look at what Bush said when he endorsed the Israeli aggression. And why don't we question the international silence all through the month of killing our children...Now that the war is over and we have come out victorious, I am not going to comment on political bickering...Isn't it more appropriate to question the blindness of the media to all of the killing, while they preach human right and democracy?...where were you through all the killing and destruction? That's all I have to say..."

Word Count:

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Hizbollah member cleverly employs Western catch-phrases to the end of advancing arguably preposterous and in any case highly controversial arguments. Extremity of position may either completely discredit speaker or significantly bolster his position.)

**Guest:**

Al-Muslimani, Ahmad. Journalist and writer.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 25 July 2006 - Various opinions on continued combat in Lebanon.

Summary:

It is unfortunate that there are such high percentages of war support within Israel, since it is clear that Israel has broken innumerable international laws by engaging in it.

While some of Hizbollah's tactics have been questionable, their achievements should be commended, particularly their enervation of Israel. However, Hizbollah's revolutionary tactics have detrimental effects on Lebanon's economy and infrastructure, as their concerns are ideological while the state's are pragmatic.

As opposed to their position in 2000, Hizbollah will face domestic and international opposition following the barbaric Israeli war in Lebanon. Hizbollah's actions have not helped reverse Israel's assumed plans to destroy Lebanon. The situation in the Middle East at large has not changed nor is there an Arab front aligned with the US and Israel. There are, however, political responses to the kidnap situation within the Middle East, which has unfortunately at times translated into "insulting" treatment of Hizbollah.

Quotes:

"It is sad to hear this figure that 90 or 95 percent of the public in Israel support the war, when we all know that the Israelis in this war have broken international laws and war laws and disobeyed all sorts of laws and resolutions that were set ever since the WWII...From another point of view, Hizbollah's tactics are proving to be tempting as well. Hizbollah has proven that Israel is no longer a strong state, as they would like to be. This so-called 'state' has been shaken by the tanks, bombs, rockets and aircraft that were used against them... If we assume that Israel has got a plan to destroy Lebanon and the Americans are backing them up in this respect, what should a sane politician do in this case?"

Word Count:

1,357

Micro Classification:

---

Clearly intended to elicit **massive hostility toward Israel**, although extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (transparent fanaticism nonetheless aided by emotional appeals; journalist)].

**Guest:**

Al-Naggar, Ahmad. Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies; "Al-Ahram" Newspaper, Cairo.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 5 August 2006 - Economic Implications of the War in Lebanon

Summary:

Expounds upon the effects of war on a country's economy. The Lebanese people adapt heroically to the circumstances and the Lebanese economy has done remarkably well in spite of the challenges it faces. Lebanon's tourism industry is larger scale than is Israel's, which is why it has more to lose on that front. The economic losses in Lebanon are a direct function of Israel's vindictive and hateful military operations, that seek primarily to destroy Lebanon, and only tangentially to weaken Hizbollah.

Economic factors are not a consideration for Israel, who is funded by the U.S. The aid received by so rich a country as Israel is in no way comparable to the aid received by the Palestinians or by any other state. Any aid that Lebanon might receive would be insufficient to compensate for the losses imposed upon it by Israel. Arab countries donated money to the U.S. in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and should be donating much more to meet the horrific humanitarian emergency in Lebanon. Lebanon's security should be guaranteed, not only Israel's. The humanitarian situation demands immediate monetary attention, while considerations concerned with reconstructing the economy should be dealt with after the war.

Certain Arabic countries benefited economically as alternative tourist destinations. They reaped further economic benefit from increased oil rates and income and from the rise in the price of gold. However, the regional tension also had negative economic effects and popular support of the Lebanese resulted in stock market decreases as well.

Responds to question with respect to Hizbollah's sources of funding by quoting Hizbollah's assertions that they have investments and voluntary contributions. In any case, external funding would be perfectly reasonable and would not detract from Hizbollah as an independent organization, since many developing countries and other bodies receive external funding. Asserts that Hizbollah's aims - of achieving the release of Lebanese detainees and liberating Lebanese land occupied by Israel - determine its status. Furthermore, Israel's retaliation is wholly disproportionate.

The Haifa chemical factory is an important target for the Lebanese army and Hizbollah, as a central facet of the Israeli economy. However, the latter, as opposed to Israel, have moral qualms about attacking environmentally problematic sites.

---

An immediate unconditional ceasefire, followed by a settlement as part of a larger regional political scheme, must be put into effect to achieve regional stability and limit losses, mostly on the Lebanese end.

Relying on the international community for economic support in rehabilitating Lebanon will only breed disappointment and is also unnecessary in light of the huge resources at the disposal of regional countries. Although directing funds to Palestine and Lebanon is of limited consequence for these countries, it would create security for Lebanon until the conflict with Israel is resolved.

Quotes:

"...There is consensus about the size of economic losses in Lebanon compared to losses on the other side, since the Israeli military machine is enormous and works to a great extent based on hatred, more than on [attempts at] targeting Hizbollah or military targets. It is a destruction of the basic and industrial structure that has no military excuse. There is no military excuse for what is taking place in Lebanon...Anyone who wants to see stability in the region has to work towards an immediate ceasefire at the moment, unconditional. Following a ceasefire, conditions for a settlement can be negotiated, guaranteeing stability and security for Lebanon. And the other side might have its own conditions, but there must be a balance. Israel always searches for its own security, but not Lebanon's; its own detainees, but not Lebanon's. There needs to be a balance that will guarantee a long term settlement on the Lebanese borders..."

Word Count:

1, 727

Micro Classification:

Clearly emerges from a premise **hostile to Israel** and **sympathetic with Hizbollah**. Being cloaked in professional and academic guise, likely to persuasively transfer this message to the listener. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3]

Guest:

Al-Naqash, Anis. Coordinator of Al-Aman Network for Strategic Studies, Beirut.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 25 July 2006 – Various Opinions on Continued Combat in Lebanon

Summary:

There have always been internal divides and differences of opinion in Lebanon; what unites the various factions and ethnicities is their understanding of the Arab-Israeli struggle. The Arab world at large is highly divided, with one element subordinating to the Americans and Zionists and the other willing to do whatever is in its power to resist. There is an unfortunate lack of unity amongst Arab nations and individual Arab cooperation with the Americans and Zionists which sabotages prospects for one nationalist Arab entity.

---

Hizbollah is by far more powerful than Israel thinks it is and its demands will have to be met. A new regional dynamic will hopefully crystallize with the victory of the Hizbollah and the Palestinians. The US and Israel will be greatly weakened. The Arab League has actually supported Israel's aggression in the hopes that there would be payoff in alliance with the US against Iran and Hamas.

Hizbollah has acted in accordance with the policy of the Lebanese government in resisting the Israeli enemy. Israel is responsible for the war in exploiting the opportunity to invade Lebanon and reconfigure the Middle East in accordance with American wishes by reacting to kidnap of 2 soldiers completely disproportionately. However, fortunately Hizbollah was well-prepared and foiled Israel's plans.

Quotes:

"The struggle between the resistance and the Zionist enemy has a long history...Some think that the nation doesn't have the right tools to stand against the Americans and the Zionists and that they have to accept any solution presented to them. The other element thinks that due to the historical and cultural nature of the region, they can defeat the superpowers, regardless of how small they are...Instead of uniting to solve the issue of Arab national security in the region, each Arab nation started to negotiate its own ideology according to American and Zionist conditions...This is the same tool used in different situations and in different countries and results in Arab nations shirking their duties, their challenges and their fight for one nationalist Arab unity...If we look at the situation optimistically, we can say that the Middle East is being re-established in total contrast to the new American plan for the Middle East. If Hizbollah and the Palestinian resistance win this war, then a new establishment will solidify and Israel is going to be proven wrong...Hizbollah has consistently acted based on the wishes of the Lebanese government and its Hizbollah ministers to resist the enemy until Israel withdraws from Sheba Farms, releases the Lebanese detainees in its prisons and discloses the maps of landmines in Southern Lebanon that are killing people every day..."

Word-Count:

1,154

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **massive hostility toward Israel**, although extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1 (extremity of position and unbridled support for Hizbollah detracts from effectiveness of position)].

(2) 30 July 2006 - Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

Summary:

Popular resistance, in the form of the Hizbollah, is the only hope for Israel's Arab neighbors in the absence of a capable international community. Fortunately, it is very strong and successful against the Israeli enemy.

Quotes:

"...the UN is supposed to conduct relations between countries, and I think that now the UN is controlled by the US, who behaves as if it controls everything. We

---

remember the first Qana massacre in 1996 that the UN failed to condemn what Israel did...they are not useful anymore. The EU can't make any serious decisions. The US supports Israel and the UN is paralyzed, in this case the solution is popular resistance...we have hope only in our popular resistance, this is what the Palestinian people do."

Word Count:

237

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **massive hostility toward Israel and the U.S.** and curry **sympathy with Hizbollah and the Palestinians.** [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Position is harmed by extremity but aided by references to international community)].

**Guest:**

Al-Nuyami, Dr. Musib. Editor-in-Chief of Al-Vefagh Daily Newspaper (Iran)

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 24 July 2006 - Israeli Attack on Lebanese Economy and Other Aspects of Israeli War in Lebanon

Summary:

Israel deals with regional conflicts by blaming others so as to bolster their position with respect to world opinion. America constitutes the root of the problem in its support of Israel. Iran bears no hostility or enmity toward anyone, it simply objects to Israeli brutality and coercion, as is its moral obligation. Iran will respond to any attack against it. Iran does not recognize Israel, which was constructed on stolen land. It perceives a moral possibility to support Lebanon and is not afraid to do so as it is not concerned with American or international opinion. The existence of Israel cannot be reconciled and that country constitutes the problem in the Middle East.

Quotes:

"In my opinion, the problem is not with Israel; it is with the American government. They want to be the problem and the solution at the same time...There is no enemy attitude from Iran to anybody. But it's all about what Israel is doing which make us have objections. Iran is against Israel when it is taking people's right by force, taking land, killing civilians...How can America help Israel fire illegal bombs, while even Iranian emotional support is forbidden?...Iran doesn't recognize Israel as a legal country because it was built on somebody else's land...Iran doesn't have any relationship with America and they are not afraid of American anger. They see that American politics is a failure that has no logic...Iran's opinion is rooted in morals and rules, legal and logical, whether they are accepted internationally or not...Why do [European] countries have a right to help the Israeli crimes, while other sides can't support Lebanon?...This problem (Israel) has lasted for sixty years...What Israel is doing proves that no one can live with it, even the Arab countries..."

Word Count:

Micro-Classification:

Vehemently anti-Israeli and anti-Western rhetoric may have reverse effect. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Extremity of position detracts from its reliability, although cleverly employs humanitarian notions of justice)].

Guest:

Al-Sayegh, Wissam, BBC Correspondent, Beirut

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 23 July 2006 - Hizbollah's Media War

Summary:

Journalists are endangered and inhibited by Israeli attacks, which are a deliberate attempt at silencing the truth.

Quotes:

"There are no restrictions as such from the Lebanese side, but after several media sites and vehicles carrying media personnel have been targeted [by Israel], we are now have to remove the signs on our cars that say that we are media...what makes [journalism] dangerous these days is traveling...when broadcasting stations and satellites are targeted it is clear that they are being deliberately targeted...hitting such media sites is to silence the truth."

Word-Count:

236

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Negative** image of Israel in the mind of the listener. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (emphasizes precisely those points likely to foster antipathy toward Israel.)]

Guest:

Al-Sayyed, Dr. Muhammad Sa'id. Deputy Director of Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 24 July 2006 - Israeli attack on Lebanese Economy and Other Aspects of Israeli War in Lebanon

Summary:

Asserts that the underlying motivation for the war is Israeli collective punishment of Lebanese population -- in violation of international law -- so as to incite civil war and popular rejection of Hizbollah. Anger and revenge fuel Israel's objective of weakening all Arab countries, but especially Hizbollah, because they are powerful. Israel's behavior is barbaric and inhuman. Iran has little to benefit from engaging

---

Hizbollah at this time such that claims of Iranian instigation are untrue. Israel is not battling Iran through the Hizbollah because it could fight them directly.

Quotes:

"We don't have to consider too much to conclude that this [war] is collective punishment. They (the Israelis) want to destroy Lebanon and make Hizbollah responsible for it...What is happening is really barbaric. Israel is directing massive anger at civilians..."

Word Count:

706

Micro-Classification:

Likely to elicit **hostility toward Israel**, particularly as cloaked in academic guise. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (Seemingly academic and humanitarian position thoroughly attacks Israel.)]

(2) 8 August 2006 - Regional and International Attempts to Resolve War in Lebanon

Summary:

The Bush government wanted complete control over the world as well as in the Middle East, an attitude which Western Europe has resisted. France is cooperating with the U.S. to maintain a measure of control in Lebanon and the Arab region, to achieve balance in their political position and to assert themselves within the EU.

It would not have been in Hizbollah's or Iran's interest to spark war with Israel at this juncture if they in fact are strategically linked; the fortuitous time for such action would be as the EU and US were considering striking Iran in response to its nuclear initiative. Syria further is attempting to avoid regional conflict. Therefore, neither Iran nor Syria were behind the Hizbollah kidnapping of Israeli soldiers. We should not reject Iran, but rather cultivate a good relationship with it, as it is a supporter of Arabic power and of the Lebanese and Palestinian causes. However, there are some oppositional forces within Iran who believe that Iran's best interests lie with the West and not with the Arabs.

Hizbollah's position will be determined by their victory or loss in the war. Either way, they will face difficulties inside Lebanon and the American-controlled world. They are thus compelled to agree to international force deployment and can hope to affect Lebanon and sustain the Lebanese idea from within its internal structures.

Quotes:

"...Western Europe was fighting what they called 'the American attitude' under Bush. That government wanted to have complete control over the world and inside the US and the UN...In this situation, we can't push Iran away, because ultimately it is a country who comes across as a supporter of Arabic power. I think, to the contrary, that we need a very good relationship with Iran and we need to appreciate the Iranian opinion, supporter of the Lebanese and Palestinian causes...In any case, they [Hizbollah] will face difficulty inside Lebanon and in the world, which is controlled by the US. Therefore they have only one choice: to struggle to keep the Lebanese idea [alive]...The solution has to come from the Lebanese themselves..."

---

Word Count:

883

Micro Classification:

Extremely **hostile to the U.S., Israel and the West** at large and **sympathetic with Hizbollah and Iran**. Extremity of position may actually prompt reverse sympathies in listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1** (Extremity of anti-Western rhetoric lends little credence to the position)].

**Guest:**

Al-Sudeiri, Dr. Turkey. Editor-in-Chief, "Al-Riyyad" Daily Newspaper

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 27 July 2006 – Failure of Rome Summit and US Policy

Summary:

Questions whether the US is aware of its failures in the region as well as its accusatory approach to Syria. US folly is driving enemy factions, such as the Sunni and the Shi'a, to unite against the US. Anger in the Arab world is directed more toward the US than toward Israel, because the US is allowing Israel to do as it pleases in the region, including possess nuclear weapons. The Sunni are gathering progressively more volunteers to fight the US, while the US is causing the Shi'a to join them. The US definition of terror will continue to evolve as does Arab activity. Every Arab group who recognizes the destruction and casualties being caused by Israel will naturally participate in the resistance toward America and Israel.

Quotes:

"...the anger in the Arab world is no longer towards Israel, but more towards the US, because they have given the "green light" to Israel to do what they like in the region...We are being humiliated as Arabs whenever we see those images of burnt and dead children...All these images are creating more violence and anger towards the Americans and Israel..."

Word Count:

438

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **massive hostility toward Israel and the U.S.**, although extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (extremity of position against Israel and the US nonetheless maintains some credibility, as it refers to humanitarian concerns)].

**Guest:**

Ali, Mustafa al-Hajj. Hizbollah Party Member and Legislative Representative

**Program Participation:**

---

(1) 3 August 2006 – Divergent Hizbollah and Israeli War Tactics

Summary:

Israel has adopted the failed American strategy in Iraq of attempting to horrify the resistance into submission. The Israeli enemy is, however, able to reach the civilian Hizbollah infrastructure only, as Hizbollah has adopted unique strategies with which to fight the Israeli enemy. Time has turned in favor of Hizbollah and against the U. S. and Israel.

Hizbollah is a Lebanese resistance movement whose sole aim is the defense of Lebanon.

It was prepared for all possible Israeli reactions to its operation.

As a resistance movement, it was not responsible for preparing the population; nonetheless, the Lebanese identify with the aim of releasing the detainees.

Hizbollah is a supplement to the Lebanese army; combined they serve to protect Lebanon from the threat of Israeli attacks – a goal which other factors (such as France) have tried to prevent. The Lebanese army remains weak in the wake of the Lebanese civil war.

Quotes:

"...Of course the Israeli enemy was able to touch the civilian infrastructure of Hizbollah, which is open and apparent to everyone. What we mean by civilian infrastructure is the hospitals and medical centers, and the political and social centers of the organization, as well as other civilian locations. As for non-civilian locations, Israel was not able in any way to touch...When you are faced with an enemy that wages an open war against you, you have to use all the factors that work in your advantage to prevent this enemy from achieving its aims. What weakened the enemy is that it attacked all of its targets in the first week. All these targets didn't only affect the resistance, but the whole of the Lebanese population. So what we lost, we lost all together, and therefore the time factor has no value any more. There are no more losses to be inflicted on the Lebanese people..."

Word Count:

1,044

Micro Classification:

Emerges from premise **highly antithetical to Israel**. While clearly intended to **cultivate hatred of and hostility** toward Israel, extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1 (The fanatical opinion represented bears little credibility)].

Guest:

Alima, Eyal. Israeli Radio Journalist

**Program Participation**

(1) 1 August 2006 – Israeli Objectives in Lebanon

---

Summary:

Time is increasingly becoming a determinant for the Israeli military, particularly following unfortunate events in Qana. Lack of domestic Israeli consensus, both military and civilian, is a function of failed military objectives.

Quotes:

"...these internal disagreements stem from the absence of achievement of the established goals for this battle. It is known that when success is achieved, there are no disagreements or arguments; there is consensus. However, when these are not achieved, disagreements increase and expand, whether within Israeli leadership or within the population as well..."

Word Count:

319

Micro Classification:

**Does not excite sympathy or identification** with either party. [Neutral Position; Impact: 2 (Journalist offers reasonable and dispassionate analysis)].

(2) 5 August 2006 – Economic Implications of War in Lebanon

Summary:

Power is always asymmetrical, although Hizbollah has proven capable of confronting the Israeli army – of questionable benefit to the Lebanese government.

Israel is spending large sums on the war, which it can afford to do, having chosen to invest the fruits of its successful economic year on war.

Quotes:

"No doubt Israel is spending large sums of money, but according to economic analysts in Israel, at least on the economic front, Israel is able to handle this burden. Especially since it had done very well economically over the past year. As for whether it wants to use this economic success in this war, it has already given the answer by deciding to continue with this war."

Word Count:

108

Micro Classification:

**Does not excite sympathy or identification with either party** to the conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Journalist offers reasonable and dispassionate analysis)].

