A STUDY EXAMINING PERCEPTION AND KNOWLEDGE OF

CRIMINOLOGY/CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND POLITICAL

SCIENCE STUDENTS ON TERRORISM

AS IT PERTAINS TO THE

PALESTINIAN/ISRAELI

CONFLICT

by

MICHAEL ANDREW GOSSETT

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

August 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first express my appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Alejandro del Carmen for providing much needed guidance and assistance in the completion of this thesis. He constantly pushed me to challenge myself to overcome the struggles necessary to be successful. I would like to thank the entire Criminology department for their continual help and guidance on my thesis as well as for my overall education. I have truly appreciated the insight and wisdom offered to me by all of the professors within the department.

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Stickels and Dr. Polk for their generous time and support throughout this process. A special appreciation goes to Mark Saber for assisting me with SPSS. To Cathy, Pam, and Lindy: you are the ones who hold it all together and I am forever in your debt. To one of my best friends, Robert Harrison, for allowing me to vent my thesis frustrations in NYC – and still willing to be my friend afterwards – thanks.

Most importantly, thanks are in order to those who mean the most to me. This paper is a tribute to my parents who have always supported me and I'm proud to be able to show them my completed work. A huge thank you is due Chuck and Barbara Pascoe who have supported me in this endeavor as well and have provided me a great example to follow. Mostly however, thanks are due my wonderful wife Hilary. Without your constant love and support this paper never would have reached completion. I know this

and you know this. It is through you that I found the strength to complete this challenge. Words cannot express the admiration and respect that I have for you. I love you and look forward to facing the next adventure with you. Next stop: a little apartment in Silver Spring, Maryland and a few years at the University of Maryland – GO TERPS!!!.

June 23, 2007

ABSTRACT

A STUDY EXAMINING PERCEPTION AND KNOWLEDGE OF

CRIMINOLOGY/CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND POLITICAL

SCIENCE STUDENTS ON TERRORISM

AS IT PERTAINS TO THE

PALESTINIAN/ISRAELI

CONFLICT

Publication No. _____

Michael Andrew Gossett, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2007

Supervising Professor: Dr. Alejandro del Carmen

The purpose of this study is to examine perception and knowledge of Criminology/Criminal Justice and Political Science majors. University of Texas at Arlington students were asked to identify scenarios related to actions taken by both Palestinians and Israelis as they pertain to terrorism. The data in this study were obtained from a sample of UTA students enrolled in both Criminology/Criminal Justice and Political Science courses. These findings revealed that both CRCJ and Political

Science respondents share a similar propensity towards identifying terrorist acts. Additionally, the findings revealed a general lack of knowledge and familiarity with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and an acknowledged reliance on television media and the internet for primary information regarding the subject.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Present Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the knowledge and perception of CRCJ and Political Science students at the University of Texas at Arlington regarding terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. These two student populations will be asked to identify scenarios related to actions taken by both Palestinians and Israelis in order to determine their level of knowledge and perceptions regarding terrorism within the conflict.

The ability to fill the existing gap in current literature, regarding whether terrorism and terrorist actions are identifiable through concrete definition and observation or rather if identifications fluctuate based on public perception regarding the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, could have significant implications for scholars as well as criminal justice professionals. If the present study's findings reveal that students do have a concrete and definitive view and understanding of terrorist actions, then it could provide confirmation of the success of researchers within the terrorism field of study who attempt to clearly convey to the public what exactly constitutes terrorism. If however, the study's findings reveal that terrorist acts are identified in a more fluid manner based on the observer's preconceived ideas and perceptions, then researchers

within the field may feel the need to continue to strive for a universal manner in which to define the concept of terrorism.

In support of its primary focus, this study explores how the participant's perception and knowledge of the conflict has been formed. This information may provide insight as to how the defined acts of terrorism are actually viewed and filtered by the observer. It is believed that the strength of this study is that it demonstrates the utility of the effectiveness of Criminology/Criminal Justice curriculum in examining terrorism and terrorist acts as compared to Political Science curriculum in regard to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

1.2 Brief Historical Overview of the Conflict

"To say, as the great Jewish philosopher Martin Buber did in June 1947, that the Arab-Israeli conflict is over a land of two peoples is to grasp the essence of a problem that has been one of the most intractable, and tragic, in contemporary history" (Mendes-Flohr, 1983). When Martin Buber spoke these words, the State of Israel did not yet exist, though its declaration was not far away (Fraser, 2004). At the time Buber made this statement, the land was referred to as Filastin by its Arab inhabitants and Palestine by its British rulers. According to Fraser (2004), the fact that Arabs and Jews had different names for the land they shared reflected their totally different views of its past, present and future.

The rivalry and hatred between the Israeli and Palestinian people has raged for thousands of years (Tessler, 1994). To the Arabs, Palestine was an Arab land whose soil they had cultivated for generations; as such, it was entitled to independence as any

2

other Arab country (Fraser, 2004). To the Jews, Israel was a Jewish land that had been their inspiration throughout 18 centuries of dispersion, dispossession, and persecution; as such, its destiny was to be the fulfillment of their dreams of statehood (Fraser, 2004).

According to Harms and Ferry (2005), people often assume that the current conflict between the Israeli people and the Palestinian people originated in Biblical times and has continued to present day. While the histories of both the Palestinian people and the Jewish people are both long and often tragically intertwined, most people assume that this is a "thousand-year-old" conflict (Harms and Ferry, 2005). In fact, nothing could be further from the truth (Harms and Ferry, 2005). The current dilemma essentially centers on the fundamental fact that, since the creation of a British mandate in 1922, both Jewish and Palestinian nationalists have laid claim to the same geographic area that today is comprised of Israel, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, and a small portion of the Golan Heights (O'Neil, 1978).

At the end of the First World War in 1918, victory over Turkey left Britain in control of Palestine for the next 30 years, not as a colony but as a Mandate from the newly-established League of Nations (Fraser, 2004). The Palestine Mandate, approved in July 1922, was handicapped from the start due to the incompatibility of the British promises made during the war (Fraser, 2004). According to O'Neil (1978), over the course of the next two decades the Zionists and Arabs clashed violently, not only with the Mandatory Power but also with each other.

With the successful proclamation of the State of Israel in May 1948, Palestine seemed to have disappeared from the map of the Middle East, but the Palestinians did

not disappear and the quarrel remained (Fraser, 2004). Many subsequent wars, violence and reprisal, and years of diplomatic stalemates and complex negotiations have merely confirmed that the intensity of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has remained undiminished (Fraser, 2004).

<div style="text-align:center">1.3 Understanding Terrorism</div>

According to Hoffman (2004), "terrorism is a military technique of the disenfranchised meek and terrorist groups might be thought of as quasi-military units. However, there are essential differences between terrorism and war. First, terrorism relies on the psychological effect more than the physical, and needs an audience. Second, terrorism often targets non-combatant, non-governmental civilians". In contrast, modern state militaries develop weapons to avoid collateral damage and, while not always successful; civilians are not usually the primary target (Hoffman, 2004).

According to Laqueur (1999), no one can develop a composite picture of a terrorist because no such picture exists. Terrorism fluctuates over time and the profile of terrorism changes with circumstances (Laqueur, 1999). Laqueur (1999), explains that because of the fluid nature of terrorism there can be no terrorist mosaic because of the different types of terrorism. Terrorism is a political phenomenon different from ordinary crime of psychopathology (Laqueur, 1999).

According to Marks (2006), terrorism today claims greater attention for two-reasons. Present-day practitioners of terrorism have introduced a new scale of violence, which threatens not only specific fragile national governments but also the stability of the international state system, including developments such as globalization (Marks,

<div style="text-align:center">4</div>

2006). Modern technology and globalization, itself, make this possible (Marks, 2006). Second, terrorism as a tactic has been increasingly adopted by the growing number of nationalist insurgents around the world (Marks, 2006). According to Marks (2006), terrorism is, therefore, now more strategic in character.

1.4 Role of Media

Davison (1983), suggested that "In some cases, a communication leads to action not because of its impact on those to whom it is ostensibly directed, but because others (third persons) think it will have an impact on the audience". In recent years, scholars have revisited this idea and documented effects of presumed media influence in various aspects of social life (Gunther and Storey, 2003). According to Slone (2000), most individuals do not assess threat to personal and national security on the basis of direct experience but rather on the basis of more indirect forms of exposure.

Harms and Ferry (2005) state that "the view that most Americans have of the "Middle East" comes from sound bites on television or newspaper accounts both of which amounts to scorecards of the dead". According to Herman and Chomsky (1988) and Lee (1990), it is widely acknowledged that political media broadcasts are seldom ideologically neutral and are often perceived by viewers to be biased. Many works have sought to show that the news is not a neutral and natural phenomenon, but rather a manufactured production of ideology (Korn, 2004). According to Philo (1995), these analyses assert that news media are inherently and consistently biased in favor of those occupying powerful positions in a particular society, presenting accounts of events within structures and frames shaped by the dominant values and interests of that society.

Herman and Chomsky (1988), assert that the mass media serve as a system for communicating messages and symbols to the general populace. According to Herman and Chomsky (1988), the media's function is to inform as well as to socialize individuals and integrate them into the institutional structures of the larger society. Similarly, other scholars have argued that the mainstream media in the United States tends to reflect the agenda and views expressed in the mainstream government debate (Korn, 2004).

Inspection of terrorist acts and their associated media coverage in different countries reveals many examples of the high motivation of each side in this dyad to achieve its objectives by exploiting the other (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). To begin to remedy this, Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), propose that the media should formulate a set of ethical codes or clearly defined guidelines to ensure restrained and cautious coverage of terrorist incidents. Liebes and Kampf (2007) state that, "as a result of current media practices, coverage has turned from black and white to shades of gray in which the traditional villain is not exclusively evil and the hero is not exclusively righteous".

<div align="center">1.5 Public Perceptions</div>

Polner and Simms (2002) assert that, "on the surface, little has changed since those years when Americans, including Washington's foreign-policy elite, lent support to Israel because of the Holocaust and the cold war, while saying to Israelis and Palestinians, you're both right, but leave us out of your fight". According to Saad (2007), for the nearly 20 years that Gallup polls have been tracking American's

sympathies in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, more Americans have continually sided with the Israelis. As reported in a Gallup Affairs survey updated February 4, 2007, that remains the case today, as a solid majority of Americans (58%) say their sympathies lie with the Israelis and only 20% say their sympathies are more with the Palestinians (Saad, 2007).

Despite much more favorable views of the Israelis than the Palestinians, as evidenced by recent Gallup polls, Americans are only slightly more likely to say the United States should exert more pressure on the Palestinians than on the Israelis to make the necessary compromises to reach a peace agreement (Jones, 2007). According to Jones (2007), while Americans have tended to be more pessimistic than optimistic about Middle East peace, there have been times when optimists outnumbered pessimists, usually in response to events. In May 2003, a slight majority of Americans, 51%, thought Arab-Israeli peace was possible just before President George W. Bush held high-level talks with Israeli and Palestinian leaders to discuss the "road map for peace" (Jones, 2007). Jones (2007), reports that optimism proved to be short-lived however, as escalating violence between the two sides soon followed.