Guest:

Ashki, Dr. Anwar. Director of the Middle East Center for Strategic and Legal Studies, Saudi Arabia

**Program Participation:**

(1) 2 August 2006 – Arab Positions Toward War in Lebanon

---

Summary:

There is a discrepancy between popular Arab opinion and the positions of Arab government positions. With respect to the former, there is unanimous opposition to the aggressive Israeli attacks, while Arab governments are divided into active and passive countries. Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Jordan fall into the former category and are taking steps toward stopping aggression. The oil weapon cannot be used as the international repercussions would be too severe. Arab armies cannot become involved militarily for political reasons, but they will make Israel pay the price for its inexcusable aggression. There is coordination between Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Jordan, with the Saudi Arabia and Egypt acting as the main facilitators. There is some strategic Saudi-Syrian cooperation, but Syria cannot participate in Saudi/Egyptian diplomatic moves owing to its weak standing in the international arena. Saudi-Egyptian diplomatic manoeuvring has been successful in urging Europe into insistence on unconditional ceasefire and all Arab countries behind Lebanese 7-point plan. More extreme strides are being saved for the future for the benefit of the unified Arab position. The conflict will unify the Arabs. Saudi Arabia has always supported its intimate companion, Syria, in its conflict with Israel. Lebanon is a model in its religious coexistence, which the army needs to preserve by preventing the existence of armed militias. This would prevent future Israeli attacks, which are only executed owing to the cultural challenge Lebanon poses.

Quotes:

"...The first big mistake would be for Arab states to take part in this war. Secondly, to take part by stopping oil, because we are facing a dangerous enemy...if Israel targeted Egypt's dam, and it can, the whole of Egypt will sink...we are not scared of facing Israel. We faced Israel in 1967 and won militarily...Egypt is not scared of Israel, but it is exercising politics that will make Israel face its crimes and make it end this ugly crime against the Lebanese and the Palestinian people...We know that Saudi Arabia and Egypt are not scared of Israel, but we do not want to give Israel an excuse. We need to contain the situation as much as possible. After this, we can take things further...Syria is considered by Saudi Arabia a soul-mate and it is not possible for Saudi Arabia to tolerate any attack on Syria..."

Word Count:

966

Micro Classification:

Clearly exudes **hostility toward Israel**. [Attitude: 2; Impact: 1 (Ludicrous assertions greatly diminish effectiveness of intensely anti-Israel position)].

(3) 7 August 2006 – Arab Foreign Minister Summit

Summary:

Saudi Arabia has not been able to facilitate anything of substance owing to the absence of an agreed Arab agenda. Hopefully the present Summit will be effective. There are many inter-related factors that have affected the adoption of a resolution, however the Arab delegation will likely arrive at a unified front to take to the Security Council, which will likely meet the demands of the Lebanese government.

---

The political war, as contrasted with the military war, involves a large number of countries. Egypt and Saudi Arabia have been able to utilize their relationships with Israel and the US to the benefit of the Arabic cause. The role of the Arab foreign ministers is to balance the affairs between Israel, Hizbollah and the remainder of the involved countries with respect to the deployment of an international peacekeeping force.

While all means are legitimate in combating Israel and the US, international law and institutions should be sufficient in putting an end to the war and ultimately toward reaching an overall regional resolution that removes Sheba Farms and the Golan Heights from Israeli sovereignty and adequately addresses the Palestinian conflict.

Quotes:

"All paths are open during an uprising, but international law is not tending toward uprising right now, as long as there is a plan for a resolution and a Security Council...there will be a new Middle East, including a safe Middle East. Now we are at the end of this misery and I hope the Arab countries will follow and keep the balance in a way that is fair to the Arab people and international law."

Word Count:

640

Micro Classification:

While clearly representing a pro-Arab position, the substance of the statements are **not likely to excite identification or sympathy with either party** to the conflict. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Academic represents clearly pro-Arab position that nonetheless is presented in reasonable terms that refer to international law)].

Guest:

Atwan, Abd al-Bari. Editor-in-chief of Al-Quds Al-Arabi Daily (London)

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 25 July 2006 - Various Opinions on Continued Combat in Lebanon

Summary:

The Middle East is undergoing regional change with certain Arab leasers, namely Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the Palestinian Authority, aligning themselves with the U.S. in the wake of the perceived threat from Iran. They perceive threat from resistance groups in Lebanon and Palestine and are reframing their classic strategy in new terminology to please the US.

British public opinion is heavily swayed against Tony Blair's support of Israel and U.S. policy in war in Lebanon and is deeply resentful toward the atrocities perpetrated by Israel.

U.S. policy in the Middle East is facing serious crisis and failure.

Quotes:

---

"...public opinion in Britain is very sympathetic with the devastation in Lebanon and full of anger and resentment against the Israelis, who are violating all international law and destroying houses and killing people in Lebanon...The U.S. administration is exceptionally confused. Instead of creating allies, it is creating enemies. The enemies of the U.S. are progressively growing while the Americans constantly talk about breaking the hearts and minds of the Arabs and Muslims. "

Word Count:

664

Micro Classification:

Likely to elicit **hostility toward Israel and the U.S.** [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (European Arab journalist harps on particularly sensitive points that would be likely to persuade listeners of the justice of his case, especially as analysis appears reasonable and accurate.)]

(2) 30 July 2006 - Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

Summary:

Excuses should not be made for Egypt's inaction with respect to conflict. Rather than show solidarity with the victims of Israeli massacres, the once great and militant Egypt did not even recall its ambassador from Israel in response to the Israeli offensives. Egypt is responsible for the affairs in Gaza and has in spite of this done nothing to respond to Israel's aggressions in that region either.

Quotes:

"A while back Israel killed three Egyptians soldiers on the Rafiah border. This [conflict] is an Israeli adventure. Did Egypt respond by bombing Tel Aviv? Hizbollah kidnapped two soldiers, two soldiers, while Israel arrested and put in prison nine elected Hamas ministers and twenty-five parliament members. But Egypt didn't move..."

Word Count:

212

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to excite **hostility toward Israel and identification with Hizbollah, Lebanon, and the Palestinians.** [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (European Arab journalist presents extreme position that is likely to be persuasive, although fanaticism may detract from credibility)] .

(3) 2 August 2006 - Arabic Positions Toward the War in Lebanon

Summary:

The Arabic countries who can exert extreme pressure on Israel through threatening severance of diplomatic relations, withholding oil, or freezing peace settlements with Israel are not doing so, self-interestedly choosing rather to collaborate with the U.S. in allowing Israel's aggression in Lebanon and thus enjoy huge oil revenues. They are allies with the US in its various initiatives, including a potential conflict with Iran. Arab silence proffers legitimacy to Israeli attack on Lebanon, while even the

---

European position condemns Israel in stronger terms. Arab passivity is so great that even Olmert praised it. States incredulousness at willingness of Arab states to consider common interests with Israel and against other Arabs. The Arabs should use their monopoly on oil to advance their political positions against Israel and should also use diplomatic moves to convince the Europeans of their anguish and threaten severance of diplomatic relations with the U.S. and Europe. Arab passivity is appalling.

Quotes:

"...there a lot of Arab pressure cards that can be used by Arab administrations, the main administrations, specifically Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan, which have relations with Israel and can exert such pressure. But unfortunately, until now there has been no such thing. I think there is an agreement with the United States to back the Israeli aggression on Lebanon to destroy Hizbollah, paralyzing its effectiveness mainly in order for Arab for Arab countries to enjoy relations with Israel and enjoy the huge oil revenues... This Arab silence gives legitimacy to the Israeli attack on Lebanon. For example, you find the positions of Sweden or Finland more insistent on the ceasefire and giving greater condemnation of this Israeli aggression on Lebanon than Saudi Arabia or Egypt... Many European countries consider the Israeli attack war crimes. Destroying bridges, airports and attacking innocent civilians. Imagine President Hosni Mubaraq described the Qana massacre as an irresponsible act. Can you imagine? Corpses under the rubble, children, Arabs, Muslims, an irresponsible act? He didn't even call it a war crime. He didn't call it terrorism, state terrorism. This is not what we expect an Arab leader to say..."

Word Count:

1, 060

Quotes:

Clearly espouses **enmity and hostility toward Israel and sympathy and identification with Lebanon**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Extreme position aided by emotional and pseudo-humanitarian appeals and references to European public opinion, but harmed by degree of fanaticism)].

Guest:

Avidar, Eli. Israeli Foreign Ministry Spokesperson

**Program Participation:**

(1) 14 August 2006 - Prospects of Ceasefire

Summary:

Israel has accepted the ceasefire resolution in spite of its inadequacy owing to the interests of the international community and the Lebanese government in solving the conflict. Israel has indeed suffered significant losses, however this is not related to the ceasefire. Israel's decision to penetrate Lebanese territory was based on the need to put an end to Hizbollah attacks, which are the result of the Hizbollah-Iran connection and Iran's interest in diverting attention from its nuclear initiative. Israel has sought only to live in peace with its neighbors and was coerced into conflict. The military in

---

fact takes orders directly from the government and in no way acts independently. Lebanon's willingness to allow Hizbollah to wreak such havoc is incomprehensible.

The international resolution that catalyzed the IDF's withdrawal in May 2000 from Lebanon was problematic inasmuch as it was replaced by the Hizbollah militia, whose existence Israel and Lebanon were forced to accept to avoid armed clashes. Israel could not rely on the UN, as Hizbollah as a terrorist organization does not comply with international law or resolutions. Success of the ceasefire will depend on Hizbollah and Iran; Lebanon should utilize the opportunity it failed to utilize in 2000 to exert control over its southern territory.

Accusations toward Iran are bolstered by ballistic analysis of the rockets and such weapons exchanges between a terrorist organization and a state are not legitimate. Hizbollah has occupied many Christian areas and is responsible for the war. Israel's losses are always exaggerated in Arabic media. The Lebanese people should be grateful to the Israel army who have combated Hizbollah as a sub-state that did not confer with the government prior to attacking Israel.

Resolution 1701 offers real hope for solution and bridging of differences.

Quotes:

"...We have nothing against the Lebanese people or its South; we have...no demands, all we wanted is to live in peace. It's a ware that was forced on us after Hizbollah started the conflict...we have shown the Lebanese people that Hizbollah has an army and a fully functioning state, controlled areas and has all the external help to do what it wishes. I believe with Resolution 1701 we have a true chance to solve our problems...we have a real chance to amend our differences and we should not waste it."

Word Count:

828

Micro Classification:

**Pro Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Official government spokesperson offers fairly well presented and emotionally appealing argument in favor of his position defending Israel.)

**Guest:**

Awad, Dr. Muhammad, Cabinet Minister, PA

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 20 July - Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

Overtly hostile toward the Israeli and American positions. The Palestinians are united against Israel and America.

Quotes:

---

"As we all know, on the Arab street, if your enemy is Israel or America, you are on the right side."

Program Word-Count:

152

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative image of Israel** and the U.S. and **Identification with the Palestinians** in the mind of the listener. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1** (Extremity of position detracts from its effectiveness)].

Guest:

Ayoub, Charles. Editor-in-chief "Al-Diyyar" Lebanese Daily

Program Participation:

(1) 1 August 2006 - Israeli Objectives in Lebanon

Summary:

Armed groups in small residential areas fight differently than organized armies. Time is to the advantage of the resistance.

Israel is attempting to create facts on the ground by occupying Lebanese territory and consenting to withdraw from it only when replaced by international forces. However, the resistance, which is highly equipped with both personnel and arms, is prepared to continue its resistance for decades and will not cease resisting upon a Security Council initiated ceasefire.

Israel is an enemy and thus cannot conceivably be helping the Lebanese people, who fully support the resistance. The Israeli army can be expected to pay increasingly steep prices in terms of casualties for their incursions, and as any ceasefire would require the consent of the Lebanese government and the resistance, the war can be expected to continue for months.

Quotes:

"Israel is attempting to create facts on the ground by occupying areas within Lebanon and basing itself in these areas and not withdrawing except after a Security Council decision to send international forces to the south. And it seems that this is the agreement between Secretary of State Rice and the Israeli government...Israel would be fooling itself if it thinks that a ceasefire is possible following the Security Council. The resistance will not stop. The resistance has given itself 20 years to fight Israel."

Word Count:

507

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to evoke **massive hostility toward Israel**, however extremity of position may have the reverse effect on some listeners. (**Anti-Israel position: 2; Impact: 2** (Extremity of journalist's position harms its credibility)].

(2) 14 August 2006 - Prospects of Ceasefire

---

Summary:

Lebanon would naturally accept a UN resolution as it has sought UN interference from the outset, as opposed to Israel who imposed an overall blockade upon Lebanon and ceded to the resolution only when war proved incapable of achieving its end. Israel has insisted upon war rather than appeal to the UN.

Hizbollah is part of the Lebanese government and is represented by it, formed legitimately with the backing of the Lebanese people, Syria and Iran owing to Israeli occupation. Israel simply doesn't wish to take responsibility for its actions.

The fate of Hizbollah is an internal Lebanese issue that will be solved once adequate defenses are put in place against Israel, Lebanese prisoners are released, Shiba Farms is returned and the issue of 400,000 Palestinian refugees in Lebanon is resolved. Until then, Israel will not have peace.

Israel has been stunned by the force they have had to contend with, which is a function of Lebanese concern for Israeli massacres of women and children were Hizbollah disarmed and Israel to occupy the south.

International forces must be deployed in both Lebanon and "Palestine, i.e. Israel" if peace is to be sustained.

Quotes:

"...When Iraq attacked Kuwait the international community negotiated with Iraq before going to the UN and only then did they force it to retreat, but in our case Israel did not take that route. And if you ask me about the influence of Iran on the war, well is it Iran that ordered the Israeli planes to attack Lebanon and destroy all of the infrastructure and kill all of those people?...There is still the problem of Shiba farms and 400,000 Palestinian refugees. We have to solve these problems before Israeli children can live in peace. You have to respect human rights before you have peace from the Lebanese or from any other front...In 1982 when Israel invaded Lebanon...they massacred around 3,000 women and children in the Sabra and Shatila camps. Today the government is afraid the same will happen if Hizbollah is disarmed and Israel is still occupying the south...the massacres happened [in Sabra and Shatila] and Israel is to blame. How can we guarantee that this will not happen again the area that Israel now occupies? They have targeted mostly civilian buildings in the last 28 days and there are serious negotiations ongoing between the Lebanese army, the government and the international forces in order to avoid further mass killings..."

Word Count:

744

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel position: 2; Impact: 2** (Although credibility of position is harmed by its extremity, blatant disregard for accuracy and effective factual fabrication bolster journalist's highly emotionally appealing argument.)

Guest:

**Program Participation:**

(1) 27 July 2006 – Failure of Rome Summit and US Policy

Summary:

Lebanon's aim at the Rome Summit was to obtain humanitarian aid and to influence the Security Council and international decision makers to call for a ceasefire.

However, American objections were foreseen. Lebanon was pleased that all the participants in the conference admitted that Lebanon was wronged and there is a humanitarian crisis in Lebanon. The summit also offered Lebanon an important opportunity to hear various European, Arab and international opinions, many of whom admitted that Israel is using very dangerous weaponry with the aim of destroying the Lebanese economy and harming its inhabitants. Lebanon is not interested in participating in a summit with Israelis or in listening to any of their conniving and misleading statements. They have violated Lebanon and wrought enormous destruction.

The UN and European countries have not gone into detail with respect to economic and humanitarian solutions for Lebanon.

The Lebanese Ministry of Health and Lebanese aid commissions have made the first attempts at humanitarian aid. Israel is however targeting humanitarian aid trucks and organizations, which is causing the situation to deteriorate. Refugees also pose a major problem. The international community and Arab countries have begun to send humanitarian aid, but Lebanon requires more owing to constant Israeli attacks.

Quotes:

"Our position toward Israel is clear. They are trying to confuse us, to violate us and they have thus far displaced more than 30% of our people. They have by now destroyed most of the bridges and roads. They killed more than 400 people, half of them children. This is why we completely refuse to listen to Israel's delusional offerings...The real problem that is facing us now is that Israel is targeting human aid trucks and organizations. The situation is deteriorating as all of the roads leading to the south are destroyed..."

Word Count:

620

Micro Classification:

Likely to elicit **animosity toward Israel** and **identification with Lebanon**. [**Anti-Israel position: 2; Impact: 3** (Lebanese government official attacks Israel via emotional and humanitarian appeals)].

(2) 5 August 2006 – Economic Implications of the War in Lebanon

Summary:

Lebanese losses are difficult to calculate, but are increasing daily and are in any case enormous. There is a degree of stability owing to Lebanese perseverance and adaptability. The Lebanese economy was directly effected by Israeli destruction of infrastructure and paralysis of economy owing to loss of investment.

---

The Israeli attack is intended to affect humanitarian, not military conditions. Human casualties and the creation of refugees constitute a major portion of the loss.

Arab monetary aid to Lebanon has partially sustained Lebanese economic stability but does not compensate for the losses to which Lebanon is subjected. An immediate end to Israeli attacks followed by an end to the Israeli-Lebanese conflict would be the best possible development for the Lebanese economy.

The Lebanese fuel supply is being gradually exhausted, however a solution is expected.

Quotes:

"...The war is ongoing and every day there is additional loss incurred by destruction...The size of local production is decreasing, development is affected and individual consumption is affected. No doubt the attack on Lebanon is beyond the military, it is a human attack. The size of human loss and transfer is great. Over 20% of the population has had to move. Israel insists on targeting the economy, whether through infrastructure or industrial structures. Israel intentionally targeted factories, food factories, and first aid, and has shelled the telecommunication and electricity sectors..."

Word Count:

829

Micro Classification:

Likely to excite **antipathy toward Israel**. [**Anti-Israel position: 2; Impact: 3** (Lebanese government official attacks Israel via emotional and humanitarian appeals)].

(3) 13 August 2006 – Ceasefire Resolution: Israeli and Lebanese Perspectives

Summary:

The resolution is a stride toward an unfortunate diplomatic resolution of the conflict. The Israeli response to the Hizbollah operation was completely disproportionate and aimed to destroy Lebanon and kill its civilian and children, which it did.

Lebanon is accustomed to Israeli manipulations and resolution of the conflict hinges on Israel's commitment to the international ceasefire resolution.

Lebanon stands in solidarity against Israel and Israel's attempts at fostering internal divide are futile. In spite of some ideological and political differences within Lebanon, but no factions would escalate internal conflict if it would benefit Israel.

Quotes:

"...The resolution is a temporary step toward a final and comprehensive peace agreement...the military solution is not a possibility, as we have seen over the past four weeks. We have to resort to diplomacy...Israel has embarked upon the total destruction of Lebanon. The number of civilians killed is greater than the number of military personnel killed. The number of children killed in the conflict exceeds the number of military casualties on both sides...We have seen that until now the

---

resistance has been sticking to its promises, so Israel should not attempt to shift the conflict to an internal one. This has not happened in the last month and would never happen, because the Lebanese people have shown great solidarity..."

Word-Count:

392

Micro-Classification:

**Anti-Israel position: 2; Impact: 2** (Lebanese government official attacks Israel based upon pseudo-moral/ethical considerations, however extremity of position harms its credibility.)

**Guest:**

Binur, Yoram. Israeli Television Journalist

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 20 July 2006 - Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

No explicit indication of personal political sympathies. Points to varying Israeli objectives in Lebanon and in Gaza.

Quotes:

"The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a very old conflict and the Palestinian demands are conceded by some Israelis. But in Lebanon, when the soldiers were kidnapped without an Israeli attack on Lebanon, the [Israeli] objective was to separate the Lebanese government from Hizbollah and to strip Hizbollah of their weapons...It seems to me that it [Israel] did not succeed for several reasons."

Program Word-Count:

153

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [**Neutral Position; Impact: 2** (Israeli journalistic provides reasonable, dispassionate analysis)].

- (2) 9 August 2006 - Israeli War Conduct

Summary:

There is confusion within the ranks of Israel's leadership and the commander of the army has sought to accord additional power to the military's northern command. Israel's military will likely exercise further force in the war; hopefully against specific targets and not against civilians.

Israeli politicians have heeded the advice of military professionals with respect to managing the war, with limited success owing to Hizbollah's infrastructure in South Lebanon.