According to Helm (2001), a battle to change American minds concerning their pessimism towards the conflict must begin, because if opportunities for change are missed, there is little doubt that suicide bombers will continue to spring from the refugee camps of Gaza and the West Bank. Helm (2001), states that, "as the conflict continues unabated without the possibility for a permanent peace agreement, the potential grows for an increasingly larger and wider pool of Islamic militancy to form".

According to Manning (1994), every American has a stake in peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Manning (1994), asserts that perhaps on no other foreign conflict has the United States expended so much diplomatic effort and emotional commitment. As explained in a letter written by several former U.S. foreign diplomats, "because the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is at the core of the problems in the Middle East, the entire region – and the world – will rejoice along with Israelis and Palestinians when the killing stops and peace is attained" (Killgore, Curtiss, Held, Carolan, Bernier, Kruse, et al. 2004).

<p style="text-align:center">1.6 Definitions</p>

To ensure a better understanding of frequently used terms in the study, the author has defined several terms with meanings derived from general sources. Listed are some definitions to assist in clarity of the study:

- *TERRORISM* - In this study, terrorism is defined by the definition provided by the scholar Alex Schmid (1983) and the definition provided by the U.S. State Department as listed in title 22 of the U.S. code section 2656.

- *PALESTINE* - For the purposes of this study, Palestine refers to the Palestinian territories which consist of areas governed by the Palestinian Authority including the West Bank and the Gaza Strip (Tessler, 1994).

- *ISRAEL* - A country in the Western Asian Levant, on the southeastern edge of the Mediterranean Sea. It borders Lebanon on the north, Syria and Lebanon on the east, and Egypt on the southwest. The State of Israel was created in 1948 and is the world's only Jewish state (Tessler, 1994).

- *ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT* - An ongoing dispute between two peoples, Jewish Israelis and Arab Palestinians, that both claim the right to sovereignty over the Land of Israel/Palestine in whole or in part. This particular conflict can be traced to the late 19th century when Zionist Jews expressed a desire to create a modern state in their ancient homeland, and purchased land in the region then controlled by the Ottoman Empire (Tessler, 1994).

- *UTA STUDENTS* - Undergraduate or graduate students at the University of Texas at Arlington enrolled and attending on-site classes at the central campus. CRCJ majors are students, both undergraduate and graduate, with a declared major of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Non-CRCJ majors are students not majoring in Criminology and Criminal Justice and for the specific purposes of this study, non-CRCJ students of interest are those with a declared major in Political Science.

- *PERCEPTION* - For the purposes of this study refers to an attitude or understanding, based on what is thought, observed, or interpreted about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and towards potential acts of terrorism that have occurred within the conflict.

- *EXAMINE* for the purposes of this study means to observe or to test the condition of something as well as to inquire into and investigate results of voluntary respondents of this study's survey instrument.

1.7 Plan of Presentation

In Chapter Two, the author will present a literature review of current research that will provide the reader with an understanding of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, terrorism, the role of media within the conflict, and public perception regarding the conflict. The literature review will specifically address the historical background of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as well as the present day status of the conflict. Chapter Two will next review the literature pertaining to the history of terrorism, the definition of terrorism, and terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Additionally, the literature review will expound on the role of the media in relation to terrorism, and the conflict, and will look at the effects of the media influence. The literature review will conclude with an illustration of the public perception concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

In Chapter Three, the author will discuss the methodology of this thesis. This chapter will include a discussion concerning the sample population, sampling procedure, and analysis. The author will discuss the material which was selected for the study as well as the process of completing this study. This chapter will also include the construction and administration of the survey instrument as well as a review of the Internal Review Board process.

In Chapter Four, the author will present the results of the study beginning with a demographics overview of survey respondents. The author will discuss further issues related to the findings of the survey while highlighting any statistically significant differences between the responses from UTA students majoring in CRCJ and students

majoring in Political Science. In Chapter Five, the author will conclude the thesis with

a discussion on potential policy implications and future areas of study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

As evidenced by the tremendous amount of literature on the subject, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has fascinated scholars, students, diplomats, and citizens throughout the world for many reasons including: its complexity, the tenacious nature of the struggle and conflict, the strong passions that it inflames, and because of its religious overtones. Regardless of the reasons as to why the conflict stirs so much passion and discussion, the conflict itself has been exhaustively researched, studied, analyzed, and documented. There are numerous books, papers, and research studies devoted to explaining the origins and history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

This literature review references many of these resources and begins by providing a historical background for understanding the conflict. Secondly, terrorism within the conflict will be examined in order to determine how terrorism and terrorist acts are defined, identified, and perceived by the American people in general. Next, an overview of current public knowledge of both the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and of terrorism will be provided. Finally, public perception of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the terrorism that occurs within the course of the conflict will be discussed in an effort to examine if perception affects how terrorism is identified and defined. Each of these components will be presented in order to establish the foundation for the current study's empirical research goals.

2.1.1 Long-term Historical Overview

In order to create an informed assessment regarding terrorism pertaining to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, it is important to understand the historical context in which this conflict has developed. The origins of the present day Palestinian – Israeli conflict lay in land ownership (Harms and Ferry, 2005). The Palestinian peasants under the Ottoman Empire did not register their land by themselves and fearing taxation and conscription they left "ownership" to Arab and Turkish "notables" (Harms and Ferry, 2005). When Zionist Jews started arriving in large numbers around 1900 they purchased the land from the registered owners and proceeded to farm it themselves using newly discovered agricultural methods that made the land much more productive (Harms and Ferry, 2005).

Marcus (2007), reveals that in Ottoman Jerusalem, families of different religions picnicked together at popular shrines and that Muslims and Jews were business partners and neighbors. However, Marcus (2007) focuses on the year 1913 as the turning point when, leaders at the Zionist Congress argued for both cultural and demographic domination of Palestine, while at the same time Jews and Arabs were negotiating a possible peace. According to Harms and Ferry (2005), after World War I more Jews arrived and the violence began and continues to this day.

In a review of the subject, Fraser (2004), reveals that the Ottoman Empire entered the First World War on the side of the Germans. During the war, Britain encouraged the Arabs to revolt against the Turks and to join in the fighting on the side

of the Ottoman Empire's enemies (Tessler, 1994). According to Tessler (1994), the

British promised to support the emancipation of the Arabs if the latter would become

their allies in the war. In 1915, the head of the Arab nationalists, Sherif Hussein, and

the British High Commissioner in Cairo, Sir Henry McMahon, negotiated an agreement

(Fraser, 2004). Fraser (2004), explains that Sir Henry McMahon gave what the Arabs

believed to be important pledges on their future independence in return for their help

against the Turks. According to Fraser (2004), these pledges contained a specific

exclusion:

> The two districts of Mersina and Alexandretta and portions of Syria lying to the
> west of the districts of Damascus, Homs, Hama,, and Aleppo cannot be said
> to be purely Arab, and should be excluded from the limits demanded.

While the Arabs assumed that this referred to portions of what became Syria and

Lebanon, the British later claimed that the excluded area was Palestine, despite the fact

that neither 'Palestine' nor 'Jerusalem' appeared in any of the documents (Fraser, 1980;

Fromkin, 1989). This was to become a bitter source of controversy (Fraser, 2004).

According to Tessler (1994), the Arabs were satisfied by the terms of their

negotiation with the British and began their revolt against the Turks in 1916. The Arabs

were assisted in the revolt by a number of British liaison officers including T.E.

Lawrence who soon came to be known as "Lawrence of Arabia" (Tessler, 1994).

By the summer of 1917 the British government had begun to look at the Zionist

movement as another possible ally in a war which seemed to be going badly for the

Allies on all fronts (Fraser, 2004). The result of this need for an additional ally in the

war proved to be the issuance to the British Zionist Federation in 1917 of the Balfour

Declaration (Fraser, 2004). On November 2, 1917, the British Foreign Secretary, Arthur J. Balfour, indicated in a written declaration that Britain viewed with favor the establishment of a national home for the Jews so long as it did not prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine (O'Neil, 1978).

At the conclusion of the First World War, Britain was given control of Palestine for the next 30 years by the League of Nations (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), the terms of the Mandate of Palestine were that Britain was to be:

> responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion.

The problems associated with such a policy had already surfaced in the form of serious Arab disturbances in 1920 and 1921, directed both at British rule and Jewish settlement (Fraser, 2004).

The Balfour Declaration was made without consultations with the Arabs (Fabian, 2002). According to Fabian (2002), until the 67-word long Balfour Declaration was issued there was no Arab-Jewish tension. When the immigration of Jews increased, and when it became clear that the Jews wanted the whole of Palestine for themselves, communal tension increased (Fabian, 2002).

Jewish immigration into Palestine had started in the 1880's (Fabian, 2002). According to Fabian (2002), the Jewish Agency gave the following figures to the United Nations in 1947 for the Jewish population in Palestine:

Table 1.1 – Jewish Population in Palestine as of 1947 (Ovendale, 2004)

Year	Jewish Population
1900	50,000
1930	165,000
1939	475,000
1947	630,000

According to O'Neil (1978), the vigorous efforts of the Zionists and continued

immigration following the Balfour Declaration increased tensions in the area. Tessler

(1994), states that nothing was more important to the development of the Jewish

homeland in Palestine than immigration, and nothing was more central to the Arab's

fear of Zionism.

Fraser (2004), explains that Palestine was mostly peaceful between 1922 and

1928, when violence reappeared as disturbances erupted between Jews and Arabs at the

Western Wall in Jerusalem. In August 1929, confrontations at the Western Wall

resulted in the deaths of 133 Jews and 116 Arabs (Fraser 2004). It was then that Britain

attempted to refine its policy in Palestine by identifying Arab fear of Jewish

immigration and land purchase as the root of the difficulties (Fraser, 2004). The

Palestine issues once again stabilized until the ascension of Adolf Hitler in 1933 and the

subsequent mass immigration of Jews into Palestine due to immigration restrictions into

the United States, Great Britain, and Australia (Fraser, 2004).

According to Tessler (1994), the six year period from 1933 until the outbreak of

World War II was characterized by steadily mounting unrest and disorder in Palestine.

These years, particularly the period from 1936 to 1939, are described as the era of the

Arab Revolt in which the movement hoped to pressure the British to reduce their support of the Jews (Tessler, 2004). Fraser (2004), explains that the beginning of World War II created the need for the British to secure Arab goodwill because Britain needed to secure oil from the Middle East and because Palestine was tying down a large number of troops. According to Fraser (2004), the White Paper of 1939, proposed by British Colonial Secretary Malcolm MacDonald, conceded that Palestine would be independent in 10 years' time as a unified state and that Jewish immigration would be limited to 75,000 for the first five years and would later be contingent on Arab consent.

The Jews also organized underground militia groups during this time period such as the Irgun and Lehi in which to fight the British and the Arabs in attempts to secure a permanent homeland (Fraser, 2004). Both the Lehi and Irgun were right wing organizations full of supporters of Zionism who declared war on the Mandate proclaiming that Britain had betrayed the Jewish people through immigration restrictions and the controversial White Paper of 1939 (Silver, 1984). Furthering the intensity of the Jewish intention for securing a homeland was the horrifying human tragedy taking place during World War II (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), "the Holocaust and all events that surrounded this tragedy are fundamental to any understanding of the Arab-Israeli conflict." They led to what the American Department of State described as a 'cosmic' urge on the part of survivors to secure a Jewish state (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), they also meant that in the future Jewish leaders would think long and hard about embarking on any policy that might lead their people to another such tragedy.

O'Neil (1978), explains that, "of the two nationalist movements, the Zionist was by far the more successful in that it proved able to create and sustain, although not without considerable effort and cost, a Jewish state (Israel)." The Palestinians, by contrast, were denied concrete expression of their nationalism in the form of an independent state, because, unlike their Zionist adversary, they were plagued by poor organization, strategic miscalculations, and a lack of resources (O'Neil, 1978).

In the aftermath of World War II, Britain decided to turn what seemed to be an unsolvable problem over to the United Nations (O'Neil, 1978). At that time, the United Nations was a relatively compact body of fifty-five members (Chai, 1991). After several months of intensive and skillful lobbying by the Zionists, the UN approved a partition plan on November 29, 1947 which made provisions for both Jewish and Palestinian states (O'Neil, 1978). When the Palestinians rejected the plan, fighting ensued between the two sides and Zionists seized the initiative to acquire weapons and training their forces necessary to not only defend their communities but also to sustain a state that would be established after the British withdrew in May 1948 (O'Neil, 1978).

According to Chai (1991), the first major Arab-Israeli conflict resulted from the Arab refusal to accept the UN's partition plan. Chai (1991), explains that Great Britain ended its Mandate on May 14, 1948 and at midnight the Zionists proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel.

2.1.2 Historical Overview: 1948 – Present Day

One day later, the armies of five neighboring Arab states --- Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, Syria, and Saudi Arabia --- invaded Palestine (Chai, 1991). According to Fraser (2004), "the coalition of Arab League states which intervened in Palestine on May 15, 1948 was neither united in its purpose nor adequately prepared for war." In the ensuing conflict, the Israelis successfully secured their new state's existence and occupied twelve of the Arab quarters in modern Jerusalem (Chai, 1991). Chai (1991), reveals that they gained approximately 30 percent more territory than had been assigned to the Jewish state under the UN partition plan. Ovendale (2004), argues the real victims were the Palestinian Arabs. In 1949 the legally certified number of Palestinian refugees was almost 1 million (Ovendale, 2004). The refugees went to Gaza, Jordan, 100,000 to Lebanon, 70,000 to Syria, and smaller numbers to Iraq and Egypt (Ovendale, 2004).

Chai (1991) states that, "for the Palestinians, the 1948 war inaugurated the frustration of exile and the despair of stifled ambition. They became the dispossessed of the Middle East". According to Fraser (2004), to the Palestinians, the events of 1948-1949 became known as *al-Nakba,* 'the catastrophe'.

Chai (1991), explains that a second major Arab-Israeli conflict was weakened by Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal on July 26, 1956 in response to the withdrawal of the U.S. offer of financial support for the Aswan High Dam. Britain and France enlisted Israel's participation in invading the Sinai Peninsula and drove the Egyptian troops out of the Gaza Strip and the Sinai Desert (Chai, 1991). Chai (1991), states that universal condemnation of the Anglo-

FrenchIsraeli action compelled the withdrawal of the invading forces and the establishment of a United Nations Emergency Force along the Gaza frontier. Israel, however, gained freedom of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba (Chai, 1991). According to Fraser (2004), for the next 10 years Israel's borders were relatively stable and, despite the continuing high cost of defense, the country's economy moved steadily ahead.

In the immediate aftermath of the Suez Crisis, the people who felt most cheated by what had happened were the Palestinians (Fraser, 2004). Ovendale (2004) states that, "since 1949, there had been a growing suspicion that the Arab governments were not really much exercised by the fate of the Palestinians, but would manipulate them if it suited them." According to Fraser, discussions among young Palestinians in 1957 and 1958 led to a political revival. In 1959 the formation of Fatah, its name derived from reversing the initials of 'The Movement for the Liberation of Palestine', proclaimed the revival of Palestinian political awareness (Fraser, 2004). The leader of the Fatah organization was a man named Yasser Arafat and in 1964 at the Arab summit in Cairo, Egypt, an official Palestinian political entity was recognized (Ovendale, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), in May 1964 the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) came into existence as a voice for the Palestinian people. The PLO's activities were governed by the Palestine National Charter which basic premise was the 'partition of Palestine in 1947 and the establishment of Israel are entirely illegal' (Fraser, 2004).

According to Ovendale (2004), the settlement that ended the Suez-Sinai war of 1956 provided the pretext for the June 1967 War. The war of 1967 was to prove as

decisive in its consequences as that of 1948-1949 (Fraser, 2004). The war left Israel firmly in control of all the land of mandatory Palestine, as well as extensive Egyptian and Syrian territory, and shifted the balance of Middle East power strongly in an Israeli direction (Fraser, 2004).

According to Chai (1991), "on June 5,1967 Israel, in a lightning move, first destroyed the bulk of the Egyptian air force, then pushed through the Sinai Peninsula to break the Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, and once again put its soldiers on the bank of the Suez Canal. In the east, the Israelis ousted Jordanian troops from the Old City and seized control of all Jordanian territory west of the Jordan River". In six days (June 5-10), Israel established itself as a military power in the region, but this time its forces refused to withdraw from occupied territories as they had in the 1956 conflict (Chai, 1991).

On November 22, 1967 the UN Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 242 (Chai, 1991). Despite its ambiguity, it ranks, along with the Partition Plan of 1947, as one of the most important United Nations resolutions addressed to the Arab-Israeli conflict (Tessler, 1994). According to Fraser (2004), Resolution 242 has been the basis of all subsequent peace plans. Resolution 242 called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Arab areas; and end to the state of belligerency; acknowledgement of and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every nation in the area; the establishment of "secure and recognized boundaries"; a guarantee of freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; and a just settlement of the refugee problem (Chai, 1991).

On October 6, 1973 Israel was almost taken by surprise (Ovendale, 2004). Chai (1991), explains that, "with unprecedented Arab solidarity and newly acquired sophisticated Soviet weapons, the Egyptians and Syrians crossed the Suez Canal and attacked a hard-pressed but resourceful Israeli army on October 6, 1973, the Jewish holy day of Yom Kippur." Fraser (2004), states that because of the ferociousness and unity of the Arab forces, the Israelis were well aware that this war was unlike any of its predecessors. The invading force broke through Israel's fortifications and continued into the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights (Chai, 1991).

For the first time, the Arabs used oil as a political weapon against Israel and the United States by announcing a 5 percent reduction in the flow of oil to the United States and other countries supporting Israel (Chai, 1991). Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy" was instrumental in bringing about a ceasefire between Egypt and Israel on October 27, 1973 (Chai, 1991). Kissinger's agreement with the Soviet leadership, embodied in Security Council Resolution 338, was that the two sides would observe a ceasefire in the positions that they then occupied (Fraser, 2004). The Geneva Conference on Arab-Israeli peace was convened in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 338, which called for the implementation of Resolution 242 (Chai, 1991).

According to Ovendale (2004), President Carter invited Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin to Camp David in September 1978. The Camp David Summit, which took place from September 5 – September 17, 1978 was an attempt by President Carter to capitalize on the beginning stages of a peace

process initiated by the Egyptian President (Fraser, 2004). Ovendale (2004), explains that, "after twelve days of negotiations two "frameworks" were agreed upon: the 'Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace between Egypt and Israel' and the more problematic 'Framework for Peace in the Middle East'". The framework concerning peace between Egypt and Israel led to the signing of the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty on March 26, 1979 (Fraser, 2004). This treaty led to the mutual recognition of each country by the other, cessation of the state of war that had existed since the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, and the withdrawal of Israeli civilians and armed forces from the Sinai Peninsula as it returned to Egyptian control (Tessler, 1994).

According to Tessler (1994), the Israeli government had no intention of allowing the Camp David accords to lead to an Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza (Tessler, 1994). The Camp David summit had deliberately left the final status of the West Bank and Gaza unresolved (Tessler, 1994). The Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza saw Camp David as the ultimate betrayal by their most powerful ally, condemning them to permanent Israeli military occupation (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), their view was widely shared in the Middle East.

The Camp David accords had incensed the PLO that was operating from southern Lebanon (Ovendale, 2004). By 1975, the Palestinian refugees within Lebanon's borders numbered 300,000 and were effectively an informal state-within-a-state operating from South Lebanon (Ovendale, 2004). With continuing frequency, violence erupted between the PLO in South Lebanon and the Israeli army due to PLO forces frequently firing rockets at northern Israeli settlements (Fraser, 2004). In July

1981, the Americans arranged a ceasefire and, although this had been observed, many Israelis felt nervous about the PLO's accumulation of weapons in southern Lebanon (Fraser, 2004).

On June 3, 1982 the Palestinian militant group Fatah-The Revolutionary Council attempted to assassinate the Israeli ambassador to London (Tessler, 1994). On June 6, 1982 Israel responded with a full-scale invasion of Lebanon in an effort to drive out the PLO, initially from South Lebanon and then altogether (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), by August 1982 the PLO withdrew its forces from Lebanon with assistance from the United States to Damascus. With the removal of the PLO fighters, combat in Lebanon ceased but Israeli forces remained (Fraser, 2004). The majority of Israeli forces were withdrawn from Lebanon in January 1985, leaving behind a small force to establish a security zone to protect Israel's northern settlements (Fraser, 2004).

The First Intifada, or Palestinian uprising, refers to a series of violent incidents between Palestinians and Israelis between 1987 and 1991 (Tessler, 1994). According to Ovendale (2004), "there was a growing sense of frustration among Palestinians, particularly on the West Bank, but also in Gaza, at the lack of progress in finding a durable resolution for their humanitarian and nationalistic claims after the establishment of Israel in 1948 and the Six-Day War in 1967". Spontaneous and widespread protest demonstrations erupted in December 1987, showing that Palestinians under occupation had in fact lost neither the political will nor the capacity to challenge Israeli government policies (Tessler, 1994). The Intifada, also known as the "war of the stones", which

broke out on December 8, 1987 was not planned but a culmination of all these factors (Fraser, 2004).