---

This war concerns broader regional dynamics and constitutes Iran's first serious attempt to challenge Israel through the means of a Lebanese militia group. However, Israel cannot realistically hope to uproot a Lebanese militia group from within Lebanon, while also being unable to accept provocations and aggression from within a country who then refuses to accept responsibility for it.

Quotes:

"...I think that the battle from the Israeli side will continue with more power and we hope that this power will be directed to objectives, which are not civilians...Hizbollah is the arm of Iran and this war is a war about control of the Middle East [and is] between Iran and Israel. This is the first time that Iran is challenging Israel is serious ways, and Hizbollah is one of these ways. The problem on the Israeli side is managing the war, not the objective of the war...every [Arabic] country should be responsible for its own borders and land with Israel."

Word Count:

394

Micro Classification:

Makes statements that can serve both in moral offensives against Israel and in its justification. Overall, can be considered moderately pro-Israel with criticism according more legitimacy to his advocacy. [Pro Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist provides reasonable, unbiased analysis that nonetheless has the effect of justifying the Israeli position)].

Guest:

Bishara, Dr. Azmi. Israeli Arab Member of Knesset.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 9 August 2006 - Israeli War Conduct

Summary:

Internal Israeli discord is not between the military and the political ranks of government; it is simply a reflection of finger-pointing amongst politicians. The objectives of the war are determined by an American vision for re-crafting the region, which is why they are constantly changing and why statements of Israeli politicians are contradictory, violent and racist. Israel intentionally targets civilians.

Israel does not necessarily want to be a vehicle for American politics, since the more recent American position has actually encouraged Israeli belligerence. Presently, the US is encouraging Israel not to accept a ceasefire agreement until Hizbollah is defeated, which may be impossible and will in any case involve enormous casualties.

Quotes:

"...the ministers of Israel talk about destroying villages completely, this is the language they are using and this shows the incompetence of their military besides their racist barbaric opinion in dealing with the Arabs...What is happening now is that they (the U.S.) are encouraging [Israel] not to accept a ceasefire until Hizbollah

---

loses the war, and in my opinion...[this] is impossible or might be a bloody objective. You might need to destroy all of the Lebanese villages and cities and thousands of Israeli soldiers might be killed to achieve an objective like this..."

Word Count:

659

Micro Classification:

Includes some blatantly anti-Israel statements along with the expression of some perhaps questionable but legitimate opinions. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3 (increased by position as Israeli Arab Member of Parliament and by the fact of the vitriolic attacks against Israel being interspersed with seemingly neutral analysis)].

Guest:

Bu'zenab, Ghalib, Senior Hizbollah Member

**Program Participation:**

(1) 19 July/ August 2006 - The Challenges of International Force Deployment in South Lebanon

Summary:

Attacks Israel as an evil, manipulative aggressor responsible for violence and civilian massacres;

Asserts that the international community is unreliable and that resistance through (terror) attacks on civilians of Israeli enemy are acceptable. Palestinian terror ("resistance fighters bombing occupied Palestine") is on equivalent moral ground with Israeli action in Lebanon.

Quotes:

"...the attacks from Israel still maintain and reinforce this attacking attitude and the evil objectives...This way of twisting things and the aggressive attitude will not be accepted."

Program Word Count:

377

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative** image of Israel in the mind of the listener. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Credibility of vicious attacks against Israel and the US harmed by position as Hizbollah member and by fanaticism, but aided by humanitarian, moral appeals and rationalizations)].

(2) 20 July 2006 - Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

Overtly hostile toward the Israeli position and toward America and Europe. Asserts that Hizbollah is a legitimate resistance movement; kidnap ("arrest") of soldiers was a legitimate action to the end of achieving a prisoner exchange. Israel overreacted with

---

the political aim of sparking regional conflict and eradicating resistance with US backing. Israeli enemy's "massacres" are morally reprehensible.

Quotes

"...Israel and America think that if they can weaken the resistance in Lebanon they will achieve their dream, and if they cannot, they will fail as they did in '98 and 2000."

Program Word Count:

684

Micro-Classification:

Clearly intended to excite **hostility toward Israel and identification with Hizbollah, Lebanon, and the Palestinians**. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 Credibility of vicious attacks against Israel and the US harmed by position as Hizbollah member and by fanaticism, but aided by humanitarian, moral appeals and rationalizations)].

Guest:

Cohen, Meir. Israeli Radio Journalist

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 22 July 2006 - Visit of US Secretary of State and Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

No explicit indication of political sympathies; explains Israeli position in descriptive terms, while certainly explaining its position with respect to combat and potential ceasefire.

Quotes:

"The cease-fire is the worst thing that could happen to Israel because it would mean victory for Hizbollah and Iran...Israel knows that there is limited time to sort out this war, therefore Israel is directing painful attacks against the Hizbollah...Lebanon put itself in a difficult situation by allowing the Hizbollah to do what they're doing from Lebanese territory...Israel was patient...and they withdrew from Lebanon...and Hizbollah attacked again."

Program Word-Count:

436

Micro-Classification:

May **excite sympathies or identification** with Israel. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Journalist offers well-reasoned analysis)].

- (2) 29 July 2006 - US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

A political solution to the conflict is possible, however Israel has not yet agreed to a ceasefire and is interested in preparing the ground for the transmission of international forces with the support of UN Resolution, the US, and the UK. Military

---

and diplomatic channels are mutually influenced. There will be pressure on Israel on the part of the international community and the Arab countries to accept a ceasefire, which should be effectual. The specific duties of PKO have not been determined. Israel's actions hinge on Hizbollah's and Lebanon's compliance with SC Resolution 1559.

Quotes:

"If Rice is not able to come out of these negotiations with a political statement approved by Israel and Lebanon to be proposed at the UN Security Council session next week, this will keep all sorts of options open (for Israel, militarily). This does mean that Bush and Blair's decisions are preventing the international union from participating in the decisions and pushing for a ceasefire..."

Word Count:

510

Classification:

**Does not excite sympathy or identification** with either party to the conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Journalist offers well-reasoned analysis)].

Guest:

Darwish, Adel. Journalist, London.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 29 July 2006 - US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

Large segments of the British government and public have objected to Tony Blair's policies of support for Israel's exaggerated response to the Hizbollah and alliance with the US. This coupled with the threat to Britain's alliances in the Arab world have spurred the British PM to change his position. However, the proposed PKO solution is not promising, as Hizbollah is an agent of Syria and Iran, and the US and the UK are aware, based on experience, that fighting them is problematic. Although the British public correctly perceives the US to be firmly supporting Israel, this is changing. Tony Blair has mistakenly aligned himself with US policies which is detrimental to Britain, as it isolates it from the rest of Europe and also constrains its own initiatives.

Quotes:

"...we are witnessing a change in the politics of the US with respect to Israel...this change...could be considered a good sign and a warning to Israel. And probably Tony Blair was right to step in and denounce this war recently, even if he is just doing it to save his reputation in Britain..."

Word Count:

387

Classification:

---

Likely to evoke **hostility toward the U.S. and Israel**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2** (Journalist expresses anti-Israel position in fairly moderate terms)].

**Guest:**

Duri, Latif, Secretary for the committee for Israeli-Palestinian Dialogue, Meretz Political Party

**Program Participation:**

(1) 15 August 2006 - Internal Israeli Arena

Summary:

The Israeli left has objected to the war from the outset; rather than agree to a prisoner exchange, the Israeli Prime Minister chose to exploit the kidnapping of Israeli soldiers as a pretext for invading Lebanon and killing innocent people. Resistance to the war within Israel has gradually increased; Meretz only supported it initially because it was not aware of its real underlying motivations. The war has not accomplished any of its aims; the confrontations in Gaza and in Lebanon have simply demoralized Israel. There has been no victor, only mutual destruction and casualties.

Direct negotiations with Syria would be of great benefit to Israel and would enable arrival at a solution. Israeli concessions would make peace with Syria possible.

Quotes:

"...We could have gotten our soldiers back in 24 hours if we had agreed to release Palestinian women and children prisoners...Olmert did not agree to the exchange because the war was pre-planned and he took the kidnap of the Israeli soldiers as an excuse to invade, destroy and kill innocent people..."

Word Count:

424

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Position: 1; Impact: 2** (Israeli politician harshly criticizes Israel; although criticism stems from identification not from enmity, its impact is increased manifold by the Israeli identity of the speaker.)

**Guest:**

Edrei, Avihai, IDF Spokesperson

**Program Participation:**

(1) 23 July 2006 - Hizbollah's Media Warfare

Summary:

Hizbollah employs propaganda that is not accurate reflection of actual developments on the battlefield. It falsely portrays itself as protecting Lebanon, when in fact it harms it. It perpetrates lies that lack all basis or evidence in reality, while Israel provides factual proof for all of its claims. Israel bombs Hizbollah media centers owing to the

---

dangerous propaganda they disseminate. Any other damage is collateral and unintentional. Journalists are given utmost latitude possible in light of security and enemy intelligence considerations. Hizbollah kills indiscriminately within Israel.

Quotes:

"I consider the Hizbollah organization an enemy of Israel, operating against Israel... They try to be seen in a different light, such as an organization that is protecting Lebanon. But ultimately the Lebanese people will say in a clear voice that Hizbollah will not protect Lebanon. Hizbollah made mistakes that destroyed Lebanon; they are responsible for moving Lebanon backwards... They have tried to pass their lies off as truth... Israel targets Almanar TV because it broadcasts propaganda... Anyone living in Israel is a target for Hizbollah, without distinction between Christians, Jews and Muslims."

Word-Count:

791

Micro-Classification:

May **excite sympathies or identification** with Israel and cultivate **negative image of Hizbollah** in the mind of the listener. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (Official government spokesperson defends Israel's position)].

**Guest:**

Elad, Moshe. Retired IDF Colonel, Haifa.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 9 August 2006 – Israeli War Conduct

Summary:

The military and the government work in tandem; Israel needs to solve the Lebanese issue diplomatically and is waiting for a resolution that would see Lebanese troops deployed in the south. The large-scale bombing by Hizbollah leaves the army no choice but to enter South Lebanon. The Israeli army is very well organized, despite the fact that it has encountered some difficulties. Additional force needs to be exerted to bring about Hizbollah's surrender or retreat. Israel has no choice but to fight it as a militia and to fight it at full-force, as Hizbollah has determined the nature of the military confrontation. There has been Israeli success, in spite of the fact that Hizbollah has been preparing for the war for a long time, and patience is required until the bombings can be stopped, Hizbollah disarmed, the kidnapped soldiers returned and international forces deployed.

Quotes:

"...as long as the rockets are here, there is no solution other than to send the army to South Lebanon... Everyone in Israel preferred that this be political, but I think that Hizbollah is managing this war through the last drop of blood. Israel has no other choice. Israel has to bring as much power as they can to finish this war with Hizbollah..."

---

Word Count:

333

Micro Classification:

**Represents the Israeli position** whose expression may excite sympathy with Israel.

[Pro Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (former Israeli military man justifies Israel's position in reasonable terms)].

Guest:

Fares, Amin. Economic Analyst, Musawa Center, Jerusalem.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 5 August 2006 - Economic Implications of War in Lebanon

Summary:

In spite of Israel's strong economy, it is certainly affected by the war. The losses in Israel's north, where the economically central city of Haifa is located, stem only from stagnation and not from destruction of infrastructure, such as Lebanon suffers.

Quotes:

"...[Israeli] losses...are limited to the lack of movement of these [tourism and agriculture sectors]...not what we see in Lebanon, [where there damage to] infrastructure, which is much greater."

Word Count:

144

Micro Classification:

**Does not excite sympathy** or identification with either party to the conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Relatively unemotional economic analysis)].

Guest:

Fawzi al-Shuaybi, Dr. Imad. Director of the Center for Strategic Data and Studies, Damascus.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 29 July 2006 - US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

Syria copes with its plight through exploiting the mistakes of the ignorant, such as the US, who aims to implement an ill-informed and unethical policy in the region. The US interferes indirectly through Israel, who is its agent. There will not be a large-scale regional war with Israel, since it is internationally unacceptable and because Israel is incapable at present. US disregard for Syria will ultimately be of detriment to itself and to Israel.

Quotes:

"This new [American] strategy aims to experiment with the Arab world and reshuffle their regimes and is totally contrary to the principles of human rights. It also wants to

---

bring an end to the resistance and replace it with terror. They also pretend to solve the problem peacefully and instead they exercise military solutions. They experiment in weak regions...The Syrians believe that they play a major role in the region and disregarding them is not going to solve the problem. On the contrary, it is going to harm the US and Israel more than Syria itself."

Word Count:

652

Classification:

Likely to arouse **hostility toward the U.S and Israel**. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Highly anti-American position harmed by Syrian source but aided by moral appeals)].

(2) 7 August 2006 – Arab Foreign Minister Summit

Summary:

The French understand that the Hizbollah is a serious organization that cannot be easily disarmed, which is causing them to use pressure tactics to advance Resolution 1559 (if I understood correctly).

Only a perverted resolution would not stop Israel from crossing "the blue line," while preventing Hizbollah from carrying out its duties with respect to Sheba Farms. Syria will assert itself as Lebanon's neighbor. However, Syria is not behind the developments in Lebanon; the responsible factor is in fact an American plan for securing Lebanese citizenship for Palestinians. Israeli strategy points to this, although Hizbollah has incredibly managed to resist the Israeli army, a fact which is responsible for the Saudi decision to hold an Arab Summit.

The decision must be acceptable to the Lebanese, to avoid a situation in which Hizbollah is forced to carry on resistance operations owing to further occupation, which could spawn conflict between Hizbollah and international forces.

Seems to concede that the Arabic position in the Middle East is weaker than in the past and that Arab countries may need to go along with a New Middle East plan for the time being (if I understood correctly).

Quotes:

"...If they [the French] bring a resolution that doesn't talk about the operations, which they call defensive operations, which might reach civilians, and doesn't talk about going back to the borders, to the blue line for the Israelis, there are many problems...they [Hizbollah] gave the impression to all sides that there is a possibility for this organization to continue working and no one can take the arms from them that easily...It is clear that there is an Israeli plan to produce quick attacks and they have specific objectives, but they were surprised about their information regarding Hizbollah and the operation and for the first time it has happened that militia war can stop a country's army from going forward... "

Word Count:

788

---

Micro Classification:

Emerges from a position **hostile to Israel**, although content is only **moderately hostile**. [Attitude: Anti-Israel 1; Impact: 2 Syrian academic expresses anti-Israel position in analytical terms)].

(3) 12 August 2006 - International Ceasefire Resolution

Summary:

The resolution in no way implicates Syria. It is a tool by which to placate Israel in its difficult struggle with the Hizbollah. Israel's morale has already suffered owing to its inability to defend its borders and cities and it will continue with minor operations until international forces disarm Hizbollah on its behalf. The international community has assumed a pro-Israeli stance, although Hizbollah is the actual victor as a guerilla force which in fact determines the implementation of the resolution. Although the conflict foretells regional escalation, matters have been contained to a degree and the solution will enable both Israel and Hizbollah to save face. Internal Israeli discord is most responsible for developments. Opting for a military solution to the conflict was a mistake on the part of Israel, which is apparent in its failed results. Military leaders would have recognized this. Negotiations are inevitable and America will need to address the Lebanese, Syrian and Palestinian issues in light of its precarious position with respect to Iraq.

Quotes:

"...Israeli presence on Lebanese soil and suffering losses at the hands of Hizbollah will not break their (Israel's) morale, because it has already been broken by being unable to guard its territory and by having war brought to them in the form of direct missile attacks on Israeli cities, considering that they have always attempted to have their wars fought on foreign soil...the international stance is pro-Israeli, but on the ground and in reality Hizbollah is winning the war, as is always the case when guerilla warfare is used...The US foreign office is not all about ideologies. At some point Israel will force it to negotiate because it would be too much of a burden to cope with the entire region by itself. Ultimately, going back to the political table will be the only solution."

Word Count:

568

Micro Classification:

Content fairly neutral, although it seems to hint of hostility toward Israel. **Not likely to elicit sympathy or identification with either party**. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Syrian academic expresses position in analytical terms)].

(4) 17 August 2006 - The Politics of War in Lebanon and Elsewhere

Summary:

The timing was right for Assad's speech of victory. The Lebanese who oppose the resistance are contradictory and seek to benefit from the victory of the resistance.

---

Quotes:

"...there are some factions in Lebanon that backstab the resistance; sometimes they say that it is a tool of Syria and Iran and sometimes it is Lebanese. They are full of contradictions. They have lost their identity and now that the resistance has won the war, they want to in some way feed off of that victory..."

Word Count:

167

Micro Classification

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1** (Syrian academic seems clearly to represent view highly supportive of Hizbollah and antithetical to Israel; however he is afforded very minimal time which curbs impact.)

**Guest:**

Ghandour, Subhi. Executive Director, Al-Hewar ("Dialogue") Institute (Washington).

**Program Participation:**

(1) 29 July 2006 – US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

Utter failure of Israeli aggression has lead US to make final attempt at saving its image by pushing for international solution to the Resistance's attacks Israel as well seeks a way out through deception and chicanery. Israel is responsible for violating numerous international agreements and laws and for creating difficulty for the existing PKO in Southern Lebanon. The US Administration has a very particular design for the region, which does not include any peaceful negotiations with Lebanon or putting an end to the Israeli aggression. The US is rather attempting to isolate Hizbollah, a symbol of resistance in the region and in Lebanon, as part of its overall effort to isolate all the key players – Syria and Iran – from the Lebanese and Palestinian resistance. Their plans for such a New Middle East are however completely failing; popular Arab support is with the resistance. The root of the Middle East problem is Israel's occupation of Palestinian and Lebanese territory -- a fact which the US will have to recognize.

Quotes:

"It is evident that the aims of Israel's aggression weren't met, neither politically nor militarily. The aim was that the Israelis' aggression and violence in Lebanon would lead to the destruction and humiliation of the Resistance in Lebanon. They even aimed to drive the Lebanese people to rebel against the Resistance, but they failed to achieve their aims...the US failed to achieve its aim to isolate the resistance from the people and destroy their popularity. On the contrary, this war created more unity among the people and support for Hizbollah, which is now stretching to the whole Arab region...What has been happening in the last few years in Palestine and Lebanon proves that the core of the problem in the Middle East is Israel's occupation of Palestinian and Lebanese lands..."

Word Count:

862

---

Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **hostility toward Israel and the U.S.**, although extremity of position may have reverse effect on some listeners. (Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Extreme position aided by pseudo-humanitarian appeals and academic guise, but harmed by degree of fanaticism)).

Guest:

Ghanem, Dr. Asad. Department of Political Science, The University of Haifa.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 3 August 2006 – Divergent Hizbollah and Israeli War Tactics

Summary:

Lebanon has long been controlled by elements other than its official government (PLO, Syria).

Israel's large-scale attacks are not related to the kidnap of the Israeli soldiers, but is rather a function of Israel's desire to take revenge on the Lebanese people and to confront other regional dynamics – Syria and Iran – along with the US.

Israeli public opinion in support of the war is growing less cohesive, which provides the only hope of motivating the cessation of the Israeli attack on Lebanon.

The Palestinian issue is a factor for both Hizbollah and Israel. Israel had intended to destroy Hamas following its destruction of Hizbollah. Israel resorts to political solutions when it realizes the futility of force (?).

Quotes:

"...we all know that this attack over the last three weeks has nothing to do with the release of the Israeli detainees. This would have been possible through exchange of detainees and Israel had done this in the past. Israel wanted to destroy the infrastructure of Lebanon and this is part of historical revenge against the Lebanese people, having to do with the withdrawal of 2000 as well as considerations beyond Lebanon..."