According to Ovendale (2004), it was sparked by an Israeli army vehicle in the Gaza Strip crashing into a truck with Palestinian workers, causing four deaths. The funerals became massive demonstrations and Israeli soldiers opened fire in the Jabalya refugee camp and a youth was killed (Tessler, 1994). Over the following days, unrest spread across the Gaza Strip and then into the West Bank (Fraser, 2004). According to Ovendale (2004), "it soon became clear that the scale of what was happening far surpassed any previous form of protest in the Occupied Territories and that the Israeli authorities were not well prepared to deal with it". Even Yassir Arafat and the PLO were slow to grasp the significance of the uprising (Ovendale, 2004). Fraser (2004), states that, "the PLO quickly moved to establish authority over the Intifada by sponsoring provocateurs and enhancing their image in the territories and amongst the Palestinian people". The PLO was also driven to action because of the growth of rival organizations Hamas and the Islamic Resistance Movement which also struggled to emerge as leaders of the Intifada and leaders of the Palestinian people (Fraser, 2004). According to Tessler (1994) by the time the Oslo Accords were signed in 1993, 1,162 Palestinians and 160 Israelis had been killed.

The Oslo Accords were finalized in Oslo, Norway on August 20, 1993 and subsequently officially signed at a public ceremony in Washington D.C. on September 13, 1993 with Yasser Arafat signing for the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Yitzchak Rabin signing for the State of Israel in the presence of President Bill Clinton

(Fraser, 2004). The principles of the accord were that the Israeli government would recognize the PLO as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people while the PLO recognized the right of the state of Israel to exist and renounced terrorism, violence, and its desire for the destruction of Israel (Fraser, 2004). According to Ovendale (2004), the accords also called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from parts of the Gaza Strip and West Bank and affirmed a Palestinian right of self-government within those areas through the creation of a Palestinian Authority. Palestinian rule would last for a five year interim period during which a permanent agreement would be negotiated (Ovendale, 2004).

According to Fraser (2004), it soon became clear that, despite goodwill and international acclaim, the Oslo Accords faced strong opposition from both Israelis and Palestinians. Many Israelis did not support the Accords because they did not believe the Palestinians were sincere in their efforts to reach a peaceful resolution with Israel nor did they believe they should give up land in the face of Palestinian violence (Ovendale, 2004). The PLO and Yasser Arafat faced opposition from Palestinian groups who wanted no compromise with Israel (Ovendale, 2004). Fraser (2004), explains that together with the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, Hamas was to provide the front line of Palestinian opposition to the Oslo process. Its tactics were to resort to violence in order to provoke an Israeli response, and hence discredit the PLO's concessions.

Ovendale (2004), reveals that "in the Palestinian autonomous regions on the West Bank, economic decline and frustration meant that an increasing number of Palestinians deserted the PLO for Hamas". In October and November 1994, a series of

terrorist incidents mounted by Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad against Israelis in Israel led to Arafat detaining Hamas activists, Israeli reprisals, and counterreprisals by the Islamic organizations (Ovendale, 2004). Moves towards implementing the second stage of the Oslo Accords took place against the background of terrorist attacks on Israelis and further Israeli settlement programs in the occupied territories, including plans to seize Arab-owned land in East Jerusalem to construct Jewish neighborhoods and facilities (Ovendale, 2004).

On November 4, 1995 Israeli Prime Minister Yitzchak Rabin was assassinated at a peace rally in Tel Aviv (Fraser, 2004). Rabin was murdered by Yigal Amir, a Jewish right-wing nationalist activist who opposed the peace process that Rabin had supported (Ovendale, 2004). Upon Rabin's assassination, the Prime Minister vacancy was immediately occupied by Shimon Peres who continued Rabin's peace plan (Fraser, 2004). Despite Rabin's death, on some levels the expectations of progress appeared to progress and on January 20, 1996 elections for the Palestinian Council were held in the West Bank and Gaza in which Yasser Arafat's position as President of the Palestinian Authority was confirmed by 88% of the electorate vote (Fraser, 2004).

According to Ovendale (2004), "despite the appearance of progress in the peace plan, the final talks of a permanent peace plan alluded to in the Oslo Accords were becoming less likely with each passing day filled with violence, retaliation, and suicide bombings". On May 29, 1996, amidst increasing Israeli doubts about the peace process as well as increasing violence, Benjamin Netanyahu was elected Prime Minister of

Israel (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), Netanyahu raised many questions about many central premises of the Oslo accords.

It appeared to the Palestinians and the Arab states that Netanyahu, and seemingly his ally, the United States had stalled the peace process (Ovendale, 2004). Fraser (2004), explains that during Netanyahu' leadership, tensions grew between Palestinians and Israelis as violence increased without any external signs of potential diplomatic resolutions. In fact, it was not until October 1998 that the next significant advance could be made when Arafat and Netanyahu came together at the Wye Conference Center in Maryland to sign the Wye Memorandum with President Clinton acting as witness (Fraser, 2004). According to Ovendale (2004), the Wye Memorandum saw that Israel would begin a phased withdrawal from an additional 13% of the West Bank in essentially a trade of land for security over a period of 12 weeks. The Palestinians agreed to identify and arrest alleged terrorists and confiscate their weapons while the American Central Intelligence Agency supervised (Ovendale, 2004). Fraser (2004), reports that the Palestinian National Council also agreed to eliminate all sections in the National Charter that called for the destruction of Israel as part of the Wye Memorandum.

After the implementation of the Wye agreement, Arafat and the PLO came under attack from both Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hamas who did not agree with the concessions to Israel (Ovendale, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), Prime Minister Netanyahu also came under assault from within his own political party by members of the cabinet who did not agree with the concessions to the Palestinian National Council.

28

On November 6, 1998 Palestinian Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility for a suicide bombing that killed 2 people and injured 25 in response to the Wye Agreements (Ovendale, 2004). As violence continued to escalate throughout 1998 and into 1999, the Israeli people chose to turn back to a Prime Minister who worked for a peace agreement an on May 17, 1999 Ehud Barak was elected (Fraser, 2004). According to Ovendale (2004), Barak worked diligently towards a peace agreement. Barak worked closely with President Clinton and in July 2000 met with Clinton and Arafat at the Camp David Summit 2000 (Fraser, 2004). The summit's intended purpose was to reach a "final status" of the problem but Yasser Arafat rejected a plan proposed by the United States and Israel (Ovendale, 2004).

Arafat's rejection of the proposed "final status" without offering a counter-offer is often seen as setting the stage for the al-Aqsa Intifada (Ovendale, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), the failure of the summit led to an undeniable rise in tension. The Israeli Government later accused Palestinian Authority of planning an uprising with the goal of regaining the political initiative (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), the al-Aqsa Intifada, or Second Intifada, began in late September 2000. On September 28, 2000 Ariel Sharon, leader of the Israeli opposition political party, led over 1,000 Israeli troops and police officers to the al-Aqsa compound in the Haram al-Sharif/Temple Mount, one of Islam's holiest sites (Ovendale, 2004).

The actual visit of Sharon was seen by many Palestinians as an attempt to assert Israeli sovereignty over an Islamic shrine, but only resulted in scuffles and the throwing of stones (Ovendale, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), the following day, unarmed

Palestinians held a massive demonstration in protest and, in response to the demonstrations, the Israeli police shot 7 Palestinians and wounded over 200. This sparked what Palestinians saw as a mass revolt, led by the Tanzim, an organization of Arafat's Al-Fatah movement (Ovendale, 2004). The Israeli leadership viewed the response as one orchestrated by Arafat as the first stage in a Palestinian war of independence (Ovendale, 2004). Israeli helicopter gunships and anti-tank missles struck apartment blocks in Gaza and snipers singled out individual Palestinians: by the end of October 2000, 127 Palestinians had been killed and 5,000 injured (Bregman, 2002).

Ovendale (2004), explains that the al-Aqsa Intifada had its roots in Palestinian frustration over the peace process. Amayreh (2002), states that, "to Palestinians, it increasingly seemed that Israel, with the connivance of the United States, had used the Oslo accords to consolidate its occupation of the West Bank, and even to institute South-African-style apartheid measures through its considerable increase in settlement activity, both with the building of further settlements as well as the expansion of existing ones, with Jewish-only bypass roads that cut through areas of Palestinian population and which served to isolate one Palestinian section from another". Unlike the Intifada of the late 1980's, the Palestinian security forces now had arms (Fraser, 2004). More critically, the suicide bomb was to become the weapon of resistance for those who felt they had no other option (Fraser, 2004).

According to Fraser (2004), "as the once potential peace process descended into a climate of violence, world opinion became shocked at the carnage". The sight of a

Palestinian boy dying in his father's arms in Gaza and of the lynching of two Israeli

soldiers in Ramallah reinforced the escalating violence taking place between Israeli

forces and the Palestinians (Ovendale, 2004). Ovendale (2004), reports that on

February 6, 2001, Ariel Sharon won the Israeli election held to choose the new Prime

Minister. Sharon pledged to maintain sovereignty over Jerusalem and increase the

number of Israeli settlements on the West Bank (Ovendale, 2004). Fraser (2004),

explains that the election of Sharon as Prime Minister, further infuriated Palestinians,

who viewed Sharon as a war criminal who had been in charge of a military unit in 1953

that had killed 66 Jordanians in the retaliatory Qibya raid. While Palestinians viewed

Sharon as a war criminal, Israelis viewed him as the hero of the settlers and the Israeli

right who would ensure the country's security.

In March of 2001, Hamas instituted a policy of using suicide bombers to strike

at the heart of the state of Israel (Ovendale, 2004). Following Arafat's demand for a

settlement based on international legitimacy, Sharon encircled Palestinian centers with

trenches and earth barricades (Ovendale, 2004). Settlers reacted to Palestinian attacks,

and Palestinians responded with suicide bombers (Ovendale, 2004). On March 29,

2001 Israel attacked Arafat's presidential guard in Gaza and at Ramallah (Ovendale,

2004).

According to Ovendale (2004), the United States supported Sharon's position

that before negotiations could start terrorism had to be reduced or ended. The Israeli

policy of assassination was not condemned, nor that of bombardment by helicopter

gunships supplied by the United States (Ovendale 2004). The policies of the United

States and Israel converged on the subject of the threat of 'international terrorism', and specifically of "Islamic terrorism" (Ovendale, 2004).

The year 2002 saw continued violence with escalating intensity on both sides (Fraser, 2004). On March 27, 2002 a Palestinian suicide bombing in the Park Hotel in Netanya killed 30 Israeli civilians (Fraser, 2004). This event became known as the Passover Massacre and Hamas claimed responsibility (Fraser, 2004). Acccording to Fraser (2004), this event triggered Israel's Operation Defensive Shield and "two days after the Passover Massacre, castigating Arafat as an enemy who was part of a coalition of terror against his country, Sharon announced that the Israel Defense Forces would conduct an extensive campaign against the centers of terrorism". According to Fraser (2004), the operation's initial target was Ramallah, where Arafat's headquarters were surrounded, effectively confining the President to a room.

After several years of the continuing cycle of violence and casualties, a potential breakthrough occurred in early 2003 (Ovendale, 2004). After learning of an Israeli intelligence report that Arafat himself had paid the Palestinian militant group al-Aqsa Martyr's Brigades $20,000, the United States demanded democratic reforms in the Palestinian Authority (Ovendale, 2004). The United States also demanded that the Palestinian Authority appoint a Prime Minister independent of Arafat (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), in March 2003 Arafat appointed the moderate Mahmoud Abbas as Palestinian Prime Minister to appease the United States. While Arafat controlled foreign policy, Abbas assumed responsibility for internal security and public order (Ovendale, 2004).

According to Fraser (2004), following the appointment of the new Prime Minister, the United States, as part of the Quartet, unveiled the Road Map for Peace. The Road Map for Peace was a plan to end the Israeli/Palestinian conflict by dissolving militant organizations, establishing a democratic Palestinian state, and putting and end to Israeli settlement expansion (Fraser, 2004). Prime Minister Abbas supported the proposed plan but seemed unable to successfully confront and stop militant organizations (Ovendale, 2004). In response to the proposed Road Map for Peace plan, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and al-Aqsa Martyr's Brigade, increased the frequency of their suicide bombings in an effort to nullify the proposed plan (Ovendale, 2004). In September 2003 Prime Minister Abbas resigned his position due to his belief that he could no longer rule effectively under Arafat (Fraser, 2004). According to Ovendale (2004), after the resignation of Abbas as Prime Minister, the Israeli government agreed that Arafat should be 'removed'.

On February 2, 2004 Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon announced a plan to transfer all Jewish settlers from the Gaza Strip and a withdrawal from the settlements (Ben-Ami, 2006). According to Ben-Ami (2006), Sharon's plan was known as the disengagement plan and was intended to prevent further escalation of violence and suicide bombings. Sharon's plan faced intense opposition from Israeli settlers and many members within his cabinet who viewed the plan as a reward for terror (Ben-Ami, 2006). Sharon's disengagement plan was put to a voter referendum and was adopted on June 6, 2004 under the revised conditions that the dismantling of each settlement would be voted on separately (Ben-Ami, 2006). According to Golan (2006), the

disengagement plan stated that all Israeli residents were to evacuate the Gaza Strip by August 15, 2005 or face eviction. The disengagement from the Gaza Strip was completed on September 12, 2005 when the last Israeli soldier left the area (Golan, 2006). Under the disengagement plan, 21 Jewish settlements in the Gaza Strip, and 4 Jewish settlements in the West Bank were evacuated and over 9,000 Jewish settlers were forced to leave their settlements (Golan, 2006).

During the year 2004, Yasser Arafat had been surrounded by Israeli forces in an essential prison or house arrest (Golan, 2006). Arafat's health had been failing for several months and on November 11, 2004 Arafat died (Ben-Ami, 2006). On January 9, 2005 Palestinian presidential elections were held and Mahmoud Abbas was elected as president of the Palestinian Authority (Ben-Ami, 2006). Ben-Amii (2006), explains that, "Abbas's platform was that of peaceful negotiation with Israel and non-violence, although while calling on militants to halt their violence he did not advocate their disarmament by force". According to Golan (2006), violence continued throughout the year 2005 despite a truce between the Israel and the Palestinian Authority. On February 28, 2005 at the Sharm el-Sheikh Summit of 2005, Sharon and Abbas agreed on a cease-fire truce while Jordan and Egypt acted as witnesses (Golan, 2006). Leaders of Hamas and Islamic Jihad maintained that the truce was non-binding to their members and continued their attacks on Israel despite attempts by Abbas to stop their continuing violence (Golan, 2006). Golan (2006), explains that support for the disengagement plan by Sharon was weakened by these unrelenting attacks on Israel, resulting in retaliatory attacks by the Israel Defense Forces.

34

The Palestinians held general elections for the Palestinian Legislative Council on January 25, 2006 (Golan, 2006). In a surprise turn of events, the Islamist group Hamas won with an unexpected majority of 74 seats compared to 45 seats by the incumbent Fatah organization (Golan, 2006). According to Golan (2006), Palestinians voted for Hamas partly out of disillusionment with the Fatah organization which is viewed as corrupt and motivated by greed and not Palestinians best interests. Hamas is officially recognized as a terrorist organization by the United States and the European Union and by gaining control over the Palestinian Authority it has jeopardized international funds because international laws forbid sponsoring terrorism (Golan, 2006). According to Golan (2006), the Hamas organization, known as a militant terrorist organization, must now learn to change its political actions to be able to successfully work with a moderate Palestinian president in Abbas and learn to coexist with the Fatah organization and most importantly, Israel.

<u>2.2 Present Day Conflict</u>

Due to the fact that the focus of this study directly relates to perception and knowledge regarding terrorism within the conflict as it currently exists, the following pages will provide the reader with an overview of the present day conflict. According to Kimmerling (2006), "many Palestinians and their ideological supporters consider Judaism only as a religion. As such, if the Jews are not a nation, or even an ethnic group, they have no legitimate claim over Palestine. Their demand to 'return' to their supposed fatherland is faulty and in any case not superior over the uprooted and disinherited Arab inhabitants of Palestine 48 years before". Kimmerling (2006),

35

explains that the Israeli counterclaim is that there never existed a coherent Palestinian people in history, there was never a formed Palestinian state, and most of Arabs living in British Palestine immigrated there following work opportunities created by Jewish immigration and British rule.

Kimmerling (2006), states that, "the Zionist historiography and sociography was presented as a national movement, exercising its "natural right" of self-determination by return to the ancestral motherland and the Arab and Palestinian perception is that this "return" was and still is a part of the global colonialist system, mainly of relocation of Europeans to non-European lands". The Zionist responses were: (a) the millenary longing of the Jews to their homeland, (b) their suffering of persecutions (including the Holocaust) during their dispersal in exile, and (c) the Jews lacked colonial power to settle and protect them (Kimmerling, 2006). The Palestinians' responses were that the British colonial rule supplied a security umbrella to the Jewish immigrant-settler community in their state-building efforts in Palestine, the World Zionist Organization, and other Jewish associations provided the financial and political support for the colonization project (Kimmerling, 2006).

Additionally, the Palestinians continue to question why they have to pay the price for European persecution of the Jews (Kimmerling, 2006). According to Bunzl (2005), the Arabs have traditionally regarded the Holocaust as a European event. Because they feel that Europeans were responsible, it is their view that Arabs should not "pay the price". The "price" usually was defined as the establishment and existence of the State of Israel at the expense of the Palestinians (Bunzl, 2005).

According to Hashemi (2006), "Muslims perceive Israel fundamentally as a European settler state formed on the ruins of Palestinian society. The ongoing Occupation of the West Bank, with its escalating settlement construction and human rights violations, serves as a constant reminder of the imperial impact of the region". Hashemi (2006), asserts that, "the conflict in Israel-Palestine today is perceived by Muslims as an in-your-face colonialism not from a bygone era, but of the present. The facts that the final borders of Israel-Palestine remain to be determined, that most of Israel's political leaders have been European, and that Israel is generously supported by a superpower, give the Israeli-Palestine conflict the decidedly colonial spin of powerful Europeans versus impoverished natives".

2.2.1 Zionism

Classical Zionism proclaimed the Jew's continuing and unbreakable tie to Palestine, to the territory they regarded as *Eretz Yisrael* (Tessler, 1994). According to Gorny (1987), the creation of a Jewish majority was the fundamental aim of Zionism, since the term "Jewish state" means a Jewish majority and Palestine will become a Jewish country at the moment when it has a Jewish majority. Within the Zionist ideological consensus there coexisted three relatively distinct tendencies – political Zionism, labor Zionism, and cultural Zionism (Finkelstein, 2003). According to Finkelstein (2003), "analogous assumptions informed the distinctive Zionist approach to the Jewish Question. Throughout the Diaspora, its adherents argued, Jews constituted an 'alien' presence amidst states 'belonging' to other, numerically preponderant, nationalities".

According to Finkelstein (2003), "political Zionism proposed that the Jewish nation resolve the Jewish Question by (re-) establishing itself in a state that "belonged" to it. For labor Zionism, the Jewish Question was not only the absence of a state but the class structure of the Jewish nation, which had become lopsided and deformed over the course of its long dispersion". According to Finkelstein (2003), "labor Zionism imbued the demand for a Jewish majority with a dual significance: first, it would ratify the Jew's rights to claim title to the state and second, it would signal their right to radically alter the demographic balance in Palestine, clearing the way for territorial concentration of the Jewish nation". Cultural Zionists wished to resolve not the 'problem of the Jews' but the 'problem of Judaism' in the modern world (Finkelstein, 2003). Finkelstein (2003), explains that, "the most pressing task for cultural Zionism, therefore, was to elaborate a *Weltanschauung* (world view) relevant to the contemporary world yet still bearing the unmistakable impress of the Jewish people's resplendent legacy".

According to Ovendale (2004), the Arabs in Palestine were conscious of this awakening. Between 1909 and 1914 nationalist opposition in Palestine to Zionism grew in the face of a growing fear that if the Jews conquered Palestine the territorial unity of the Arab world would be destroyed and the Arab cause weakened (Ovendale, 2004). What spurred the Palestinians' opposition to Zionism was not anti-Semitism, in the sense of an irrational or abstract hatred of Jews, but rather the prospect of their own expulsion.

According to Tilley (2005), "Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, was crippled at birth by a devastating internal contradiction. By

advocating Jewish control over the state in a land inhabited by indigenous non-Jews,

Zionism created an unsolvable conundrum: If the state were to be democratic, how

could it privilege Jews? If it were to be Jewish, how could it be democratic?"

According to Tilley (2005), early in Zionism's history, Jewish intellectuals clearly

identified the "Jewish-democracy" contradiction, warning that it would provoke

disaster. These intellectuals supported mass Jewish immigration to Mandatory

Palestine, but thought Jews should share state power with Arabs (Tilley, 2005).

Otherwise, they predicted, the indigenous population would resist, with awful

implications for all (Tilley, 2005).

2.2.2 Anti-Semitism

Chesler (2003), states that, "anti-Semitism has been an omnipresent factor in the

life of every Jew for thousands of years". According to Prager and Telushkin (1983),

> Jew-hatred and its latest incarnation, Israel-hatred, are the price Jews pay for
> their role in history. They pay it often unwillingly and they live the role, for the
> most part unwittingly. But as the great French Catholic theologian Jacques
> Maritain noted: "Israel is to be found at the very heart of the world's structure,
> stimulating it, exasperating it, moving it. Like an alien body, like an activating
> ferment injected into the mass, it gives the world no peace, it bars slumber, it
> teaches the world to be discontented and restless as long as the world has not
> God, it stimulates the movement of history. It is the vocation of Israel which the
> world hates.