Word Count:

578

Micro Classification:

Likely to excite **moderate hostility toward Israel**. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3 (Israeli Arab academic offers seemingly objective analysis)].

Guest:

Gharib, Dr. Edmond. Lecturer, International Relations, American University, Washington D.C.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 27 July 2006 – Failure of Rome Summit and US Policy

---

Summary:

Although there is broad support of Israel in the US, dissent against US policy and strategy in the Middle East is being to crystallize. For the most part, the underlying principles of a peace plan in the Middle East have not changed. The US is attempting to utilize regional dynamics to exert pressure on those factions within the Arab world that oppose the principles of freedom and democracy and are perceived as threatening to the US and the world. Posits that pressure should be put on Israel to end its attacks, similar to the pressure exerted during the Suez War.

General opinion toward the US has changed and there is enormous disillusionment with it. The world has grown cognizant of the righteousness of Israel's enemies and Israel's abhorrent behaviour is changing public opinion. Hizbollah has succeeded both militarily and socially. The position taken by the US has spurred objection to their policies and the international arena is largely unified against it and its role in the region.

Quotes:

"...We have grown disappointed with the US and are doubting their sincerity and respect. The horrible images of destruction and death that we see on TV, in spite of the bias toward Israel in some of the media outlets in the US, show the entire world who is wrong and who is right. The killing in Lebanon isn't just targeting the Shi'a or the Muslims, it is targeting people from all different sects and religions...Israel is targeting the whole of Lebanon, including its women and children. These images are changing public opinion. I also think that Hizbollah has successfully resisted Israel for longer than expected and has also successfully unified the various fronts...The role of the US and the justice in their [involvement in] solving the crisis in the region is being questioned..."

Word Count:

931

Micro Classification:

Likely to elicit **hostility and antipathy toward Israel and the U.S.**, particularly as it is couched in academic guise and is descriptive analysis is interspersed. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3**] (American Arab academic employs humanitarian and emotional notions toward seemingly objective attack of Israel and the U.S.)

Guest:

Hamada, Hassan. Lebanese Journalist and Political Commentator

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 20 August 2006 – Actual Prospects for Peace in the Middle East

Summary:

The war is Lebanon's alone as it alone is threatened by Israel and it alone achieved victory. The Arab movement for a world peace conference has no value because it does not support the Palestinian and Lebanese struggles and in fact suppresses them.

---

Lebanon had no choice but to accept Resolution 1701. The Lebanese government initially took a neutral position in the war – an anomaly – but eventually correctly realigned its stance against the Israeli enemy and toward Lebanese unity. Lebanon is however unified, as Hizbollah is a real resistance movement reflecting true nation-wide motives and popular opinions, although some opposed them. They were successful beyond all expectations and are securing progressively more support and influence, especially as Israel committed massacres more severe historically than what Germany did.

Israeli and American calls for international conferences and resolutions are really just disguising intent to defeat the Palestinians and take their territory.

Quotes:

“...we should not forget that this is example of what happened in Lebanon might be unique in the history of wars between nations in that the Lebanese government at the...beginning of the war took a neutral position between Lebanon and the enemies. We can't deny that. After that, things changed because of the power relationship in the battlefield...and then the government did the right thing to change its opinion and achieve Lebanese unity....Hizbollah is not practically a movement or organization or militia. In reality in Lebanon they fight and struggle well...this resistance is a popular thing, therefore they [Israel] couldn't divide Lebanon. Some people refused the idea of resisting Israel, also they are from all ethnic and religious groups in Lebanon and some people support Hizbollah from all the ethnic and religious groups. The truth is there is real resistance... this war gave the resistance more place notwithstanding all the disagreements, which no one can hide. But I see that there is a big chance to work with the resistance mentality, especially with all the massacres committed by Israel, like no one in history has seen something similar. It is even worse than what Germany committed...there is a kind of vision in the American government calling for letting out another balloon to deal with the resolutions and the meaning from there is to achieve from what is happening in Palestine now and practically to crash the Palestinians completely and to take all of their lands and this would be an ending for the Palestinian cause...”

Word Count:

695

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1** [Extremity of position against Israel and the US held by Lebanese journalist and commentator harms its credibility.]

**Guest:**

Hamzawi, Dr. Amr, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 19 July / August 2006 - The Challenges of International Force Deployment in South Lebanon

Summary:

---

No explicit indication of political sympathies. Seemingly **neutral** discussion of composition of PKO forces and analysis of American role and aspirations.

Quotes:

America and Israel are attempting to achieve international forces that are not only peaceful but also able to fight. If they cannot take Hizbollah's weapons away, at least [they aim] to stop them from getting hold of weapons...The problem with America's decision is that they could not get international agreement. From a Lebanese and Arabic point of view they would think America's decision is weak and ineffective. The only weakness is that America cannot carry it out without total agreement of other world countries."

Program Word-Count:

321

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 3 (American Arab from respectable peace institute offers fairly neutral analysis)].

(2) 22 July 2006 - Visit of US Secretary of State & Israel's Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

Largely neutral analysis of American objectives in Lebanon war. The U.S. desires to allow Israel to continue its attacks in Lebanon; discussion of American objectives – altering internal Lebanese and regional dynamic, disarming Hizbollah and protecting Israel. American government views international arena as simplistic dichotomy, in which Iran, Syria and Hizbollah are enemy. Latter is of lesser significance.

Quotes:

"America wants to rewrite the internal political map of Lebanon. The main thing is to disarm Hizbollah and use that regionally and in Lebanon. The second important thing from the American point of view is Israeli security...The US views this conflict and this region very ideologically..."

Word Count:

468

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 3 (American Arab from respectable peace institute offers fairly neutral analysis)].

(3) 25 July 2006 - Various Opinions on Continued Combat in Lebanon

Summary:

Societies are usually divided in times of war and in light of Israeli atrocities, Israeli society must be divided as well. In America, there is a very wide range of opinions but the Administration is acutely biased toward Israel, as its clear policy toward the

---

Middle East centers on undermining Iran and Syria. The U.S. is using Israel to execute its two-pronged strategy which consists firstly of undermining the power of Iran and Syria and putting pressure on other resistance groups in the Middle East so as to realign alliances in the region. Anti-war sentiment in the U.S. is not translated into political action since the U.S. administration's views are so unequivocal. In spite of the major atrocities perpetrated in Lebanon and the need for a cease-fire, the U.S. should continue to try to implement their new policies in the Middle East. However, the U.S. is short-sighted in attempting to do so.

Quotes:

"...when we look at the bigger picture of the atrocities in Lebanon that we have seen so far from Israel, including all of their massacres in the past and in Sabra and Shatila for example, we cannot possibly say that there are no divisions within Israeli society with respect to such aggressions...The U.S. Administration is so obviously biased toward Israel's policies and is giving them the green light to do whatever they wish...the atrocities in this war were many and a cease-fire should be called, but at the same time I believe that the U.S. should continue to use this time to implement their new policies in the Middle East...the actions of the US are rapid and they might sometimes abuse opportunities without thinking strategically or foreseeing the effects...since we all know they are influenced by the neo-conservatives."

Word Count:

1,073

Micro Classification:

Likely to elicit **antipathy toward Israel**, particularly as couched in academic guise and criticism of Israel interspersed with strategic analysis. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** (American Arab from respectable peace institute challenges Israel's morality, a case bolstered by interspersing charged emotional statements with seemingly detached analysis)].

(4) 12 August 2006 - The International Ceasefire Resolution

Summary:

The offensives in Lebanon are the result of Israeli-American cooperation, as America is interested in removing Hizbollah as a presence and in applying pressure upon Iran and Syria to the benefit of its own regional allies. The UN resolution reflects a clear bias toward Israel: it is vague with respect to timing of Israeli withdrawal, makes asymmetrical demands of the parties and is further in breach of Lebanese sovereignty, all owing to its collaboration with Israel. The UN is using every means to avoid a clear and effective resolution.

Predicts that Israel will continue infiltrating Lebanon, which will in turn spark Hizbollah's continued retaliation. The resolution is not the primary concern; the primary concern is Israel's belligerent occupation of a sovereign country - which is effectively justified by the resolution.

Although the resistance has been very effective, Hizbollah's role in the internal politics of Lebanon will probably be a source of future domestic Lebanese turmoil.

---

Quotes:

"...Whether you look at it as an Israeli war with American backing or as an American war executed by the Israelis, America wants to finish up with Hizbollah and apply pressure on Iran and Syria and give its allies more power in the region....As for the fabrication of the UN resolution, there is obvious cooperation between the two...it is a one-sided resolution because of the pressure created by the US...As for the geopolitical map...first of all, we have to understand that the resistance has shocked Israel and the US. Secondly, this conflict has brought internal solidarity to Lebanon, although I believe that once the conflict is over the question of the role of Hizbollah as a resistance force and an internal political power will surface and I foresee internal trouble."

Word Count:

689

Micro Classification:

Evidently **hostile toward Israel, the US and the international community** and **sympathetic toward Israel**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** (American Arab from respectable peace institute avoids extreme and irrational statements, and rather applies seemingly cogent - if misleading or false - arguments in support of his position, lending it legitimacy and increasing impact)].

Guest:

Hanna, Elias. Retired Lebanese Brigadier General.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 26 July 2006 - Rome Summit and Siniora's Call for End to War

Summary:

The international force is an Israeli-American conception, not Lebanese. Lebanon must consider the particularities of any prospective force as well as other important non-related war issues. The proper solution would give Lebanon power, with the function of an international force being to temporarily protect Lebanon, not only Israel. All parties, including Hizbollah, must agree to its presence and its objectives must be clearer. NATO's role in the region should be questioned, as it is controlled by western powers who support Israel. Hizbollah and the Lebanese must agree to the appointment of any international force along with Israel; the specifics should be determined following the outcome of the battle, as Nasrallah is meeting striking success against the enemy, which could have significant implications for any prospective peacekeeping force. The time which will be required to activate the force hinges on whether a peaceful resolution is achieved and on the length of time it requires.

Quotes:

"The solution is to give the power to the Lebanese government. But if the solution is to have an international force, it would be for a transitional period, to protect Lebanon and not just protect Israel from the Hizbollah... ...The French president is right to question the role of NATO in the region, as the influence of the western

---

powers in the region and their support of Israel is obvious...I don't think that an international force will be successful in Lebanon if it didn't get the approval of the Lebanese people and Hizbollah on the one hand and Israel on the other...I think that we cannot assign an international force until we see the outcome of the battle on the ground... "

Word Count:

792

Micro Classification:

Clearly represents a fundamentally anti-Israel view, but in spite of this conveys relatively neutral message that would elicit only **moderate antipathy toward Israel**. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3 (Retired Lebanese general offers strategic analysis tainted by clear undertones of hostility to Israel)].

**Guest:**

Hassan, Dr. Hussein al-Hajj. Hizbollah MP representative.

(1) 31 July 2006 - Political Resolutions to Conflict

Summary:

The American government is completely responsible for the entire operation in Lebanon. Their policies have in fact remained constant throughout and they include support of Israeli massacres and obstruction of the Security Council's attempts to condemn Israel for the massacres it perpetrates.

Quotes:

"...hundreds of children have died, but they (Israel) don't deserve the condemnation of the Security Council because American pressures the Security Council to assume such positions and stands. American politics have not changed."

Word Count:

325

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **hostility toward Israel and the U.S.** [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Credibility of vicious attacks against Israel and the US harmed by position as Hizbollah member and by fanaticism, but aided by humanitarian, moral appeals and rationalizations)]

**Guest:**

Hasson, Yisra'el. Israeli Member of Knesset, "Yisrae'l Beitenu" Party.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 15 August 2006 - Internal Israeli Arena

Summary:

---

The aim of the war in Lebanon was to remove hard-line Islamists from the Middle East, which include Hizbollah, Iran and Syria, with the former possessing a huge weapons arsenal. Israel has utterly failed, however with respect to all three and the international community.

The focus of the war should have been Iran's nuclear bomb and with respect to Hizbollah the attacks should have included ground forces. There was no room for error. Failures should be rapidly addressed and they must not recur in the likely imminent wars with Hizbollah, Syria and Iran. The latter comprise an axis of evil and should be eradicated. The price of war to the Israeli people was a necessary one that would have increased with time and was in any case less than the price paid by Hizbollah and the Lebanese people. Hizbollah's destruction indicates Israeli victory, whereas its extermination would have indicated Israel's takeover of Lebanon for the purpose of disposing of the foreign military bodies in its territory. Lebanon is controlled by an extremist Shi'aa group that possesses 15,000 rockets. Neither Israel nor Lebanon can live under these circumstances.

Although Israel made mistakes during the war, they can be rectified.

Hizbollah has been hiding underground in fear of Israel, which will continue until the kidnapped soldiers are returned. Syria acts cowardly as well and has made inauthentic and conniving gestures toward peace with Israel.

Quotes:

"This war was about getting rid of the hard-line Islamists from the Middle east...We should have attacked from the air, the ground and everywhere. We shouldn't have left any chance for error and then left the situation for the Lebanese government to get rid of all the foreign forces - one of which is Hizbollah - on its soil...It is a pity it turned out to be just a victory and not an extermination. Had it been an extermination, we would have gotten rid of the chain-of-evil that is called Hamas, Hizbollah, Syria, and Iran. The price that the people of Israel had to pay is much less than what it would have paid in a later stage had we not gone to war at this time...Do you think it is possible for Lebanon and Israel to accept being at the mercy of Iran and Syria?...If the Syrian president wants to talk he will have the attention of every political party in Israel. But that will not happen as long as he supplies Hizbollah with 15,000 missiles. We know who has good intentions and who does not."

Word Count:

572

Micro Classification:

**Pro-Israel Position: 2; Impact: 3** (Israeli MP presents convincing argument in support of Israel's policies.)

**Guest:**

Izz al-Din, Hassan. Hizbollah Member

**Program Participation:**

(2) 16 August 2006 - The Internal Lebanese Arena

---

Summary:

Hizbollah is not prepared to hand Israel what it sought to achieve through war to no avail: eradication of the resistance. The issue of disarming Hizbollah is subject to national Lebanese dialogue, however Israeli aggression and the issues at stake for Lebanon must be recalled.

While the Lebanese government is not an Israeli agent, some Arabs did blame Hizbollah for starting the war. The war is an American-instigated affair, and is not related to Iran or Syria.

Quotes:

"...Resolution 1701 does not state that Hizbollah should be disarmed. The international forces are there to help the Lebanese Army and disarming Hizbollah is an internal affair... This talk about the war being that of Iran and Syria is nonsense. However, it is true that this is an American war; that was stated clearly by Condoleeza Rice. The only reason that we're seeing the US back off is because the Israeli army was unable to win the war... first, we have to get all our land and prisoners back; second, we have to consider that Israel is our enemy and will reenter the South any time it feels it wants to; and, finally, we have to have a defensive strategy, whereby the army's mission is set and agreed upon.."

Word Count:

387

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Position as Hizbollah member detracts from credibility of position, however 'reason' in which narrative is cloaked lends it credence.)

**Guest:**

Jabour, Dr. George. Member of Syrian Parliament and Academic Political Analyst

**Program Participation:**

- (1) **26 July 2006** – Rome Summit and Siniora's Call for End to War

Summary:

Discusses the implications of Syria's absence from the Rome Summit, stating that Syria and Iran, as key players in the conflict, should have been included. States that the U.S. is responsible for the absence of a cease-fire agreement, which is most necessary. The U.S. is demonstrating extreme irresponsibility by indicating that there are other objectives beyond a cease-fire. The facts on the ground are constantly changing, and the resistance is staying surprisingly strong, with direct effects on the conference. The U.S., as Israel's operator, is responsible for bloodshed in the region, which the Hizbollah was forced to perpetrate in the name of international law, and for Israel's constant and flagrant violations of the same. The new plan for the Middle East should be fashioned by Middle Eastern countries, not by the US, who does not respect human rights or human life in the Middle east. The positions of "moderate"

---

Arab countries toward the war has been very harmful and is undergoing change. There is sufficient precedent to the recognition that a Jewish state should not exist.

Quotes:

"...If the [Rome] Summit want to be fair, then the participants need to start throwing blame at the Americans for not pushing for a cease-fire in Lebanon... The solution lies very much in the various UN resolutions that the Americans have rejected many times, thereby encouraging Israel to neglect, when they could have easily pressured Israel to abide by them... It is only due to Hizbollah that Resolution 425 was applied, and to apply this resolution Hizbollah had to fight hard and to shed lots of blood to liberate Lebanon, while the US could have forced Israel to implement it without any bloodshed. The USA should now be thinking about the loss of human lives... it is not the Iranian president who first said that Israel should not exist. It was the Russian president Rousfeld who once... warned King Abdel Aziz 'You, the Arabs, are very generous and hospitable, be wary of the Jews. One day they will throw you out, like they have been thrown out before you'..."

Word Count:

845

Micro-Classification:

The employment of western catch-phrases may well successfully **elicit the hostility toward Israel and sympathy with the Hizbollah and Syria**, toward which it clearly aims. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2**; Credibility of Syrian parliament member and academic analyst's fierce attacks against Israel and the U.S. aided by emotional appeals and misguided references to international law and morals, but harmed by fanaticism)].

(2) 2 August 2006 - Arab Positions Toward War in Lebanon

Summary:

Arab government positions have begun to change, with blame toward Hizbollah, however minimal, being now directed toward Israel. There is continual movement toward greater understanding of the Hizbollah and Palestinian resistance positions and away from the positions induced by American pressure. There is a unified Arab position calling for an immediate unconditional ceasefire. Although there is coordination between Syria, Egypt and other Arab states, there remains room for improvement and for more unequivocal statements in support of the Hizbollah and against the Israeli attacks. The Arab world must jointly and rapidly work toward achieving its objectives. Thus far, their positions have been unjustifiable. Syria is always interested in internationally effective Arab collaboration, which grows increasingly more likely as the U.S.' control over Europe weakens. Syria further remains prepared to respond to the Israeli attack on Lebanon.

Quotes:

"This decision [by some Arab states to blame the Hizbollah, however slightly] shocked the Arab and Islamic world as a whole as well as sympathizers of the Palestinian cause, and advocates of human rights and peace throughout the world... it is unacceptable that the whole world is unified in their position against this

---

attack and for us Arabs not to be the ones who stand against this attack. This is ethnically and humanitarially rejected..."

Word Count:

850

Micro Classification:

Assumes a clearly **pro-Arab and anti-Israel position**, which may cultivate an anti-Israel position amongst certain segments of listeners, particularly as it employs western humanitarian language. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2; Credibility of Syrian parliament member and academic analyst's fierce attacks against Israel and the U.S. aided by emotional appeals and misguided references to international law and morals, but harmed by fanaticism)].

(3) 20 August 2006 – Actual Prospects for Peace in the Middle East

Summary:

Israel's can achieve peace through territorial exchanges; it must first desire to be a good neighbor, which it clearly does not as it continues to be an occupier in spite of international law. As Arab hatred of Israel is justifiably growing, an international conference must be convened to end of ending the Israeli occupation. However, America is not interested in this and is in fact growing more aggressive.

Israel has been trying to divide between the Arab parties, in spite of their inherent unity, since 1991, however, Lebanon, Syria and the Palestinians and the remaining parties were drawn together through the 'brave resistance.'

Arab fronts are all united and Syria will liberate the Golan; past peace conferences were tricks as Arab fronts can't be divided. Real peace will require a world conference, which America could easily initiate through Israel. Otherwise, armed resistance will serve its function in its place.