According to Finkelstein (2003), "anti-Semitism was the natural impulse of an organic

whole 'infected' by a 'foreign' body (or too obtrusive a 'foreign' body)".

The Merriam-Webster International Dictionary (2004) even redefined the term "Anti-Semitism" in the following manner:

1) Hostility toward Jews as a religious or racial minority group, often accompanied by social, political, or economic discrimination
2) Opposition to Zionism
3) Sympathy with opponents of Israel

According to Cesarani (2002), "the omnipresence of anti-Semitism for Jews has altered the way some people view Zionism. Instead of seeing Zionism as a late 19th century secular, national liberation movement that aspired to build a socialist utopia in the ancestral homeland of the Jews, Israel was seen as merely a retort to European anti-Semitism and a bastion against the next wave of Nazis".

2.2.3 Question of Boundaries

Following the Camp David summit and the Oslo Accords, the next significant step towards attempting to reach a definitive peace and the establishment of permanent borders between Israel and Palestine is represented by the "road map" for peace plan (Fraser, 2004). According to Fraser (2004), the "road map" for peace plan was drawn up by the Quartet comprising the United States, Russia, the United Nations, and the European Union. In addition to mandating an immediate cessation of violence and terrorism, the Road Map also improves on the Oslo Accords by calling for an independent, democratic, and viable Palestinian state alongside Israel and a settlement that will end the occupation that began in 1967 (Fraser, 2004).

On June 4, 2003 the triumvirate of President Bush, Prime Minister Abu Mazan, and Prime Minister Sharon reaffirmed their commitment to the "road map" at the end of

their summit meeting in Aqaba, Jordan (Jones, 2003). According to Jones (2003), the more immediate map shaping Israel's political landscape was the one detailing the phased construction of the security fence in and around the West Bank. According to Jones (2003), while many Israelis welcomed the security fence, its construction encompassed Israeli settlements in doing so, cut across swaths of Palestinian land which isolated many villages and farmers from their fields. The old Green Line was 224 miles in length but the length of the security fence has been closer to 600 miles (Jones, 2003). According to Jones (2003), "the need to secure settlements inside Israel has meant a unilateral land grab from the Palestinians of up to ten percent of the West Bank".

2.2.4 Settlement Expansion

According to Patterson (2002), one of the central elements in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been the continuous encroachment of Israeli settlement on the territories Israel won in the 1967 war. Originally described to the Israeli public as a bargaining chip for peace, Patterson (2002), explains that, "the territories have become a new battleground in which Israeli settlers, supported and sponsored by the Israeli government; vie with Palestinians for control over a contested patrimony". According to Patterson (2002), while it is true that most American presidents have opposed settlement construction in the occupied territories, few have been successful at halting its progress. The number of settlers living in the occupied territories has doubled since the Oslo peace accords were signed in 1993, increasing from 200,000 to 400,000 (Patterson, 2002). Israeli expansion of settlements in the West Bank is a critical point of contention that raises in the minds of Palestinians serious questions about Israel's

ultimate intentions and about the huge effect the settlements will have on a future Palestinian state (Ben-Meir, 2006).

According to Finkelstein (2003), "Palestinian resistance has consistently focused on the twin juggernauts of Zionist conquest: Jewish settlers and Jewish settlements". According to Fraser (2004), "the ideological thrust behind government policy in the West Bank, and to a much lesser degree Gaza, was to build up the Jewish presence to such an extent that it would be indissolubly bound to the rest of the country". The key to this was land, access to which was largely secured through the old Ottoman concept of 'state land', continued during the British and Jordanian periods (Fraser, 2004). According to Ovendale (2004), by designating certain areas as 'state land', it is estimated that by 1987 Israel had secured just over 50 percent of the West Bank and 30 percent of the Gaza Strip.

Benvinisti (1995), offers that separating the Gaza Strip from Israel is easy and practical. The West Bank, however, is a different story as much of the land has been confiscated to build Jewish settlements, to connect existing ones, and to provide security for these scattered enclaves (Benvinisti, 1995). These settlements were built with an important overarching strategic concern, namely, to prevent through geography the possibility that a Palestinian state would ever emerge in the West Bank (Benvinisti, 1995).

To quote Michael Tarazi, member of the Palestinian Authority Negotiation Affairs Department, "most Palestinians believe the major obstacle to the creation of an independent Palestine is the presence of illegal settlers, who, he said, doubled in number

42

from 200,000 to 400,000 between 1993 and 2000" (Pasquini, 2002). According to Peace Now, 34 new illegal settlements were built on occupied Palestinian land in 2001, the first year of Ariel Sharon's term as Israeli prime minister.

According to Patterson (2002), the perception amongst both Palestinians and Israelis is that Ariel Sharon is the architect of the settler movement, which began after the 1967 war. Sharon is perceived as the practical engineer of the idea that there is no room for the Arabs to live between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea in their own political entity (Patterson, 2002). According to Michael Tarazi, "Sharon's ambition is to cement Israeli control over all the land of what he calls Greater Israel" (Pasquini, 2002).

The seemingly relentless expansion of settlements that began in the 1990's undermined the Palestinians faith in the peace process, especially as the expansion threatened to destroy any prospect of a contiguous Palestinian state (Fraser, 2004). Patterson (2002) contends that, "while dismantling settlements may be unpopular with the Israeli population, peace requires an end to the settlements".

A growing number of Americans who deeply sympathize with Israel have spoken eloquently of the need to recognize that Israel has committed severe human rights violations against the Palestinian people through its nearly 40 year military occupation and theft of Palestinian land for Israeli settlements (Niva, 2007). Niva (2007) contends that, while extremely critical of Palestinian terrorism, they conclude that peace with security is not possible until Israel ends the injustices. According to Cromer (2006), an increasing number of Israelis' have voiced their view that the

growing number of people living below the poverty line and the widening social gap

may diminish Israel's resilience and as a result, strengthen the terrorists' determination

to continue their armed struggle against the Jewish state.

2.3 Terrorism in the Israel/Palestine Conflict

This part of the literature review will be devoted to the concept of terrorism and

terrorist acts. Beginning with an overview of the definition of terrorism and the

difficulties that scholars have had in reaching a universal definition, this section will

also include the current documented definitions of terrorism. Next, goals and

justifications for terrorism will be assessed in order to gain an understanding for the

reasons behind terrorism. Some of the common characteristics of terrorists as well as

the most recognized terrorist methods will be presented. Next, this section will provide

an examination of the history of terrorism as well as specific instances of terrorism over

the course of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This section will conclude with an

examination of the potential future of terrorism.

2.3.1 Definition of Terrorism

According to Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler (2004), "few terms or

concepts in contemporary political discourse have proved as hard to define as

terrorism". Most researchers tend to believe that an objective and internationally

accepted definition of terrorism can never be agreed upon; after all, they often say, "one

man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" (Ganor, 2002). Cooper (2001), states

that, "there has never been, since the topic began to command serious attention, some

golden age in which terrorism was easy to define or, for that matter, to comprehend".

When the subject itself appeared, in the late 1960's and early 1970's, various professional commentators noted the difficulties involved in composing a definition which would gain broad agreement among those concerned with the subject (Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004). According to Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler (2004), one writer, Walter Laqueur, simply threw up his hands, arguing that terrorism had appeared in so many different forms and under so many different circumstances that a comprehensive definition was impossible. According to Laqueur (1977), "an observer would simply know it when s/he saw it". Almost 30 years later, and after publication of thousands of books and articles on the subject, another leading figure in the field, Martha Crenshaw (2000), noted that "… the problem of defining terrorism has hindered analysis since the inception of studies in the early 1970's" and has shown no sign of abating entering the 21st century (Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004).

According to White (2006), many arguments arise when anyone tries to define terrorism. Instead of agreeing on the definition of terrorism, social scientists, policy makers, lawyers, and security specialists often argue about the meaning of the term (White, 2006). Terrorism is hard to define because it means different things at different times (White, 2006). Walter Laqueur (1999), explains that it is difficult to define because the meaning changes through history. Alex Schmid (2004), offers that terrorism cannot be defined because it is a concept, not a physical object. H.H.A. Cooper (2001), summarizes the difficulty with the phrase "a problem in the problem

definition". White (2006), confirms that we can agree that terrorism is a problem, but we cannot agree on what terrorism is.

One reason, according to White (2006), that terrorism is difficult to define is because it has a pejorative context. A person is politically and socially degraded when labeled a terrorist, and the same thing happens when an organization is called a terrorist group (White, 2006). According to White (2006), the definition of terrorism usually fluctuates according to the interest of the group defining the term. For one thing, 'terrorism' has been widely used for purposes of political effect (Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004). According to Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler (2004), "the resulting war of words simply adds to the ambiguity and compounds the confusion. Often the polemic involves confusion, unintended or deliberate, between ends and means". Terrorism, like crime, is defined in many different ways, and the meaning changes when differing groups use the term (White, 2006).

Terrorism as a concept also seems to suffer from 'border' and 'membership' problems (Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004). Where does terrorism stop and other forms of political violence begin, guerilla warfare or urban warfare, for example (Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004)? According to Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler (2004), the same acts, such as air piracy or assassinations, may be considered terrorist acts on some occasions but not on others, usually based upon the assumed motivations of the perpetrators or the social standing of their victims. Menachem Begin, as the leader of the Irgun (Lehi's Zionist rival) in postwar Palestine, was the first to see the propaganda advantage in referring to his followers as "freedom

fighters" rather than terrorists (Weinberg, Pedahzur, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004).

According to Rapoport (2004), terrorist groups adopted this appealing description and

called themselves freedom fighters, understanding the propaganda advantage.

Kennedy (1999), explains that, "the fight against terrorism is frequently plagued

by the old adage: one person's terrorist is simply another's freedom fighter". This

question is perhaps nowhere more acutely identifiable than in the ongoing struggles of

the Middle East, where those labeled as terrorists by many are often considered to be

martyrs by others (Kennedy, 1999). According to Kennedy (1999), their pictures hang

on local barber shop walls along with those of movie stars, they are immortalized in

song, and children skip down alleyways shouting their names.

According to Ganor (2002), terrorism and guerilla warfare often serve as

alternative designations of the same phenomenon. Ganor (2002), states that, "the term

'terrorism', however, has a far more negative connotation, seemingly requiring one to

take a stand, whereas the term 'guerilla warfare' is perceived as neutral and carries a

more positive connotation". Ganor (2002) explains that, "the aims of terrorism and

guerilla warfare may well be identical; but they are distinguished from each other by the

targets of their operations. The guerilla fighter's targets are military ones, while the

terrorist deliberately target civilians". By this definition, a terrorist organization can no

longer claim to be 'freedom fighters' because they are fighting for national liberation

(Ganor, 2002). Even if its declared ultimate goals are legitimate, an organization that

deliberately targets civilians is a terrorist organization (Ganor, 2002). By characterizing

terrorism as a mode of operation directed against civilian targets, as opposed to basing

47

the definition on the *goals* of the violence, the slogan that 'one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter' can be refuted (Ganor, 2002).

Cooper (2001) says, "hope springs eternal, and perhaps for this reason alone, so many conferences and writings on the subject of terrorism begin with the obligatory, almost ritualistic recitation by the presenter of some preferred definition of terrorism". While there are hundreds of definitions of terrorism, no definition has gained universal acceptance (Marks, 2006). The main elements of terrorist action are the calculated use of unexpected, shocking, and unlawful violence against non-combatants in order to intimidate or coerce a government or civilian population to accept demands on behalf of an underlying ideology or cause (Loza, 2006). According to Marks (2006), in essence, all definitions are reorderings of the following considerations:

1) Terrorism always involves violence or the threat of violence.
2) Terrorism is violence, but not every from of violence is terrorism.
3) Guerrilla and insurgency warfare are not the same as terrorism, although they are often intertwined.
4) Classic terrorism is "propaganda of the deed," which is even more important in today's world given the ubiquity of modern media.
5) Terrorism is always a secondary choice, even among insurgents.

The most widely used definition of terrorism in criminal justice, military, and security circles is a rather simple view fostered by Brian Jenkins and Walter Laqueur (White, 2006). Jenkins (1984), calls terrorism the use or threatened use of force designed to bring about a political change. Laqueur (1987), says, "terrorism constitutes the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective by targeting innocent people". According to White (2006), Jenkins definition of terrorism includes the following characteristics:

1) Terrorism is violence or the threat of violence.
2) It may be a crime, but criminals are not terrorists.
3) The victims are of secondary importance.
4) Terrorism is designed to create drama.
5) The drama is for a target audience.
6) These factors separate terrorism from other forms of conflict.

Ganor (2002) suggests that, "a correct and objective definition of terrorism can be based upon accepted international laws and principles regarding what behaviors are permitted in conventional wars between nations. These laws are set out in the Geneva and Hague Conventions, which in turn are based upon the basic principle that the deliberate harming of soldiers during wartime is a necessary evil, and thus permissible, whereas the deliberate targeting of civilians is absolutely forbidden". The official definition of terrorism for the U.S. State Department (US Department of State, 1999), is found in Title 22 of the United States Code section 2656 and provides the following:

1) The term 'terrorism' means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.
2) The term 'international terrorism' means terrorism involving citizens or territory of more than one country.
3) The term 'terrorist group' means any group practicing, or that has significant subgroups that practice, international terrorism.

According to Kennedy (1999), this definition has the advantage of being relatively succinct. On the other hand, in an attempt to bring clarity to the understanding of terrorism, Paul Wilkinson has identified seven features common to all types of political terrorism and the list consumes a page and a half (Kennedy, 1999). According to White (2006), in an effort to solve the definitional dilemma, Schmid (1983), tries to synthesize various positions. Schmid's definition was refined from 109

separate definitions he received from scholars who responded to questionnaire he had

mailed them (Weinberg, Pedahuzr, and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004).

White (2006) reveals that, Schmid found a number of elements common to

leading definitions and that most definitions have two characteristics: Someone is

terrorized, and the meaning of the term is derived from the targets and victims of the

targets. According to White (2006), Schmid offers a conglomerated definition of

terrorism, or an academic consensus definition. The definition of terrorism that Schmid

(1983, 1988), proposed states:

> Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed
> by (semi-) clandestine individual, group, or state actors, for idiosyncratic,
> criminal, or political reasons, whereby-in contrast to assassination-the direct
> targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of
> violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively
> (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as
> message generators. Threat-and violence-based communication processes
> between terrorist (organization), (imperiled) victims, and main target
> (audience(s)), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of
> attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is
> primarily sought.

According to White (2006), some scholars think that Schmid has solved the definitional

dilemma by combining definitions. Schmid's academic consensus definition of

terrorism is cited by the United Nations (White, 2006).

2.3.2 Terrorist Goals/Methods

There are several reasons given for the use of terrorist activity (Loza, 2007).

Among them are: to create high profile impact on the public with the goal of

undermining public confidence in their own government; to make routine social activity

difficult; to inflict as much damage as possible; to seek vengeance; and to create

physical pain and paralyzing psychological emotions such as panic, chaos, unrest, fear,

paranoia, anxiety, anger, grief, and a sense of tragedy (Ardila, 2002, Furnish, 2005,

McCauley, 2002, and Thackrah, 2004). According to Loza (2007), Middle-Eastern

terrorism is based upon more than religion: and is also acutely affected by current and

historical cultural experiences within the Islamic world (Loza, 2007). These

experiences include political and racial conflicts both within and between these nations,

and the historical relationships between the Islamic worlds the West, and the people of

Israel and the Jewish faith (Loza, 2007).

Several scholars have suggested that the goal of Islamic extremists/terrorist

organizations is to politicize the region by toppling secular governments and

establishing authentic Islamic governments and implementing Islamic law over the

region (Ardila, 2002, Kepel, 2002, and Furnish, 2005). According to Loza (2007), there

are numerous causes for the surge of Islamic extremism/terrorism.

1) The political exclusion and repressive political environments in
   which the vast majority of Muslims have been living such as
   deprivation of freedom, incarceration, and suffering under repressive
   regimes (Hafez, 2003, and McCauley, 2002).
2) The decline of the Muslim world from a strong civilization into a
   marginalized region of the world (Thackrah, 2004, and Furnish,
   2005).

51

3) The history of occupation of Islamic countries by Western countries, currently embodied by the existence of Israel (Kepel, 2002, Ardila, 2002, and Hafez, 2003).
4) The history of conflict between Israel and the Arab world, epitomized by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the humiliating defeat of three Arab countries by Israel during the 1967 War (Kepel, 2002, and Hafez, 2003).

Scholars have also suggested sociological reasons for the frequent reliance on terrorism by the Palestinians in the ongoing conflict (Loza, 2007). According to Loza (2007), "these reasons include extreme poverty as part of a general economic decline, high rates of unemployment, the cultural insulation and sense of being disenfranchised from their community, and an overall culture of feeling hopeless and ineffective". According to Kepel (2002), and Ardila (2002), extremist groups such as Hamas and the PLO take advantage of these economic conditions by offering free social services to the poor and needy at a grass root level. By gaining the support and trust of the desperate population, the extremist groups are then able to socialize their followers into extreme ideologies and theologies (Loza, 2007). Groups such as Hamas and the PLO often manipulated these feelings of disarray, deprivation, frustration, and injustice of the social structure and bred youth who were ready to bring about an alternative to their situation by whatever means necessary (Hafez, 2003 and Thackrah, 2004).

White (2006), asserts that, "terrorists, like soldiers and police officers, need to feel justified when they use force. Terrorists seek to justify their actions just like all other people. They have the same need for social approval, but they are routinely condemned by the population at large; therefore, terrorists must look to themselves for approval". The terrorist group becomes the primary source of social reality for an

individual terrorist (White, 2006). Loza (2007) explains that, when a militant entity is not strong enough to attack their opposition militarily, they may turn to terrorism by bombing public places, attacking civilians, and conducting assassinations in an effort to draw attention to their cause and influence the political process of their enemy. Terrorism is often justified as a means to an end or as acts that are committed in response to a perceived injustice (Loza, 2007). As demonstrated by Ganor (2002), "terrorism is often used as a tool in the political game and is viewed as justified by an organization that feels it is responding to an equally horrific injustice". As illustrated by the statement of Abu Iyad (1983):

> As much as we repudiate any activity that endangers innocent lives, that is, against civilians in countries that are not directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict, we feel no remorse concerning attacks against Israeli military and political elements who wage war against the Palestinian people… Israeli acts of vengeance usually result in high casualties among Palestinian civilians – particularly when the Israeli Air Force blindly and savagely bombs refugee camps – and it is only natural that we should respond in appropriate ways to deter the enemy from continuing its slaughter of innocent victims.

According to Ganor (2002), Abu Iyad believes that innocent victims are civilians in countries that are not directly involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict (implying that civilians in Israel, even children and old people, are not innocent), while he describes Palestinian civilians as innocent victims.

2.3.3 Characteristics of Terrorists

There is no single terrorist personality but that terrorists follow similar behavioral patterns (Post, 1987). According to Post (1987), the individuals who are attracted to terrorist groups are social outcasts. Terrorists are usually people who have

been rejected by mainstream society and who fall in with like-minded individuals (Post, 1987). The social misfits in terrorist groups reinforce each other and mutual support inside the organization is more important than retaliation (Post, 1987). Post (1987), explains that, "terrorist groups create a mentality of "Us-against-Them", and terrorists expect to be pounded by their adversaries". The constant reinforcement of antisocial behavior in terrorist groups produces conforming behavior inside the organizations (White, 2006). When an individual rejects mainstream society, that individual's only hope for social acceptance lies in the group that rewards his or her behavior (White, 2006). If the terrorist group rewards antisocial behavior, the individual is further motivated to attack the norm (Post, 1987).

An alternative view of terrorism is offered by Ross (1999). According to White (2006), rather than attempting to create an individual terrorist profile, Ross tries to conceptualize terrorism by combining social structure and group psychology. According to White (2006), Ross defines five interconnected processes involved in terrorism:

1) Joining the group
2) Forming the activity
3) Remaining in the activity
4) Leading the organization
5) Engaging in acts of terrorism

According to Ross (1999), "structural factors include the way a society is organized, its political and economic systems, its historical and cultural conditions, the number of grievances citizens have and their mechanisms for addressing grievances, the availability of weapons, and the effectiveness of counterterrorist forces". Ross believes

that structural factors interact with the psychological makeup of potentially violent people to produce terrorism (White, 2006). According to White (2006), although Ross's ideas do not provide a typical profile of a terrorist personality, they help explain the transformation of terrorism through history and provide social and psychological indicators of terrorism.

Bodrero (2002), asserts that terrorists share six characteristics that differentiate their activities and mentality from ordinary criminals.

1) Terrorists focus their actions toward a goal while criminals are unfocused.
2) Terrorists are dedicated to a cause while criminals may live in a criminal underworld, but they are not devoted to crime as a philosophy.
3) Terrorists rarely cooperate with officials because they do not wish to betray their cause. Criminals will often make deals to avoid punishment.
4) Terrorists tend to attack when confronted with force while criminals usually run.
5) Terrorists strike against symbols after careful planning while criminals strike when the opportunity to do so is present.
6) Terrorists prepare for and rehearse their operations while criminals rarely train for crime.

According to Ganor (2002), in the past, terrorism was primarily defined by the act itself. Ganor (2002), explains that, "if the action was in contradistinction to the generally understood and subscribed to rules of warfare, it was considered criminal and/or terrorist". According to Dugard (1989), the introduction of the notion of the just war, and more particularly *jus ad bellum* concepts, into international terrorism:

> … makes the terrorist's motives directly relevant to his culpability. If an offender's motivation is personal gain or advancement of an 'unjust' (i.e., reactionary) political cause, he becomes an international terrorist, a *hostis humani*. If on the other hand, his object purpose is to oppose colonialism, racism, or alien domination, and to assert the principles of self-determination, then he is not a criminal, but an heroic figure engaged in a just struggle against the twentieth century infidel.