Quotes:

"...You can never guarantee your security through geography; you have to be a good neighbor to have peace – a lesson which Israel should have understood. One Arabic leader said that the fourth generation has even more hatred toward Israel [than the first?]....There is occupation and international law is clearly against the occupation, but the occupation is still here, therefore we should make a big conference to end this occupation. But the problem is...America is becoming more aggressive...we feel that all the peace conferences that have happened in reality were sort of tricks. But in reality the channels are united; dividing the channels was a big American mistake...if someone wants to build real peace, they should unify the channels between all the Arab countries and Israel and build peace. This will happen through a world conference. This would happen with a wink from America to Israel. But if doesn't happen with a blink it will happen with resistance..."

Word Count:

407

Micro Classification:

---

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2** [View is highly critical of Israel and the US and closely identified with Israel's self-declared enemies, although guest refrains from explicit hostility and presents his view in academic, western-friendly terms – bolstering the effectiveness of the presentation. Syrian source, however, detracts from effectiveness.]

**Guest:**

Jallul, Faisal. Journalist, Paris.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 8 August 2006 - Regional and International Attempts to Resolve War in Lebanon

**Summary:**

France's historical relationship with Lebanon is of subsidiary importance to the role of Saudi Arabia, the Gulf countries and Egypt in the conflict.

Although there has been damage inflicted upon Lebanon, Israel has been made to suffer as well and will never reach Hizbollah's heart. Israel, the US and France are now opting for a political resolution as Israeli military endeavors are failing. Arabs can't expect the French to adopt the emotional Arab opinion with respect to Hizbollah and Iraq, as they are allies of the US and members of the EU. France is however interested in an adequate political solution in Lebanon and has probably influenced the US toward its position.

**Quotes:**

"...the historical French-Lebanese relationship is important, but the one that is really important in this conflict is Saudi Arabia and Egypt, something that the French, US and Israeli knows very well...I know Israel can have big power to destroy but they couldn't hit Hizbollah's heart, there is still resistance, they are fighting on the borders of Lebanon...We should remove the Arabic emotion when talking about French politics, which sometimes puts more on France's shoulders more than they can handle...we need to liberate (separate?) the French opinion from the emotional Arabic opinions..."

**Word Count:**

450

**Micro Classification:**

Clearly emerges from an **anti-Israel, pro-Arab and Hizbollah** premise. Criticism of Israel is, however, relatively moderate, although academic sounding analysis can increase impact. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1, Impact: 2** (French Arab journalist presents unabashedly pro-Arab and pro-Hizbollah, but nonetheless relatively level-headed position)].

**Guest:**

Kabha, Dr. Mustafa, University of Be'er Sheva

**Program Participation:**

---

(1) 23 July 2006 - Hizbollah's Media War

Summary:

Israel and Hizbollah both seek to justify actions via media, but have different target audiences. Media and politics are closely linked. American opinion staunchly supports Israel, however there are increasing images of destruction in Lebanon.

Quotes:

"There are differences in the objective of the medias of both [Israel and Hizbollah]...Both want to justify what they are doing and give reasons why they are in this war."

Word-Count:

106

Micro-Classification:

**Does not excite sympathies or identification** with either party to conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Israel Arab academic offers fairly objective analysis)].

Guest:

Keidar, Dr. Mordekhai. Bar Ilan University, Israel.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 25 July 2006 - Various Opinions on Continued Combat in Lebanon

Summary:

Israeli society is generally marked by diversity of opinion, however is invariably in unanimous consent with respect to Hizbollah's declarations about expunging Israel from the map and will support whatever government is in power to combat this mouthpiece of Iran and the existential threat it poses. There is overwhelming support for the war and the government, as an elected leadership, does not disregard public opinion. Minority dissent signals positive societal diversity. Hizbollah is an Iranian pawn, which has offered Lebanon up on the Iranian altar. Lebanon and its civilian population has entered into a marriage of convenience with Hizbollah and allowed it to harm it through its relationship with Iran.

(Response) Sheba Farms are very peripheral and not unequivocally Lebanese territory; Prisoners are in prison for murder; Lebanese economy is based partially on western tourism, to which Nasrallah objects.

Quotes:

"When we watch Al Manar Television and Al Nour Radio and listen to all their slogans day and night about wiping Israel off the map of the Middle East, we (Israelis) all start to agree...in Israel there's a genuine conviction that Hizbollah is the mouthpiece of Iran and its long struggle with the Jewish state...this war has touched us as people, as a society, as a religion and as a state...We are proud of our society that has different opinions and we welcome their (anti-war) voices about or against the war or against the war, as long as the war continues based on the opinion of 95%

---

of the people...Nasrallah has sacrificed Lebanon as a sage country and offered it to Iran."

Word Count:

773

Micro Classification:

Likely to elicit **identification with Israel**. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Israeli academic offers sound arguments in support of Israeli actions)].

(2) 9 August 2006 - Israeli War Conduct

Summary:

The process of decision-making involves the military ranks making suggestions and the political ranks deciding upon one of them. The present war is unique in that it involves fighting a militia that, similar to the forces of the Intifada, fight amongst civilians and force Israel to harm civilians. The war is being managed with flexibility and decisions are made as immediate responses to developments on the ground.

There is consideration of the war and its management on the military, political and civilian levels. Militarily, there is disagreement about whether or not to use ground forces, which carry a lot of casualties, even if they are effective.

Israel will leave Lebanon when the resulting situation will be bearable and when long-term quiet on the border can be achieved, which will require serious action on the part of Israel. Lebanon needs to decide whether it desires to act as a proper government, a decision upon which Israel's military presence in Lebanon hinges.

Contrary to the opinion that Israel's unwillingness to agree to an immediate ceasefire will encourage civil war, there is some indication that the war's conclusion will in fact have that effect owing to internal ethnic discord. Israel prefers a diverse Lebanon, which would, in the guest's personal preference, include Hizbollah as a religious political party but certainly not as an independent military force with an independent agenda.

Quotes:

"...the only thing similar to this war is the Intifada. That was a war against people who were hiding behind civilians, just like the situation at present with Hizbollah, who fights in the proximity of people and from within houses and on the streets. This is something we don't like, because it causes us to harm civilians, which is something unfamiliar to us. The discussion now concerns managing a war that is novel to us...Israel will leave Lebanon when they have achieved the proper results. We can now either achieve quiet for a short period of time or for a long period of time. But that would require strong action from Israel inside of Lebanon...Before talking about an international resolution, Lebanon should decide what kind of country they want to be, a country of ministers or a country of gangs. And if they want to remain a gang-country perhaps Israel will remain in South Lebanon until forces from the EU come to replace them...Hizbollah [existing] as a political party concerned with closing bars and covering girls, personally I'd prefer this, because I am a religious

---

Jew. But if Hizbollah wanted to have an independent army and a separate agenda, an Iranian agenda, this is something that Israel doesn't want."

Word Count:

555

Micro Classification:

Clearly **represents an Israeli position** whose expression might excite identification with Israel. [**Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Israeli academic offers sound arguments in support of Israeli's actions)].

(3) Summary:

The perpetrators of the Sabra and Shatila massacres were Lebanese; the IDF was accused only of ignoring them. The massacres were a function of a sectarian approach that has long entrenched Lebanon in bloody conflict and which will continue to do so unless discarded.

Any suggested resolution that will give peace to Lebanon would be acceptable to Israel, who is very realistic with respect to militia disarmament in Lebanon and is interested in internal Lebanese stability and in good neighboring relations.

Although Nasrallah enjoyed widespread support initially, a lot of dissent surfaced with the destruction that Hizbollah policies wrought.

Quotes:

"...Any suggestion that would bring peace to Lebanon and give the government control over its land would be accepted by Israel...We are very realistic at the moment. If the government is able to impose its policies and not the policies of individual sects, this will bring peace and stability to Lebanon. It will also not allow others to interfere with its internal affairs, like Syria and Iran. Lastly, Israel will be the best neighbor possible..."

Word Count

268

Micro Classification:

Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (Academician presents highly cogent case in defense of Israel).

**Guest:**

Khalil, Anwar. Lebanese MP, Beqa Valley.

**Program Participation:**

30 July 2006 – Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

Summary:

---

Israeli assertions that Lebanon should exercise sovereignty over its own territory rather than allow the Hizbollah to destroy it simply seeks to blind the international community to Israel's aggression and relentless attacks on South Lebanon. Israel is violating all international agreements and resolutions. Israel's victims are not related to the resistance, which is itself a highly honorable and patriotic endeavor.

Quotes:

"...I assure you that 99 [%] of the numbers of the martyrs are not related to the real battle that we expect Israel to fight. I mean, facing the resistance, the solid resistance, the honor resistance which does the utmost that any group can do...to defend their country."

Word Count:

169

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to provoke **large-scale hostility toward Israel** and curry **sympathy and identification with Hizbollah** and Lebanon. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Impact aided by position as Lebanese government official and by humanitarian, emotional appeals and references to international law, but harmed by fanaticism)].

Guest:

Khan, Abd al-Wahhab Badr. Deputy Editor of Al-Hayat Daily Newspaper

**Program Participation:**

(1) 26 July 2006 – Rome Summit and Siniora's Call to End the War

Summary:

U.S. aims with respect to the war and regional plans have not been clear and are changing. The war will not likely achieve American-Israeli aims for the region and the US is recognizing the need to retreat its their initial plans of democratizing the Middle East. The Palestinians may have expected the war to afford them a break from Israeli harassment, as any serious pressure on Israel to consider their rights is not being exerted, but this has proven a false hope.

An Arab League conference is essential because other international channels for securing an end to the war have failed. However, owing to the internal Arab divides, with some countries actually opposing Hizbollah, such a conference would not have any real effect .

Hizbollah is growing more popular in the Arab world. The Europeans and Americans, however, who have grown obsessed with the war on terror, have mistakenly perceived Hizbollah as a terrorist group.

Quotes:

"The problem with the American position is that they are supporting the war, while it does not look like it will achieve the aims of the American administration or of Israel in the near future. ..At the beginning they wanted to call for a new Middle East plan and spread democracy in the region, but later they realized that this plan...might turn the world against them. Now they are going back to their original plans and

---

claiming that the aims of this recent war are noble...It is evident that the popularity of Hizbollah [in the Arab world] has grown recently. The only objection is that Hizbollah did not give any prior notice...that it is going for such a major operation. At the same time, public opinion in...the Arab world is supportive of the idea of resistance. Throughout the conflict, they have been behind the principles of this resistance group, because Hizbollah has been leading this fight with dignity and justice. In return they have received a lot of respect...On the other hand, the positions of Europe and America center on their own obsessions. When they are obsessed with an idea, it becomes difficult to convince them otherwise. Now they are obsessed with their war on terror and they have considered Hizbollah a terrorist group, which is, of course, wrong."

Word Count:

685

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **hostility toward Israel**, although extremity of position toward Israel and the West as well may have reverse effect on some listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (British Arab journalist expresses clear anti-US and anti-Israel position, however overt support of Hizbollah and Arab resistance may harm its credibility)].

(2) 8 August 2006 – Regional and International Attempts to Resolve War in Lebanon

Summary:

America perceives England as an ever-prepared ally owing to historical reasons that have connected the two countries. International opinion has had difficulty trying to comprehend Britain's blind consent with the US and France, who themselves support Israel in its supposed war against Iran and terror. Some British politicians have modified their opinions toward war and ceasefire. Blair has obstinately insisted on supporting US in wars in Iraq, on terror and in Lebanon, even though Britain is a superpower, because he believes it proffers him protection.

Whatever the outcome of the war, Hizbollah will consider itself victorious for having been able to withstand and endure the barbaric Israeli army. Hizbollah's future within Lebanon is a larger Lebanese issue.

Quotes:

"...England is a superpower and has its own experience and point-of-view. Tony Blair made the situation automatic...he is always ready to stand by the US point-of-view. He thinks that protects them; his stubbornness has become self-protection...When this war is over, Hizbollah will never consider that they lost the war, because they were able to struggle until now and they were able to stand in the face of the barbaric Israeli army and limit this strong army..."

Word Count:

511

Micro Classification:

---

Clearly presents an **anti-Israel** position, interspersed with seemingly detached, academic analysis. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2** (British Arab journalist presents moderately hostile position, bolstered by use of academic analysis)].

**Guest:**

Khoury, Rafiq. Editor-in-chief, "Al-Anwar" Daily

**Program Participation**

- (1) 8 August 2006 – Regional and International Attempts to Resolve War in Lebanon

Summary:

The war doesn't only concern Lebanon, it concerns the entire region and the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Iranian influence has introduced a new dynamic which concerns both Arab countries and the international community. Lebanon can either remain a stage for conflict or become a hostage of regional or international dynamics or alternatively pursue its own "7-point" plan.

Lebanon can begin considering its position following an end to the attacks. Israel has destroyed Lebanon as a byproduct of its overarching regional strategy and desires to control the Lebanese and humiliate them. Hizbollah deployed itself in the South to protect Lebanon from Israel attacks and managed to disrupt Israeli plans to attack it, prompting a reverse Lebanese strategy of deploying masses of soldiers. Lebanon considers itself at war with Israel and is attempting to improve its relationships with Arab countries and with the world to assuage its constant suffering at the hands of Israel and to reassert itself as an Arab state. It wrongly lacks the authority to determine its own position and to participate in the Arab-Israeli conflict as an Arabic country.

Quotes:

"...In this war Israel truly destroyed Lebanon, but they couldn't attack Hizbollah's heart...it looks like this war is a big plan for Israel...Hizbollah has spread in the south to protect Lebanon from Israel attacks and what really happened is that Israel failed and was not able to hit Hizbollah as they wanted...they [the Lebanese] are facing a barbaric war. Now even the cars can't move in Lebanon...Lebanon is insisting about Sheba Farms because they want to go back to a situation similar to other [Arab] countries...[In] Lebanon, every seven to ten years there is an Israeli invasion and a war...we want now for Lebanon to be able to take decisions again and to stay part of the Arab-Israeli conflict, because they are a part of the Arab countries... "

Word Count:

603

Micro Classification:

Emerges from an **anti-Israel, pro-Arab and Hizbollah premise** that nonetheless attempts to appeal to the humanitarian, justice-seeking sensibilities of the listener [**Attitude: 2, Impact: 2** (Arab journalist presents overtly anti-Israel position, which nonetheless attempt to appeal to the humanitarian, justice-seeking sensibilities of the listener)].

---

**Guest:**

Mansour, Khaled. UN Spokesperson in Lebanon.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 5 August 2006 – Economic Implications of War in Lebanon

**Summary:**

The humanitarian situation in Lebanon has continually deteriorated, owing to the Israeli sea and air sieges and obstruction of relief aid. The UN's primary role is political, attempting to facilitate relief work and ultimately to enable an end to combat activities. While funding varies from one organization to another, the UN thus far has sufficient funds to cover its needs, although they received only a small portion of what was requested. The main concern for the UN is fuel supply, freezing of movement, lack of electricity, and security guarantees for trucks and ambulances delivering humanitarian support to residential areas in the South.

**Quotes:**

"The humanitarian situation has deteriorated from bad to worse yesterday after the attack on five bridges linking Beirut to the North – the only route for humanitarian aid as a result of the sea siege and air siege. The number of planes that are allowed to land is not enough for the required medical and relief aid...I am worried about security guarantees for the trucks and ambulances delivering humanitarian support to the areas in the south, where hundreds of thousands of citizens still reside..."

**Word Count:**

473

**Micro Classification:**

Presents a humanitarian angle, which is **likely to foster animosity toward Israel**.  
[Anti-Israel attitude: 1; Impact: 3 (UN spokesperson presents humanitarian case against Israel, however in neutral guise, increasing impact)].

**Guest:**

Menashe, Dr. Sha'ul, Israeli Political Commentator on Arabic Issues

**Program Participation:**

(1) 19 July/ August 2006 - The Challenges of International Force Deployment in South Lebanon.

**Summary:**

Sympathetic with the Israeli position. For the most part defensive of Israel, although moderately critical with respect to certain issues. Explanation of Israel's expectations of UN PK force and defensive strategy and imperatives.

**Quotes:**

---

"The Resolution clearly states that the only side that has the right to have weapons is the Lebanese government and Israel can't have its hands tied while Iranian rockets are being delivered to Hizbollah to be used to kill Israeli civilians. The operation this morning was thus a defensive operation...Israel was bombed for over 33 days in many locations. Israel declared honestly that they could reach any area in Lebanon while defending their own security, even to areas near the Syrian borders, without touching Syrian land. Wherever weapons may be smuggled, Israel will prevent it, which is what Resolution 1701 says, that no weapons may be smuggled to the Hizbollah, only to the Lebanese government."

Program Word Count:

832

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a degree of **sympathy and identification with Israel** in the mind of the listener. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist offers reasonable and objective analysis that nonetheless may have the effect of fostering moderate sympathy toward Israel, as it largely explains its position)].

**Guest:**

Naila Muawad, Lebanese Minister

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 17 August 2006 – Politics of War in Lebanon and Elsewhere

Summary:

Assad's speech against internal Lebanese objections to Hizbollah is in no way threatening to Syria. The Lebanese government is in any case in accord with Hizbollah and seeks partnership with it. Lebanon desires normal relations with Syria as between any two sovereign countries.

Quotes:

"...as for the claim that we are in friction with the resistance, I say that this is nonsense. If that were the case, then how do you explain that there are two Hizbollah ministers in the government, the mobilization of all of our forces during the Israeli aggression and the ongoing dialogue in Lebanon?...We aim for a partnership with Hizbollah in governing the country and not for an individualistic approach to war and peace."

Word Count:

191

Micro Classification:

Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Government official at once supports Hizbollah while making seemingly 'reasonable' points.)

**Guest:**

Musallam, Tal'at. Retired Egyptian Major General.

---

(1) 3 August 2006 - Divergent Israeli and Hizbollah War Tactics

Summary:

Considers Hizbollah achievements in light of their aims (he counts four) and determines that they have fared quite well in light of the circumstances. Miscalculation is inevitably a part of battle, however it was minimal with respect to Hizbollah. They were surprised only with respect to the dimensions of the Israeli attack, which are wholly disproportionate and criminal.

A solution will need to be arrived at; it is in the best interest of Israel -- whose ability to act upon its whims arbitrarily was curbed by the Hizbollah -- to see to that. Nasrallah is aware of Lebanese suffering and is attempting to arrive at a solution that protects the people from Israeli crimes.

Quotes:

"Under the circumstances in which Hizbollah is operating, I think that they were able to achieve the maximum that could be achieved...Hizbollah calculated that here are four main issues; two of these issues could not be solved except by military force...We find the [Hizbollah] forces distributed well, trained to a high level, an unbelievable way of hiding and location of leaderships that enabled it to manage well even today for over 20 days...This in my opinion is the mistake. It was not expected that the retaliation would be disproportionate in the sense that it includes random strikes. The military operation targeted electricity stations, what are civilian targets that have nothing to do with the war...These are crimes unprecedented historically...Israel was free to do what it wanted in the region without having to take anything into consideration. And here came Hizbollah's retaliation with rockets..."

Word Count:

804

Micro Classification:

Emerges from a premise blatantly **antithetical to Israel** and clearly intended to provoke hostility toward it, while identifying with Hizbollah. The extremity of his position, however, may have a reverse effect on some listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Retired Egyptian general presents position harmed by extremism and unequivocal identification with Hizbollah, but aided by pseudo-humanitarian, moral appeals)].

(2) 13 August 2006 - Prospects of Ceasefire Resolution

Summary:

Resolution serves both countries, but has some distinct advantages from Israel's perspective and does not really respond to Lebanon's demands. Implementation, while beginning, can be hindered by lack of Israeli cooperation.

Hizbollah's acceptance of the resolution was a strategic choice that considered Lebanese solidarity of opinion, while Israel's acceptance was just tactical and enables them to proceed with their plans.

---

Hizbollah's tactics could not likely be applied against Israel in other Arab military formats, although possible attempts to do so are concerning.

The Resolution does not encourage optimism, as it leaves Lebanon too weak to adequately defend itself against Israeli attacks and violation of its territory.

Quotes:

“Hizbollah considers Israeli acceptance [of the ceasefire resolution] a tactical [decision]. For example, the first article calls on Israel to stop its offensive operations, while Hizbollah has to stop all military operations. Israel considers its military operations defensive. Another thing is linking the Israeli withdrawal with the deployment of the Lebanese army: would that withdrawal happen once the Lebanese army is deployed or would they wait for the international troops, tactics that we are used to seeing from the Israelis...I am not optimistic. The Lebanese army that is going to stand against Israel is weak and has limited force. Even if Israel withdrew from the south, do you think it will stop violating Lebanese air and sea space?...”

Word Count:

425

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel attitude: 1; Impact: 2** [Retired Egyptian army general emerges from clearly anti-Israel attitude that nonetheless translates into only moderate verbal offensive.]

**Guest:**

Mustafa, Dr. Hala. Editor-in-Chief, “Al-Dimuqratiyya” (The Democracy) Quarterly

**Program Participation:**

(1) 29 July 2006 – US Strategy in the Middle East

Summary:

Asserts that to be accepted by all key players, an agreement will need to be negotiated between Lebanon and Israel and accepted by the Security Council. Summarizes Siniora’s demands of prospective agreement. Hizbollah, as well, accepts principles outlined in UN Resolution 1559. New negotiations can be expected shortly that will include overall solutions.

The US is pursuing a long-standing policy that is no different than its policy in other parts of the world. As Arabs, it is difficult to consider the wider perspective. The absence of an early ceasefire may have in fact facilitated a larger-scale solution and the implementation of UN Resolution 1559.

Does not foresee a clash between Israel and Syria, although Syria is clearly involved in what is going on.

The return of sovereignty to the Lebanese government is the prime goal, which can be achieved through the implementation of Resolution 1559 (disarming Hizbollah) and the transmission of an international peacekeeping force. This is to the benefit of Lebanon, not only Israel. The Lebanese government is proposing approximately the same thing as the European and international communities.

---

Quotes:

"...I don't think that the US has dealt with Lebanon from a distance and in any way differently than the way they dealt with...other parts of the world...We, the Arabs, look at the solutions from our own perspective and desires. We see the solution in our way only and don't look at it from a wider perspective...The aim now is to give the power to the Lebanese government to govern the entire country..."

Word Count:

1,120

Micro Classification:

Does **not excite sympathy or identification** with either party to the conflict. [Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 (Arab journalist espouses moderate viewpoint)].

Guest:

Nafi'a, Dr.Hasan, Dean of Political Science, Cairo University.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 19 July/ August 2006 - The Challenges of International Force Deployment in South Lebanon

Summary:

Points to ambiguity of UN Resolution 1701 and its openness to interpretation by both parties; Israel mistakenly thinks UN can/will disarm Hizbollah. Hizbollah is legitimate member of Lebanese Government; Israel has no right to determine identity of PK countries as PKO on Lebanese land. Israel is the root of aggression and violence, independent of Hizbollah; acts unilaterally and unjustly in enforcing resolution.

Quotes:

"We should not forget that Lebanon was attacked by Israel long before Hizbollah was established so I don't see any relationship between Israel's attacks on Lebanon and the existence of Hizbollah. It is a long aggression and the question is when will the Lebanese army be able to protect the Lebanese land and people. For example, being able to protect the skies of Lebanon from these missiles, and having the ability to face the fighting if Israel thought to attack Lebanon. This is the real problem."

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative image of Israel** in the mind of the listener, although initially provides neutral, descriptive information. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Egyptian academic presents unequivocally anti-Israel attitude whose credibility is harmed by extremism but aided by academic and self-righteous guise)].

Program Word Count:

1,281

(2) 20 July 2006 - Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

---

Summary:

Highly critical of Israel, the international community and the US and defensive of Hizbollah.

Hizbollah is portrayed as legitimate resistance movement; suggests that Israel's objective may be to destroy Lebanon as an ethnically diverse country.

Hizbollah is admirable resistance group, enjoying the support of the people, while Israel is a morally reprehensible and criminal aggressor, acting barbarically in complete disproportion to Hizbollah's actions.

Israel is the aggressor in the region who prevents the advent of peace owing to their expansionist aims and refusal to accept a Palestinian State and retreat to 1967 borders. All Arabs fully support Hizbollah's resistance to Israeli aggression.

Quotes:

"...the Israeli Army's dignity has been swept to the floor in this war. First of all because they are hiding in airplanes in the sky, throwing bombs at civilians on the ground, destroying bridges and bombing children. This way of war has no morals and is not legal at all...What makes people unite is the Zionist project. This is the real problem...Israel is a country that wants to expand and they have a plan to force onto the regions of Palestine, Lebanon or even Egypt...The reason for the conflict in the Middle east is the Israeli project, the settlers in occupied Palestine...We are facing a monster who does not care about the law or about morals. There are no rules...Arabic people see Israel as a killer monster. Everyone is watching the resistance of Hizbollah as an example of the resistance of the whole nation and they hope this resistance will continue."

Program Word Count:

1,001

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative image of Israel** and **Identification with Hizbollah** in the mind of the listener, although the extremity of his position taken may have the reverse effect on some listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Egyptian academic presents unequivocally anti-Israel attitude whose credibility is harmed by extremism but aided by academic and self-righteous guise)].

(3) 27 July 2006 – Failure of Rome Summit and US Policy

Summary:

Failure of summit was expected, as objectives were not clear enough from the outset and participants are not necessarily the key players in the region. The purpose of the conference was to alienate Iran and Syria after expected Israeli victory, which did not come. The UN Security Council should have the primary role of negotiating solution between conflicting parties, in spite of American attempts to undermine it. The US, however, is attempting not to oppose the unanimous opinion of the Security Council and appear as the facilitator of Israel's attacks on Lebanon. A new avenue must be found to reach an international solution to the conflict. The US must stop obstructing the role of the Security Council and stop allowing Israel's pointless and illegal military operations. Kofi Annan recognizes that Iran and Syrian should be part of the

---

negotiations and recognizes that the US is being too supportive of Israel. The US is in fact using Israel as a tool to fight their own war, which is based on isolation of Iran and Syria. Hizbollah, however, stands in their path. Hizbollah is fighting in the name of the entire Arab nation and has unified all Lebanese sects behind them against the Israeli monster, with whom they have proven that peace cannot exist.

Quotes:

“...The US muddled the case as if there had never been a veto and a decision given on this [ceasefire] case. The US should therefore be held responsible for obstructing the role of the Security Council...The US is not going to pressure Israel to put an end to their violations. The US is going to continue to allow Israel [to proceed] with their military operations until there is a veto. Even if the Security Council comes up with a solution, the U.S. is going to veto it, since they want Israel to find a military solution on the ground...The US and Israel have the same definition of foe and friend. ..The only thing that is now challenging the role of the US and complicating it, is the resistance of Hizbollah and their ability to continue to face this war. Hizbollah showed strength and ability to resist, and proved the difficulty of isolating Syria and Iran...Hizbollah is not fighting in the name of the Shi'a alone; they are working...in the name of the whole Arab nation...Now all the parties in Lebanon...believe that Israel is the deadly monster...I believe that Hizbollah is being very strong by having a true belief and clear aim of their fight against this enemy. And the entire Arab world knows who this enemy is now. Hizbollah has unified the entire Arab world and proven that their resistance is rare and something that we, in the Arab world, have been lacking for a long time...Hizbollah successfully reminded the entire Arab world that it is impossible for us to create peace with Israel and reach compromise with a destructive monster who wants to force its policies and ideologies onto the region with their weapons and military...”

Word Count:

1,671

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to elicit **hostility toward Israel**, although extremity of position toward Israel and the U.S may have a reverse effect on some listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Egyptian academic presents unequivocally anti-Israel attitude whose credibility is harmed by extremism but aided by academic and self-righteous guise)].

(3) 12 August 2006 – International Ceasefire Resolution

Summary:

The resolution is completely one-sided and serves primarily Israel's interests. It is further sufficiently vague as to allow Israel to manipulate it and adhere to it at will. Israel is not held accountable for all of the destruction it has wrought nor for the utterly disproportionate response to Hizbollah's kidnap of Israeli soldiers. The resolution ignores Israel's breach of international law and does not make equal demands of the two sides. It does not require Israel to stop its supposedly defensive operations that in fact cloak aggressive offenses. The resolution has been crafted to

---

facilitate the objective of Israel and the US to destroy Hizbollah – it reflects US influence in the UN -- and thus bears little utility.

If other issues hindering a comprehensive regional peace agreement – the Palestinians and the Golan Heights – are addressed, then the resolution might meet success. However, failing to tend to the wider issues will not afford the resolution its desired aims of pressuring the Syrian regime and de-legitimizing Hizbollah politically.

The war has introduced considerable change to the region owing to Hizbollah's success in battling Israel. Expresses pessimism with respect to a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict owing to his perception of poor American and Israeli government leadership.

Quotes:

"I think it is a totally one-sided resolution, which...serves mostly Israel, even though it does answer some Lebanese demands. It is a very vague resolution, whereby Israel can interpret it the way it likes...So if it can abuse it so as to continue its military operations it will and only in the case which hit thinks that there is no military gain to be had from its offensives will it use it as a strategy for politically covering its exit strategy until the resolution is implemented...Not only was its response excessive, but Israel should [also] be held accountable for breaching all of the international laws with respect to the destruction of Lebanon...According to the resolution, Hizbollah has to stop all operations, while Israel only has to stop the offensive. But we've seen that its operations are considered protective measures, so it can continue with whatever it is doing, without [taking] any responsibility...Hassan Nasrallah was able to deliver a major fight militarily, politically and publicity-wise. The Lebanese people are united and the Arab world realizes that the Israeli army is no longer indispensable [invincible? undefeatable?]. And for the first time in the long Arab-Israeli conflict, the people of Israel have gone to the bunker and realized that they are vulnerable to outside powers..."

Word Count:

926

Micro Classification:

Clearly emerges from an **anti-Israel premise** and is likely to influence listeners toward its own position, particularly as analysis feigns being academic. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3** (Egyptian academic's fierce attack of Israel and the US aided by seemingly academic analysis)].

Guest:

Nissan, Eli. Israeli Television Journalist

**Program Participation:**

(1) 20 July 2006 - Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

---

Overtly critical of Hizbollah and defensive of Israel and her aims.

Quotes:

"...Are they [Hizbollah] real leaders when they hide in bomb shelters while sending their fighters to the front line?"

Program Word-Count:

312

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a degree of **sympathy and identification with Israel** and **negativity** toward the Hizbollah in the mind of the listener. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist makes cogent case in support of Israel)].

(2) 30 July 2006 – Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

Summary:

Israel is not an agent of the US; it is rather acting in a manner beneficial to any in the Arab world who oppose the spread of the Iranian Revolution, as Hizbollah is in fact an agent of the latter.

Hizbollah is harmful to Lebanon, who should respect itself as a country and resist their occupation. While everyone regrets the casualties in the Qana village and sees it as a catastrophe, some of the attacks were directed against Hizbollah who, having become weak, hid amongst women and children. Israel has not targeted innocent people, while Hizbollah has fired thousands of rockets against precisely such civilian targets and uses civilians as human shields. Hizbollah has fired rockets onto Israeli civilian population centers out of residential neighborhoods of Qana – unacceptable to any country.

Contests assessment of Israel as arrogant, as Israel has demonstrated willingness to retreat from territories and has done so at great cost to itself. The Likud no longer talks about controlling both banks of the Jordan.

Hizbollah should not determine to whom ownership of Sheba Farms will go. This and Golan Heights will be discussed in negotiations between Israel and Syria in proper time. Hizbollah is an Iranian puppet and should not control Lebanon's affairs.

Hizbollah is bombing Israeli citizens and civilians; Israel is not the criminal. Israel is prepared to enter a cease-fire agreement, but not on Hizbollah's terms.

Quotes:

"...I say that Arab countries, including Egypt, should thank Israel for what it's doing against the Hizbollah organization, because Lebanon today is at the fore of buying the Iranian Revolution, fanatical Islam...Israel is resisting Iran's overtures to sell the revolution...Israel should hit the Hizbollah, so that Hizbollah will not act as the arm of Iran, spreading the Iranian Revolution in the Middle East...Hizbollah today has become weak, and where do they hide their members? They hide between women and innocent children...all these [Hizbollah-fired] bombs were fired from inside

---

residential areas in Qana, because Hizbollah sees residential areas as places from which to fire rockets..."

Word Count:

1013

Micro Classification:

Likely to excite **identification and sympathy with Israel** and **antipathy toward the Hizbollah**, although effect mitigated by confrontational host and his manner of engaging and challenging the guest. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist makes cogent case in support of Israel)].

(3) 31 July 2006 – Political Resolutions to the Conflict

Summary:

The U.S. and Israel are not in disagreement, however the unfortunate events in Qana village have expedited the ceasefire process. The Lebanese people pay the price for the immoral actions of Hizbollah, a terrorist organization which fires rockets from within civilian villages, such as Qana. Israel has withdrawn from all Lebanese territory. Laments the Lebanese president's declared identification with Hizbollah and opposition to international forces. Hizbollah is an agent of the Iranian Revolution and as such threatens to encroach upon the remainder of the Arab world. Lebanon can hardly be considered an independent country.

The U.S. and Israel are in agreement as to the threat that Hizbollah, Iran and Syria constitute. Arab countries in spite of this are exerting pressure on Israel, although they are also cognizant of the menace, while the Europeans are well aware of the implications of a Hizbollah and Iranian victory.

The U.S. is genuinely interested in changing the situation and ensuring that it will not regress owing to the existence of a terrorist organization on the border. Israel, as opposed to Hizbollah and Iran, is not declaring its intention to destroy anyone.

Sheba farms is a point of contention between Israel and Syria and does not concern Lebanon or the Hizbollah. If Lebanon were self-respecting it would expel Hizbollah from its territory, a terrorist organization that has sabotaged the work of Rafiq Hariri in rehabilitating the country. International forces should be imported to bring peace and stability back to the region.

There are clearly clefts within the Arab world.

Quotes:

"...Israel's war at this time is not against a normal army; it is against a terrorist army who uses villages as their battleground...Israel doesn't want any land from Lebanon; Israel has withdrawn from all Lebanese land...If Iran is successful in advancing the methods of the Iranian Revolution in Lebanon, then this Revolution will spread to the entire Middle East...you know very well that there is a group of evil-doers who play a negative role in the Middle East and they are Iran, Syria and Hizbollah...[they] will have a negative effect not only on Israel and Lebanon, but on the rest of the Arab countries [as well]...Israel is not threatening to destroy any country, while we hear

---

from Iran and Hizbollah...that [they] want to destroy Israel...if an international force were really created and spread in the area to protect firstly the independence of Lebanon then I would start to see peace and stability in the region..."

Word Count:

1,053

Micro Classification:

May excite **identification with Israel** and **animosity toward Hizbollah, Syria and Iran**. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist makes cogent case in support of Israel)].

(4) 13 August 2006 – Ceasefire Resolution: Israeli and Lebanese Perspectives

Summary:

Israel is not simply trying to buy time; it has willingly withdrawn on numerous past occasions. Withdrawal should further not pose a problem as long as the resolution's conditions are met and Hizbollah withdraws from the south and ceases firing rockets on Israel. Israel has been forced to deal with a terrorist organization supported by Syria and Iran. Support for the war has been virtually across-the-board, however following its close, questions will almost certainly be raised.

Quotes:

"I don't see any attempts at buying time on the part of Israel. We have seen regular withdrawals from Israel in the past...What we are dealing with here is not a conventional army, but a terrorist organization backed by Syria and Iran..."

Word Count:

200

Micro Classification:

**Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** [Israeli journalist presents cogent argument in defense of Israel.]

**Guest:**

Qisbar, Rafiq. Economic Expert, Beirut.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 24 July 2006 - Israeli Attack on Lebanese Economy and Other Aspects of Israeli War in Lebanon

Summary:

Israeli attacks on Lebanese economy and civilian are deliberate and an attempt at weakening Hizbollah and their support within Lebanon.

Quotes:

"Since the war started Israel has been targeting economic sites and bridges, aiming to destroy the Lebanese economy, houses, milk factories and gas stations. All of this tells us that Israel is directly targeting the economy. The objective is to weaken the

---

economic capacity and production as well as to ensure very little income for civilians. Israel sees this as a very important objective."

Program Word Count:

145

Micro-Classification:

Likely to elicit **hostility toward Israel**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** (Lebanese economic expert insists on Israel's morally dubious combat techniques)].

**Guest:**

Rahal, Dr. Hussein, Hizbollah Spokesperson

**Program Participation:**

(1) 23 July 2006 - Hizbollah's Media War

Summary:

Israel is a murderous enemy who massacres innocent people. It propagates malicious lies to cloak its evil and brutal violations of human rights and international law. Israel deliberately targets media centers in Lebanon and restricts journalists within Israel with the aim of silencing the truth and violently projecting their own frustrations on the Lebanese population.

Quotes:

"This is the first time we see them [Israel] fighting in a war and exaggerating. Today, the UN in Lebanon said that what Israel is doing is against all human rights. They are bombing civilian buildings and claiming they are military places. This is Israeli propaganda. They are committing massacres. The Israeli leaders should go to international court to be punished for what they are doing... They also destroyed many other media places because they do not want to reveal the real picture to the world."

Word-Count:

650

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative image of Israel and Identification with Lebanon and Hizbollah** in the mind of the listener, although the extremity of the position taken may have the reverse effect on some listeners. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Credibility of vicious attacks against Israel and the US harmed by position as Hizbollah member and by fanaticism, but aided by humanitarian, moral appeals and rationalizations)].

**Guest:**

Rizqa, Dr. Yusuf. Palestinian Minister of Information

**Program Participation:**

---

(1) 20 July 2006, Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

Overtly hostile toward the Israeli position. Israel is bullying and oppressing Palestinian people. Israel and the US responsible for dysfunction of Palestinian govt. Israel is aggressor and occupier with malicious and evil intent both in Lebanon and Gaza, seeking to harm population, not to recover kidnapped soldiers.

Quotes:

"...they [the Palestinian civilian population] understand the reasons why the government has become disabled. If conditions were amenable to proper government performance, the people might demand their civil, social and regular rights, education and health, but the Palestinians see that this government is surrounded by the Israeli occupation and is under pressure from America. That this government has an excuse...The issue is about whether Israel can stop the occupation and aggression, which is constantly being thrown at the Palestinian people."

Program Word-Count:

430

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Highly Negative image of Israel and Identification with the Palestinians and with Hizbollah** in the mind of the listener. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3**: Palestinian government official attacks Israel and the U.S. on moral grounds)].

Guest:

Saad, Edmond. Editor-in-Chief, *Al-Nahar* Daily Newspaper, Lebanon.

**Program Participation**

(1) 13 August 2006 – Ceasefire Resolution: Israeli and Lebanese Perspectives

Summary:

Although other Arabs in a state of war with Israel may have gained educationally from Hizbollah's actions against Israel, its intention was simply to start with the liberation of occupied Lebanese land. The resistance is legitimate and had to carry out the kidnapping operation when it did, for timing purposes. It claims that it was not aware that the US and Israel were already planning an attack on Lebanon and therefore could not foresee the dimensions of Israeli retaliations. A real resolution would require Israel to withdraw from Sheba farms so that Hizbollah will not initiate resistance attacks.

Quotes:

"...The resistance is legitimate under the government agreements and admits that the operation had to happen at that moment because the timing was right. However, Hizbollah claims that it had no idea that Israel was already planning an attack on Lebanon with US blessing and therefore it could not foresee the size of the consequences. It does believe that the government shares equal responsibility in the

---

aftermath of the operation and therefore delegated negotiation with the UN to the government...

Word Count:

266

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Position: 2; Impact: 1** [Journalist's blatant and unbridled support of Hizbollah harms the effectiveness of the position.]

**Guest:**

Safadi, Muhammad. Lebanese Minister of Transportation

**Program Participation:**

(1) 16 August 2006 – The Internal Lebanese Arena

Summary:

Outlines the damage suffered by Lebanese transportation infrastructure. Negotiations with the UN are ongoing and ports and infrastructure will resume operation once the Israelis lift the blockade. The ceasefire resolution calls for exertion of Lebanese government control of ports and borders in exchange for an end to the Israeli blockade, which the Lebanese government is in the process of implementing – out of deference to the UN and not to Israel. Although plane landings are gradually increasing, an international resolution will determine the timing of the removal of the Israeli air blockade.

There have been some points of contention within the Lebanese government with respect to implementation of the ceasefire resolution – primarily with respect to disarmament. However, the resolution should be implemented. But the Lebanese government is not committed to it until Shiba Farms are liberated and Lebanese soldiers are returned.

Should Israel attack again, the Lebanese army will fight back.

Economic recovery will be the most difficult of all recovery fronts.

Quotes:

“Right now we have 78 bridges between total and partial destruction. 95 major roads are totally dysfunctional. All airport runways have been destroyed. All radars have been hit. And as you have seen, the fuel tanks in the airport are still burning...Until we get Shiba Farms and our soldiers back we are not committed to any article from Resolution 1701...”

Word Count:

541

Micro Classification:

---

**Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3** [Lebanese minister both emphasized Israeli destruction of Lebanon and Lebanese willingness to compromise and its deference to international law, while emerging from a clearly anti-Israel premise that is that much more 'justifiable' owing to his stated tactics.]

**Guest:**

Said, Dr. Abd al-Munim. Director of al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo.

**Program Participation:**

(1) 3 August 2006 - Divergent Hizbollah and Israeli War Tactics

**Summary:**

Lebanon has joined the cycle of destruction in the Middle East that has been its lot since 11 September 2001 and which sews sorrow and loss. While neither Hizbollah nor Israel intended it, they surprised each other and both are engaged in infringing upon the rights of the Lebanese people. While each side will try to claim victory, the situation will remain tension-ridden for a long time as military solutions are invariably temporary. Professes shock at his Hizbollah "brother's" intimation that the resistance is responsible for leading the military front only, not for preparing the population. Lebanon has little choice in supporting Hizbollah and confronting Israel; emerging from a civil war, its only other option would be to re-inflate it.

**Quotes:**

"...Lebanon has entered this long term open wound where no one really achieves victory or aims, but countries that are subject to these wounds will pay the price in the future...Each side will try to adapt the situation in a victorious manner to their own advantage. But the situation will remain tensed for a long time, because everyone, in all honesty, counts on time, because no one takes the history of the conflict into consideration and realizing that military conflict can only lead to temporary solutions, but cannot reach long-lasting ones."

**Word Count:**

739

**Micro Classification:**

**Not likely to curry sympathy** or identification **with either party** to conflict. [**Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2** (Egyptian academic presents moderate analysis)].

**Guest:**

Salam, Muhammad. Political Analyst

**Program Participation:**

(2) 16 August 2006 - The Internal Lebanese Arena

**Summary:**

---

The ceasefire resolution's call for disarming Hizbollah is problematic with respect to implementation, as Hizbollah is organic to the region and could easily conceal itself. The international community is counting on the Lebanese government removing any Hizbollah presence from the demilitarized zone, which the Lebanese people may in fact prefer.

Quotes:

"...the problem lies in applying such a resolution. Hizbollah does not have fixed military installations in the area; they have mobile rocket launchers that are fixed to small cars and trucks. It is not clear whether the Lebanese army and the people of Lebanon are ready to pursue these mobile weapons. And even if they do, we don't know if they will keep them, destroy them or reinstall them beyond the Litany River.

Word Count:

201

Micro Classification:

Neutral Attitude; Impact 1 [Political analyst is accorded very minimal time in which to say anything of substance.]

**Guest:**

Salman, Talal. Editor-in-Chief, *Al-Safir* Daily Newspaper, Beirut.

**Program Participation**

- (1) 13 August 2006 - Prospects of Ceasefire Resolution

Summary

Israel is targeting the entirety of Lebanon with its offensives, hoping to utilize the time they were afforded to inflict maximal damage. Although the resolution holds Hizbollah responsible for beginning the war, Israel is obviously responsible for that and for all of the subsequent destruction.

Quotes

"From what we see happening now, Israel is extensively targeting every part of Lebanon. It looks they want to inflict maximum damage on the Lebanese people and infra-structure. And it is obvious that that is why it was given that time limit... We all know that Israel is the reason behind [the war] and is still continuing with its destruction. Recently, it has been trying to occupy as much land area as possible in order to be in a stronger position for negotiating the withdrawal.

Word Count:

102

Micro-Classification:

Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 [Lebanese journalist presents seemingly coherent and cogent case against Israeli actions and morality.]

---

**Guest:**

Saraya, Usama. Editor-in-Chief, "Al-Ahram" Daily, Cairo.

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 30 July 2006 – Israeli Attacks on the Qana Village

**Summary:**

The Israelis are constantly committing crimes and perpetrating massacres and then denying it. Nobody in Egypt or elsewhere accepts Israel's crimes in Lebanon. America is executing collective punishment of the Lebanese people, which is prohibited by international law. Egypt uses its diplomatic relations with Israel to the benefit of the Arab-Israeli conflict and agreed to a peace agreement for the sake of the Palestinians and their occupied territory.

Israel's crimes against the Lebanese people violate every notion of law, however the world is unable to stand up to the U.S.

Israel doesn't seek to remove Hizbollah as a force; it simply desires war.

**Quotes:**

"Not the Egyptian government, not the Egyptian people, nobody will accept what Israel has been doing for 20 days in Lebanon. The crimes that they are committing since the 12<sup>th</sup> of July in Lebanon are crimes against the Lebanese people and are similar to the crimes in Gaza...Right now, when the martyrs' blood is still fresh, I won't talk of who is responsible or not. I will say now that we are facing a real crime, which contradicts all of the laws, even the laws of self-defense..."

**Word Count:**

465

**Micro Classification:**

Clearly intended to incite **hostility toward Israel and the U.S.** and **identification with Lebanon and Hizbollah**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Extremity of Egyptian journalist's fiercely anti-Israel position harms its credibility, but pseudo-humanitarian, moral appeals aid it)].

- (2) 2 August 2006 – Arab Positions Toward War in Lebanon

**Summary:**

The Arabic position toward the war was initially ambiguous and vague, however it became apparent that Israel is responsible for the war and the Arabic position has been against the war and in favor of a ceasefire from the outset. No Arab consensus existed at any time. Some Arab countries (Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan) condemned some of Hizbollah's conduct, while also attempting to bring about the end of the war.

Egypt has taken a clear position against Israel's actions in Qana, their breach of international law and aggression against Lebanon and has exerted enormous pressure for a ceasefire. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon is by far uglier than the Iraqi

---

invasion of Kuwait. Egyptian, Syrian and Arabic positions have converged with respect to practical actions toward controlling escalation and a ceasefire.

Extremist moves such as cutting oil supply will only benefit Israel, weaken the Arab position, and allow Israel and America to continue their criminal activities. Criticism of Hizbollah is not tantamount to accepting the Israeli attacks, as Israel has no justification for attacking Hizbollah and Lebanon. Trying to disband Hizbollah is futile, as they are part of the Lebanese ethnic fabric, however deploying international forces is unanimously agreed upon, as it would preclude any future Israeli excuses to attack the Lebanese people.

The Arab position should be more clear and realistic following the conflict. The Arabs need to work together to facilitate the end of a complete Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory, from the Syrian Golan and then on a solution to the Palestinian issue.

Quotes:

"...At the beginning of the war it seemed that Hizbollah was responsible for this conflict, but later it became apparent that Israel is targeting the entire Lebanon, its people, and infrastructure...I don't think there was ever a consortium of [Arabic] politics...there were attempts...to put an end to the war...in the sense that it refused some of Hizbollah's actions along with its efforts to end this war...There is a difference between random diplomatic moves that have negative repercussions on the Palestinian and Lebanese causes and consecutive moves that exert pressure on Israel and reveal its aggression on the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples...The politics are clear here. However, resorting to extremism in managing dialogue, resorting to stopping oil or waiving such weapons will only benefit Israel and weaken the Arab position...when we speak in an extreme tone, we have the same position as the Americans and Israelis, when you accuse the Arab position you are serving the extremists in America and Israel and not the Arabic position...I agree that the Arab position needs to be clear and unified as the European position is against attacking the Lebanese people and Hizbollah. It is not Israel's place to attack Hizbollah. This is an internal Lebanese issue that needs to be dealt with. But I don't think that removing Hizbollah will lead to anything. It is a useless idea...But let me say that the idea of placing international forces on the borders is agreed upon by all parties in order for this not to be repeated in Lebanon and for Israel not to attack the Lebanese people under any excuses... "

Word Count:

1, 251

Micro Classification:

Likely to elicit **hostility toward Israel**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact 2;** Extremity of Egyptian journalist's fiercely anti-Israel and anti-American position harms its credibility considerably, but pseudo-humanitarian, moral appeals aid it].

(3) 7 August 2006 – Arab Foreign Minister Summit

Summary:

---

Objects to implications that Egypt has not acted adequately on behalf of Lebanon by failing to threaten Israel. Egypt is in a practical, but unfriendly diplomatic relationship with Israel and in any case only has so much influence on international politics. The U.S. is the sole country whose position is of concern to Israel. Egypt's position is strategic and has aimed from the outset to curb Israel's misguided military attempts at destroying Lebanon, which in any case will not stop the resistance. Arab unity and reliance on international law will facilitate an end to the conflict. Likewise, a sustainable multi-party resolution should be reached, which will not enable Israel to destroy Lebanon again and which will create a Palestinian state in the interest of peace. The resistance achievements should be used to empower political-diplomatic moves and should not be exaggerated.

Quotes:

"...Israel is using power and they worry only about the U.S. Egypt is a strategic alliance for the Arabs. Since the first of this conflict, Egypt wanted to achieve good things for the Arabs and they wanted to stop the attacks in the area...Israel should learn from this last war that the military power that Israel is using with airplanes to destroy the county in one month will not stop the people in the resistance...Looking back now at the path and the struggle and the resistance, this [Hizbollah's achievements]...is not a complete victory."

Word Count:

427

Micro Classification:

Clearly emerges from a premise of **hostility to Israel and identification with Hizbollah**, however ultimately espouses practical resolution and reconciliation with Israel. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2, Impact 2** (Egyptian journalist presents clearly anti-Israel and anti-American position, however in terms that appear analytically reasoned)].

Guest:

Shaked, Roni. Israeli Journalist

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 9 August 2006 - Israeli War Conduct

Summary:

Internal discord within Israel is a mark of an open and democratic society; military deficiency on the part of Israel's leaders indicates that Israeli society is interested in peace, not in war. Israel did not initiate the war and should attempt to achieve as much as possible until there is a resolution, just as Hizbollah is attempting to do.

There is always dialogue between the military and political ranks in Israel and at times divergent visions. Israel is interested in making a clear statement to Hizbollah and in securing a peaceful future with the Lebanese.

---

The Israeli presence in Lebanon exists only to facilitate the entry of international forces. Israel is interested in living peacefully beside a content neighbour and has no interest in seeing civil war in Lebanon. Hizbollah as a faction becomes Israel's concern and problem only when it takes the form of a militia acting on its borders.

Quotes:

"...Israel's politics, its people and community is strong and democratic...we should understand that if Israel's leaders are not military leaders - [even though] - the world would like to think that Israel is only military, this makes an important point: that the Israeli people didn't want to go to war, they wanted peaceful means...This war came to Israel, Israel didn't start the war. Until there is a ceasefire or a UN resolution, I think Israel should do its best to succeed and achieve a lot from the other side, as we see Hizbollah doing the same...The objective [of this war] is firstly the future - not only the ceasefire...how we can live in peace with the Lebanese...Israel wants a happy neighbour that can live with it...We want Lebanon to be one country as it was before. Hizbollah can be whatever they want to be, but we can't accept them as a militia in the borders of Israel. If there is a political party called Hizbollah, this is a Lebanese problem, not an Israeli one. But if there is a militia within its borders, this is an Israeli problem..."

Word Count:

672

Micro-Classification:

Likely to foster **sympathy and identification with Israel**. [**Attitude: Pro-Israel, 2; Impact: 2** (Israeli journalist presents sound case in support of Israel)].

(2) 15 August 2006 - Internal Israeli Arena

Summary:

The criticism voiced in the later stages of the war toward the Israeli government is indicative of Israel's democratic nature and stems from a need to address the dangers facing Israel. Criticism was slightly late in coming, as problems only became apparent in more advanced stages of the war. The people of Israel and their politicians will face the consequences of the war. Israel further needs to identify the lapses so as to adequately prepare for future wars.

Although theoretical speculation is somewhat futile, it is safe to assume that had Ariel Sharon been PM and opted for war, it would have been a much swifter and efficient operation.

The war demonstrated to Israel the enmity of its Islamic neighbours, the necessity of maintaining strength and of remaining politically alert. There is little cause for optimism considering the multi-faceted dangers facing Israel. A peaceful political solution must be achieved if Israel is to remain on the map.

Quotes:

"Where there is criticism there is democracy...The reason for the criticism is to improve our fighting capabilities, because this will not be our last war with any of our neighbors...What we need now is an inquiry into what went wrong, not for the

---

sake of blaming...but to correct what went wrong during the war and to be ready for the next war that I think will take place sooner or later. We have to be ready in order to win it...The first lesson [of the war] is that Islamic forces surround Israel and want to destroy it; the second lesson is that we have to be strong as a people and an army; and, finally, we have to open our eyes and ears for the political future of the region...We still have a lot worse coming. I am not optimistic and we have to be much stronger than we are now. Danger surrounds us and it does not come only from Hizbollah...We have to find a final peaceful political solution if we want to live here forever..."

Word Count:

571

Micro Classification:

**Pro-Israel Position: 1; Impact: 2** (Israeli journalist clearly emerges from a position that assumes Israel's right to exist and of affectation that stems from personal Israeli identity. Analysis is presented as reasonable and fairly insightful.)

**Guest:**

Shams al-Waizin, Masha Allah. Iranian Researcher and Specialist

**Program Participation:**

- (1) **8 August 2006** - Regional and International Attempts to Resolve War in Lebanon

Summary:

The Iranians are perpetually to blame in the Arab world, either accused of aligning themselves with the West or with trying to influence regional politics to the exclusion of the Arabs. This reflects Arabic misunderstanding of regional politics and the Arab relationship with the West. Iran is growing closer to Arab issues, particularly the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian cause, which is why Israel is accusing Hizbollah and Iran of an agent-operator relationship. In fact, Hizbollah and Iran are in a strategic relationship, similar to the one between Israel and the U.S.

Iran is ironically supporting the Lebanese government and Lebanese unity, while the US and France are disregarding Lebanese interests. Hizbollah's recent declaration of consent to deployment of Lebanese army indirectly reflects Iranian picture of regional politics. Israel has tried to draw regional countries into declaring that Hizbollah is an agent of Syrian and Iran, which is simply a function of their loss of dignity militarily and desire to nonetheless achieve their regional objectives along with the US.

Quotes:

"...Iran is getting closer to a lot of the Arabic [positions], especially in what is related to Palestine or Hizbollah...the official policies in Iran are to get closer strategically or strategic alliances with the Arabic [position], especially when it comes to Palestine regarding the Arabic-Israeli conflict and they always were prepared to face the conflict against Israel and the settlements...It is ironic that Iran is supporting the Lebanese government...when the main side of this conflict is the US. France is

---

moving away from Lebanese opinions or interests and demands. The US officially adopted the Israeli opinion since the beginning of the conflict and France did yesterday in the Security Council...Israel wishes to increase the circle of conflict to include Syria and Iran and then proceed with their plan to [redesign] the Middle East..."

Word Count:

486

Micro Classification:

Clearly emerges from a premise **hostile to Israel** and **sympathetic to Hizbollah**. Representing the Iranian position would not, however, likely accord his position much legitimacy or influence with listeners. [Attitude: 2; Impact: 1 (Credibility of extremist position against Israel not aided by Iranian ideological pretext)].

Guest:

Shayyeb, Akram. Member of Lebanese Parliament

**Program Participation:**

(3) 16 August 2006 – The Internal Lebanese Arena

Summary:

Resolution 1701 enjoys widespread internal Lebanese support and consensus amongst Arab governments and the international community. An internal government resolution will be concluded and will determine Hizbollah's future.

Lebanon does not accept Iranian and Syrian intervention in its internal affairs nor its exploitation of Lebanese suffering and casualties. Syria's claims that his party is collaborating with the Jews are unfounded and manipulative; in fact, his party has fully embraced the resistance.

Lebanon has entirely supported Hizbollah in its war with Israel, however the demands of the international community need to be accommodated and the efficiency of the government maintained. Syrian and Iran would likely have claimed Hizbollah's victory – which was in fact in the name of the whole Arab world -- as their own and not given proper respect to Lebanon in any case. Hizbollah's victory belongs to the entire Arab people; in the meantime, no one in government looks to disarm the group.

Quotes:

"What will happen with the military power of Hizbollah is an internal military affair that will be taken care of through negotiations between Hizbollah, the speaker of the Parliament and the government...We have embraced the resistance before 2000 and we opened our arms to the refugees in this war. We worked hard to establish the right political atmosphere for the resistance to be as efficient as possible. If we were working for Israel, then why did Nasrallah sit with us 'Jews' during the national dialogue? This is an attempt from the Syrian president to take advantage of the Lebanese people and create friction between them...During the month of conflict, all of the Lebanese backed Hizbollah in its fight with Israel. But when it comes to the

---

international community and Resolution 1559, we as a people and government can't stand against them all in our fight to maintain an efficient government...[Hizbollah's victory was dedicated] to the Lebanese people, to its government, to the Arab world and nation and to the whole world..."

Word Count:  
536

Micro Classification:

**Anti-Israel Position: 2; Impact: 2** (Government official espouses view highly antithetical to Israel and to Jews in general, while also denouncing Iran and Syria and apologetically and subtly furthering the international agenda.)

**Guest:**

Shilo, Nili. Israeli Foreign Ministry Spokesperson

**Program Participation:**

(1) 1 August 2006 – Israeli Objectives in Lebanon

Summary:

Israel is a democracy and differences of opinion are expected. Israel did not initiate the conflict and will continue to protect its citizens against threat. International consensus on need for Lebanese authority to exercise sovereignty, Hizbollah to be disbanded and disarmed and kidnapped Israeli soldiers to be returned unconditionally. Israel was subjected to terrorist attacks and was forced to retaliate. Israeli operations aim to return kidnapped soldiers and meet terrorist threat. Israel expresses regret over Qana incident.

A long-term solution must be reached that will include the transmission of international forces. A political solution will follow the military actions and will be a direct extension of it, both aiming to subdue the Hizbollah threat.

The Hizbollah has suffered severe losses owing to Israel's efforts, although completely subduing it would require more time. Israel is doing Lebanon a favor by weakening the Hizbollah and is facilitating the exertion of Lebanese sovereignty in its territory. Israel shares the goals of the international community and of the U.S. in confronting universal terrorist threat. The U.S. fully supports Israel in its conflict with the Hizbollah.

In spite of internal divides, the Israel public for the most part supports continued operations, as it desires an end to the Lebanese and Hizbollah-rooted threat that has caused fear to fester.

Quotes:

"...at the end of the day, everyone knows who initiated this provocation and therefore Israel will continue its operation, because it has to protect its citizens and because the threat is still present today...As long as this threat exists, Israeli operations will continue...The Free World under the leadership of the United States

---

shares similar views about the terrorist challenges that we all face. A ceasefire alone will create a void that will be filled by Hizbollah and more terrorism. Israel and the international community share similar goals and Israel is eager to cooperate with the international community...Israeli civilians are being targeted and we are witnessing massacres and injuries and a state of great fear among the population..."

Word Count:

704

Micro Classification:

May excite **identification with Israel** and **hostility to Hizbollah**. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3 (Israeli Official and spokesperson presents cogent case in support of Israel)].

Guest:

Shlala, Rafiq, Lebanese Government Spokesperson

**Program Participation:**

(1) 19 July/ August 2006 - The Challenges of International Force Deployment in South Lebanon.

Summary:

Reports on cooperation between Lebanese Army & PKO to the end of securing Lebanese military presence in regions across Lebanon and eventual peace.

Quotes:

"...communication between Lebanon and the UN is taking place now to define a clear point of departure for all countries who may participate. When we gather all [necessary] information, participation will be clear and honest."

Program Word-Count:

353

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Moderately Negative Image of Israel** in the mind of the listener. [Anti-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 3 (Lebanese official and spokesperson offering seemingly neutral status report that nonetheless implicates Israel)].

(2) 22 July 2006 - Visit of U.S. Secretary of State and Israeli Military Operation in Gaza.

Summary:

Highly critical of both Israel and the US; representative of official position of Lebanese government. Asserts that Hizbollah is part of the Lebanese government. The government is unified and seeks immediate ceasefire. Any other demands are unreasonable; Israel's behavior is vengeful and unacceptable and the US', unreasonable. The kidnapping was simply a pretext for long-planned Israeli aggression.

---

Quotes:

"...We have a red line in Lebanon that we can't cross...we will always be united until we achieve the ceasefire and after that maybe it will be possible to think of the large number of ideas being forced on us...while the bombing and attacking [continues] this is impossible...today they [Israel] targeted media organizations in Lebanon. What does this have to do with the soldier's kidnapping?...Israel could bomb anywhere at anytime, anything they want. Is this working toward peace?...Didn't she [Rice] see how many people died in Lebanon? Didn't she see how Lebanon is being destroyed?...There is contradiction in what Rice is saying. How can you have full authority when you are economically, socially and militarily exhausted; there are currently more than one million refugees...Everything that we are witnessing makes us more certain that what Israel is doing was planned a long time ago, the kidnapping of the two soldiers was just an excuse."

Program Word-Count:

955

Micro-Classification:

Cultivates a **Negative image of Israel** and the U.S. and **Identification with Lebanon and Hizbollah** in the mind of the listener. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 3** (Lebanese official and spokesperson makes emotional appeals that imply that Israel is morally abhorrent)].

Guest:

Sidqian, Dr. Saleh, Director of the Arab Institute in Tehran

Program Participation:

- (1) 22 July 2006 - Visit of US Secretary of State and Israeli Military Operation in Gaza

Summary:

America and Israel both aspire to eradicate the Hizbollah resistance and create a New Middle East, to Iran's chagrin. Iran, however, will not be heavily affected by such developments. Hizbollah's fight is the Arab fight against Israel. Denial of direct Iranian involvement in Lebanon, since Hizbollah is a militia, whereas Iran can state open support for Syria as a sovereign state.

Quotes:

"I believe that the reason for this attack is not the two soldiers, but the desire to eradicate the Hizbollah, because Hizbollah is wanted by Israel and America...From the Iranian point of view, we have relations with Hizbollah and Lebanon, so I don't think such an end for Hizbollah would be to our benefit. But it looks like there is an international and American demand to terminate the resistance in Southern Lebanon...But I don't think that the regional card that Iran possesses would be very much affected...especially as the war waged by the US and Israel against Iran is still not an open or direct war...Supporting Hizbollah in Lebanon, I think, is supporting the Arab right."

Program Word-Count:

Micro-Classification:

May cultivate **negative image of Hizbollah** in the mind of the 'objective' observer owing to the Iranian-Hizbollah connection. Content of statements, however, while clearly hostile to Israel, is not explicitly venomous and the guest largely couches his claims in seemingly reasonable insights and sentimentalist appeals that might be effective in arousing **hostility toward Israel**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 1** (Although claims are couched in seemingly reasonable insights and sentimentalist appeals, representation of Iranian positions weakens credibility of expressed position.).

Guest:

Stern, Yoav. Israeli Journalist, "Ha'aretz" Newspaper

**Program Participation:**

- (1) 24 July 2006 - Israeli Attack on Lebanese Economy and Other Aspects of War

Summary:

Explanation of Israeli strategy and conduct and strategic analysis.

Although not all targets have been pre-determined, Israel primarily targets Hizbollah sites. Hizbollah is operating as sub-country, forcing Israel to confront Lebanon and to weaken Hizbollah by producing popular pressure. There have been very unfortunate civilian deaths that are probably accidental. Civilians always suffer in war.

The conflict is of much greater regional and global ramifications than a simple local tiff.

(Response) Journalists cannot know precisely how many civilians are targeted; International Law does not recognize the right to store and launch rockets in civilian homes.

Iran is the root of aggression in the Iran-Israel confrontation and is heading a new regional Arab dichotomy with far-reaching implications.

Quotes:

"We are targeting Hizbollah because they are operating as country within a country...If the two soldiers were kidnapped from inside Israel, while Hizbollah doesn't even recognize it as Israel, rather as 'Occupied Palestine'...with whom should we talk? Is there a country in Lebanon?...Is it acceptable in international law for resistance organizations to launch rockets from civilian homes? Is it normal that the Hizbollah plants rockets in people's homes, while these homes cannot be targeted?...So the Hizbollah is responsible for starting this...Which president in the Middle East announced yesterday that the Israeli people should go back to Europe? Who is this president? Is it not the Iranian president? Did the Israeli Prime Minister say that the Iranians should leave their land? How can such a country's present make such a declaration?..."

Program Word Count:

724

Micro-Classification:

---

As is largely explanatory, may elicit feelings of **identification with Israel** and **hostility toward Hizbollah and Iran**. [Pro-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist makes sound arguments in support of Israel's actions)].

(2) 12 August 2006 – International Ceasefire Resolution

Summary:

Resolution remains vague and thus its efficacy from Israel's perspective cannot be determined. Both parties have seen some of their interests addressed and others neglected in the resolution, however it is unclear whether the safety of Israel's northern borders has been secured. Israel's objective of stopping the launch of rockets against Jews and Arabs in Israel has obviously failed. Reaching the two prisoners through military operation would be very difficult. There are only two Lebanese prisoners serving time in Israeli prisoners -- one of whom entered Israel and brutally murdered a father and his young daughter -- and which are not comparable to the soldiers kidnapped from within Israel. Israel's offensive on Lebanon is determined by the masses of Syrian and Iranian weapons directed at Israel -- at least according to Israeli military experts.

The most recent Israeli operations following the resolution reflect Israel's attempt at 'buying time' prior to Knesset approval of the resolution, at which point operations will stop owing to Hizbollah's successful infliction of suffering on Israel's northern population.

It is imperative to recall that Hizbollah is not a state and the balance-of-power should be considered as existing between Israel and Lebanon -- which is in fact very weak. An organization that bears arms within a sovereign state is a terrorist organization. Its supposed 'resistance' is for Syrian land (Sheba Farms).

The Resolution, which followed much negotiation, should have been passed sooner in consideration of the suffering on both sides. It is, in fact, vague -- a fact which can be exploited by all involved parties. Hizbollah is interested in seeing more Israeli ground forces deployed so that it can claim victory in killing them and the guest opposes such a strategy.

Quotes:

"...there is an understanding that Hizbollah and Israel are equal in strength, militarily, however we must not forget that Hizbollah is not a state. It is an illegitimate organization. What we should therefore refer to is the balance of equilibrium between Israel and the State of Lebanon. All of the recent trouble between Israel and Lebanon and Israel and Hizbollah stems from the weakness of the central government of Lebanon...any organization that carries arms within a state is considered a terrorist organization and if you consider Hizbollah a resistance group, it is resisting on behalf of Syrian land (Sheba Land)...I do agree that the resolution is vague and that the two parties...can use this vagueness to their own benefit. I am personally with a ceasefire and employing ground forces in Lebanon is a big mistake and Hizbollah wants this to happen. The strength of Hizbollah is in its ground forces and killing Israeli soldiers will be seen as a victory..."

Word Count:

Micro Classification:

Gives fairly neutral analysis of the situation, while expressing minimal personal opinion that reflects Israeli affiliation. May excite sympathy with Israel and/or hostility toward Hizbollah [Pro-Israel Attitude: 1; Impact: 2 (Israeli journalist makes sound arguments in support of Israel's actions)].

## (3) 13 August 2006 – Ceasefire Resolution: Israel and Lebanese Perspectives

Summary:

The latest Israeli escalation is in fact with the aim of improving the Israeli negotiating position and is wrong, however Hizbollah has also been escalating. Both escalations underscore the need to arrive at an immediate ceasefire resolution. The resolution suffers from vagueness that does not address all potential points of conflicts, which makes the future uncertain.

Resolution will not be military. Although Israel did not achieve any major gains in Lebanon, this owes to the non-conventional nature of Hizbollah. There are points of contention between the Lebanese government and Hizbollah that will surface following the war.

Israel's army is attempting to buy time, but it should move its troops out of Lebanon as quickly as possible, since Hizbollah will always have the upper-hand on the ground. Retreat is made difficult however owing to unresolved issues.

Although Hizbollah succeeded in killing as many soldiers as it could, Lebanon has suffered enormous losses. Some of the Israeli decisions are not comprehensible, owing to internal military and political discord.

Hizbollah has been able to operate in Lebanon owing to the inefficacy of the central government.

Although Lebanese forces cannot function while Israel continues sky operations, Israel cannot ignore enemy actions beyond the Lebanese-Israeli border.

Quotes:

"I agree...that the escalation is for the sake of gaining more cards for later negotiations and that is a wicked move, which raises a lot of questions on the war strategy over the last month, but we also see escalation from Hizbollah...It is true that the IDF...is facing a terrorist organization and if the organization's aim was to kill as many soldiers as it could, then it did win. But that is not how wars are won. We have to remember that there are one million Lebanese refugees, thousands of civilians killed and Hizbollah still hasn't officially released its number of casualties. On the other hand, the IDF has made some strange decisions...there are a lot of internal clashes...The Lebanese people should come up with something to prevent such recurring events [Hizbollah militia acting as a government] in order to live in peace...I do agree that the Lebanese forces cannot face the ongoing maneuvering of Israeli war planes. But history has shown us that we cannot turn a blind eye to whatever is being prepared behind our borders."

---

Word Count:

760

Micro Classification:

Neutral Attitude; Impact: 3 [Respected Israeli journalist presents balanced and insightful analysis.]

(4) 20 August 2006 – Actual Prospects for Peace in the Middle East

Summary:

There is precedent for peace talks after wars in the Middle East in spite of apparent indication otherwise; in 1973 the political trend in the Middle East was actually against peace with Israel. There is not consensus or intention within Israel to work toward an international Madrid-like conference. Neither Beirut nor Damascus have signaled readiness for initiation of a peace process. There is mutual distrust between Israel and the Arabic countries. Dialogue should be conducted between Israel and each Arab country; not through the Arab league. Unilateral Israeli processes no longer enjoy popular support within Israel. The responsibility to enter into peace negotiations falls both on Israel and Arab countries and serious consideration is going into potential future resolutions.

Although Syria is not prepared to enter into covert negotiations, if Arabic countries are interested in peace then they should be able to declare openly their interest in such and should consider every potential location a possibility. Israeli politicians, in spite of the difficulties they face, must progress toward negotiations and express this to the public.

Quotes:

“...There is an exchange of distrust between Israel and the Arabic countries unfortunately. What I think is that it is better not to approach Israel through the Arabic league, but each party...that has something to do with the situation...perhaps this war will change the Israeli mentality...this responsibility [toward peace] is on both sides and not one side only. Now there is serious search for future resolutions...”

Word Count:

473

Micro Classification:

Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2 [Respected Israeli journalist offers analysis that does not for the most part indicate personal affections or identifications and certainly avoids any extreme statements.]

**Guest:**

Suwailem, Hussam. Retired Egyptian Major General.

**Program Participation:**

---

(1) 1 August 2006 – Israeli Objectives in Lebanon

Summary:

The decision to completely disband Hizbollah in the south of Lebanon was made significantly before the outbreak of hostilities and was part of an overarching Israeli strategy of preparing for a possible confrontation with Iran.

Israel's combat has been marked by error in calculations and intelligence, which has led to progressively diminishing military objectives. Furthermore, air raids not supported by land raids are futile. Hizbollah has however managed to evade even the most powerful Israeli intelligence forces, with intricate underground, communications, and military networks. Hidden storage locations conceal rockets which are carried by trucks, cars or manually and are fired indiscriminately in large numbers. Israeli intelligence failed to consider location of Hizbollah. Furthermore, Hizbollah is fighting with "gang" tactics which dictates a particular strategy and objectives different than Israel's. While Israel wants to gain the most possible territory with the least amount of casualties to facilitate entry of international force and disbandment of Hizbollah, Hizbollah is not concerned with territory, casualties or time and is simply interested in inflicting losses and casualties on the enemy. Israel is further concerned about "the day after" and the nature of a potential international PKO.

Hizbollah has rather extensive capabilities that Israel has not managed to eradicate, in part weaponry that it received from Iran, including some air capabilities.

Internally, Israeli Defense Minister has suggested that negotiations need to begin or military force exerted fully.

Quotes:

"There is a difference in strategy that we need to understand very well. At this point in time, what does Israel want? It wants to achieve as much as possible before the Security Council session next week. That's why they brought in reinforcements...it wants to achieve the most possible on land...to achieve a strong position to say 'we're on the ground, bring in international forces and move Hizbollah away.' So it wants speed in capturing land, to limit its human loss and before the Security Council decision. This is the opposite of Hizbollah's position. Hizbollah says 'I don't care about capturing land, but want freedom of movement throughout. Gang battles. Secondly, I don't care about losses, but [want] to impose painful losses on the enemy, human losses. Thirdly, I am not constrained by time, as long as a ceasefire is unconditional..."

Word Count:

1,560

Micro Classification:

Neutral Analysis. **Does not excite sympathies or identification** with any one party.

[**Neutral Attitude; Impact: 2** (Retired Egyptian general offers fairly neutral and moderate strategic analysis)].

(2) 14 August 2006 – Prospects of Ceasefire

---

Summary:

Hizbollah is not a terrorist organization but rather a liberation movement formed in response to the occupation.

The ceasefire resolution has some glaring weaknesses in that it calls for cessation of hostilities, not a ceasefire. Hizbollah will be more committed to it than will be Israel. The resolution will be carried out in stages and initially friction may continue until the Lebanese army and international forces are deployed. [Yitzhak Shamir is known as a wanted terrorist in a well-known British document.] Disarming Hizbollah will entail a process of negotiation between the Lebanese government and public and Hizbollah; Hizbollah however is an essential element of Lebanon.

Ariel Sharon is personally responsible for the Sabra and Shatila massacres as he observed it and made sure all roads leading to the area were blocked.

Lebanese troop deployment will take more than a month and in order to prevent Israeli massacres, Hizbollah personnel should be integrated into the army and should also act independently but in tandem with the Lebanese army. It should lastly as a reserve unit of the Lebanese army and redeploy itself when necessary.

Quotes:

"[Hizbollah] is a liberation movement that formed under and in reaction to an occupation. It is a liberation movement that formed under and in reaction to an occupation. And if we should refer to it as a terrorist organization, then we have to do the same with the French that fought the Nazis under Charles De Gaulle, the same with Ghandi and the British occupiers...We have to understand that Hizbollah is not the PLO...Hizbollah is part of the people, the ministries and the parliament. It is part of the social, political and economical structure of the south and no one can deny that fact or attempt to dissociate it from the Lebanese fabric...The way I see it, the only assurance against further [Israeli] massacres is total cooperation between Hizbollah and the government and the army."

Word Count:

613

Micro Classification:

Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2 (Retired Egyptian general's support of Hizbollah and attacks on Israel may suffer from the extremity of the position they convey, however are presented in clever, if highly misleading, moral and emotional appeals.

**Guest:**

Weissbrod, Amir. Israeli Foreign Ministry

**Program Participation:**

(1) 15 August 2006 - Internal Israeli Arena

Summary:

---

Resolution 1701 includes some very important elements, although implementation will be the watershed for all parties and a chance for the Lebanese government to prove itself as a proper government. While it does not reflect gains alone from Israel's perspective, its implementation is critical. Lebanese army deployment in the south and control of weapon flow will benefit the Lebanese people, while other components of the resolution benefit both Lebanon and Israel.

Israel has been interested in international force deployment from the outset; Hamas and Hizbollah should not determine the outcome of regional international relations; central governments, not militias, should dictate the rules of the game and oversee the achievement of regional peace.

Disarming the Hizbollah is indirectly mentioned in the Resolution and is an achievable, if challenging, aim.

Bashar al-Asad is not really interested in peace in the region; if he were he should stop supplying arms to Hizbollah and controlling Hamas.

The Israeli public is aware of Israel's continuing struggle for survival and as such demonstrates unbending support for the army. Internal criticism is part of democracy and stems from the clear and present danger to Israel's existence.

The Israeli FM did greatly influence the UN resolution, even if less publicly.

Quotes:

"...we...need to wait for implementation of the resolution, which I think is very important for the Lebanese government as well. This is its chance to prove that it is a true government and not just a group of sects...Deployment of the Lebanese army in the south and control of the flow of arms to Hizbollah will benefit the Lebanese people...We should not let Hamas or Hizbollah decide the new rules for the region, they should be prevented from hijacking the new peace process...we cannot let the rules of the game be dictated by militia forces. Central government should be in charge to establish peace in the region...We do have a lot to learn from this war and the criticism we are getting from the people of Israel is because we all know that there is a real danger to the existence of Israel and it is only democratic to have internal criticism..."

Word Count:

562

Micro Classification:

**Pro-Israel position: 2; Impact: 2** (Official government spokesperson obviously emerges from position of identification with Israel, however not in particularly passionate or persuasive terms.)

Guest:

Zabib, Muhammad. Economic Analyst, Lebanon.

**Program Participation:**

---

(1) 5 August 2006 – Economic Implications of War in Lebanon

Summary:

Imposing economic losses on Lebanon is an American-Israeli attempt to coerce Lebanon into accepting particular terms, as part of American vision for formatting a New Middle East. However, Lebanon is unified and will persevere.

Quotes:

"...just as Israel failed on the field militarily in breaking the resistance, it also faces thorough Lebanese unity and perseverance and another failure in forcing them to compromise and surrender under economic and human pressure."

Word Count:

136

Micro Classification:

Clearly intended to provoke **hostility toward the U.S. and Israel**. [**Anti-Israel Attitude: 2; Impact: 2** (Lebanese economic analyst suggests morally questionable Israeli and American combat techniques)].