55

2.3.4 Terrorist Methods

According to White (2006), although terrorist tactics change through time, the most common weapon of terrorism consistently proven to be the bomb, and this remains the case today. In 1848, anarchists talked about the "philosophy of the bomb", meaning that the only way to communicate with the social order was to destroy it (White, 2006). Jenkins (1984) stated that there are six tactics of terrorism:

1) Bombing
2) Hijacking
3) Arson
4) Assault
5) Kidnapping
6) Hostage Taking

According to White (2006), the threat of terrorism has changed recently to include potential threats from weapons of mass destruction (Jenkins, 1987). Technology has also modified bombing (White, 2006). According to Jenkins (1984, 1987), the six terrorist tactics can be enhanced by force multipliers, which in military terms, increases the striking power without increasing the strength of a unit. Terrorists routinely use force multipliers because they add to their perceived strength (White, 2006). According to White (2006) all political terrorists want to give the illusion that they can fight on another level. To this end, White (2006), explains that there are four force multipliers:

1) Transnational support which increases the ability of terrorist groups to move and hide (Goldberg, 2002).
2) Technology which allows a small group to launch deadly attacks (Ketcham and McGeorge, 1986).
3) Media coverage which can make a minor group appear to be politically important (Benjamin and Simon, 2002).
4) Religion which transcends normative political and social boundaries, increasing violence and decreasing opportunities for negotiation (Hoffman, 1995).

According to White (2006), groups in the Middle East, Sri Lanka, and eventually throughout the world found that bombs could be delivered by suicide attackers. Suicide attacks, which were traditionally rare in the Middle East and limited to the Shi'ite arena – in Iran and Lebanon – became widespread during the Israel-Palestinian conflict of the 1990's (Hatina, 2006). Hatina (2006), explains that, "they increasingly turned into a religious ritual, positing their perpetrators as symbols of a revolutionary theology and have engendered a debate in the Arab Muslim world as to their religious legitimacy, involving both the self-inflicted death of the perpetrator and the killing of civilian targets". Marks (2006), asserts that suicide terrorism is the single most dramatic development in the practice of insurgencies and of terrorism.

According to Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg (2003), suicide terrorism is nothing new in human history; it first appeared long before the Palestinian-Israeli struggle. This phenomenon was seen among the Jewish Sicaris as early as the first century, among the Moslem Hashishiyun in the eleventh and among the Asians in the eighteenth century (Schweitzer, 2000). According to Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg (2003), in the late twentieth century, suicide terrorist attacks took place in countries such as Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey, and Sri Lanka.

Contrary to other terrorist attacks, even the most dangerous ones, the suicide attack is an "operational method in which the very act of the attack is dependent upon the death of the perpetrator" (Ganor, 2002). Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg (2003), state that, "the terrorist is fully aware that if he does not kill himself, the planned attack will not be implemented and the suicide terrorist essentially becomes a human time-

bomb". Sprinzak (2000), explains that suicide terrorism has inherent tactical advantages over conventional terrorism: "It is a simple and low-cost operation (requiring no escape routes or complicated rescue operations); it guarantees mass casualties and extensive damage; there is no fear that the interrogated terrorists will surrender important information (because their deaths are certain); and it has an immense impact on the public and the media (due to the overwhelming sense of helplessness)".

According to Dickey, Hosenball, and Johnson (2001), some scholars and journalists depict these suicide (also known as religious martyrs-*Shahids*) as people whose motivation is a composite of religious beliefs and economic poverty. They are often unmarried religious men who are unemployed and who believed they would be rewarded for these attacks with a glorious afterlife and an eternal place in heaven (Rubin, 2002). Ganor (2002), emphasized that suicide terrorists do not have to undergo a long socialization process before participating in the suicidal act. The atmosphere in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank is such that the would-be martyr's decision to embark on his journey of destruction is in fact reinforced by the approval of the community (Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003).

According to Durkheim ([1897], 1951), "suicide acts, while having a distinct personal dimension, cannot be disconnected from the social and historical ethos of the community in which they occur". Reimer (1998), explains that Palestinian suicide terrorists can be defined as committing altruistic suicide. Altruistic suicide may occur when a person becomes deeply integrated into a social group and suicide becomes a

58

"duty" for the members of that group (Durkheim, [1897], 1951). According to Durkheim (1897], 1951), the aim of the suicide act is not to satisfy the person who commits suicide but rather the group to which he or she belongs. According to Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg (2003), the subcategory of Durkheim's typology also seems to be highly applicable to the phenomenon of suicide terrorism. The category, "acute altruistic suicide", refers specifically to the suicide of martyrs (Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003). According to Durkheim ([1897], 1951), "these individuals perceive a lofty and glorious place for themselves in the spiritual and mystical realm beyond life on earth".

According to Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg (2003), Palestinian suicide terrorists also share aspects of fatalistic suicide. Acts of fatalistic suicide, according to Johnson (1979), as well as Taylor (1982), characterize situations of hopelessness that result from continuous political and economic oppression. As noted by Stack (1979): "Fatalistic suicide … results from excessive regulation, such as that of persons with futures blocked, aspirations choked by oppressive discipline, and persons living under physical or moral despotism…Fatalistic suicides involve an escape from a normative situation from which there is no appeal."

On the afternoon of Friday, April 16, 1993, Israeli radio reported a terrorist attack at a restaurant near Mechola in the Jordan Valley (Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003). In contrast to previous incidents, this time the terrorist, a member of the Hamas organization, parked a car loaded with explosives in between two buses next to the restaurant and then, rather than leave the car behind, he detonated the explosive

device with himself inside (Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003). Despite the fact, that the number of casualties did not differ much from previous Palestinian terrorist acts, this act was unprecedented as it marked the first time a Palestinian organization had initiated a suicide bombing against an Israeli target (Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003). Ever since this first suicide act in April 1993, this method of attack has become an integral element in the Palestinian struggle (Pedahuzr, Perliger, and Weinberg, 2003).

Kennedy (1999), says that, "many recoil in horror when they hear or read of such activities as suicide bombing attacks on bus loads of innocent civilians, store and restaurant bombings, and truck and car bombings". However, many of the perpetrators of such actions are frequently seen as heroes by those who oppose the policies of the country against which the attack is directed (Kennedy, 1999). According to Hatina (2006), elementary schools taught the popular 'Song of the *Shahid*' whose lyrics went: 'Better my death than my stolen right and homeland; the sound of the explosion is pleasant to me and the flow of blood cheers me'. As the phenomenon of suicide attacks expanded, the pool of perpetrators widened out to include not only young unmarried religious males, but also older men, heads of families, and even women (Hatina, 2006).

Hatina (2006), explains that, "Islam, in contrast to Judaism and Christianity, was from its beginnings an assertive, conquest-oriented faith, and as such sanctified martyrdom in the battle against infidels and heretics. Martyrdom became a formative ethos in the Muslim collective conscience". According to Hatina (2006), "the *shahid*, or martyr, who bears witness to faith by sacrificing his life for it, was depicted as

infusing society with new blood and a new light. By taking control of their lives in the time and place of their choosing, and by exposing their victims as helpless, the perpetrators of suicide attacks claimed power for the powerless in the name of a superior metaphysical authority".

2.3.5 Historical Acts of Terrorism

According to Marks (2006), the significant dilemma of terrorism is that while terrorist acts may be considered immoral by most people, they are not mindless and both ancient and modern history provides many examples of their effectiveness. Terrorism, as a subset of guerrilla warfare and revolutionary struggles was made popular by the writings of Mao Zedong and Vladimir Lenin (Hoffman, 2004). Marxist ideas freed strategists from thinking about war in the narrow terms of conventional armies comprised of soldiers and armaments (Jenkins, 1986). According to Vladimir Lenin (1961):

> In principle we have never rejected, and cannot reject terror. Terror is one of the forms of military action that may be perfectly suitable and even essential at a definite juncture in the battle, given a definite state of the troops and the existence of definite conditions.

Hoffman (2004) explains that, Lenin viewed terrorism as the first stage of a "people's war", to be followed by guerilla warfare and full scale revolution. Both Mao and Lenin viewed terrorism and guerilla warfare as vehicles to be employed by peoples of a nation against a tyrannical domestic authority or by a state against another imperialist state (Hoffman, 2004).

The terrorism of the twenty-first century is described by Laqueur (2002), as "a phenomenon very different than has been seen in previous centuries, dating back to the Zealots and Assassins in the pre-modern era". The two principle modes of the *old terrorism model* are national liberation (insurgent) and state-sponsored groups (Hoffman, 2004). Both types seek incremental political change through the use of terrorist acts that are characterized by limited bloodshed (Hoffman, 2004). According to Hoffman (2004), "national liberation groups seek to limit bloodshed for fear that a barbaric appearance would negate international sentiment and damage the possibility of the group's inclusion into the legitimate political process". Examples of this limitation consist of the IRA and the PLO activities in the 1960s, which sought to gain national attention and sympathy and a place at the bargaining table, so that they could revise the status quo (Campbell and Flournoy, 2001).

According to Hanan (1980), "Palestinian terrorism is defined as violence committed for a political purpose, with the intent to inflict casualties to damage Israeli society, as well as to stimulate fear and rage and by so doing to incite Israel to react". A historical analysis of Palestinian violence discusses three periods of terrorism (Hanan, 1980):

1) 1919-1948, when terrorism was inflicted by local Arab groups against the growing Jewish population in British Palestine for the purpose of suppressing the Zionist's political aspirations rather than to promote Palestinian national goals.
2) 1949-1956, when acts of terrorism along the 1948 armistice lines were inflicted by Fedayeen groups infiltrating Israel from Jordan and Egypt
3) 1965 to the present, when Palestinian terrorism has been carried out by a number of Palestinian groups as part of the armed struggle of the Palestinians aimed at liberating Palestine and establishing a Palestinian state that would replace the state of Israel and include the West Bank and Gaza.

According to Hanan (1980), "the ongoing violence in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has resulted in thousands of casualties of both Jews and Arabs and examples of the horrific violence and atrocities committed during this conflict are listed in hundreds of books and journals documenting the history of the conflict". According to Kennedy (1999), the complexity of defining 'terrorism' has been well illustrated by responses to what many would call 'terrorist acts' in this region. For example, Kennedy (1999) reports that, "in October 1994 a young Israeli corporal was kidnapped and subsequently murdered by members of an armed wing of Hamas. From an Israeli perspective, this was a clear act of terrorism while among Palestinians attitudes about the kidnapping and subsequent killing were mixed". According to Kennedy (1999), Hamas leaders and many Palestinians refugees claimed the crime was justified as a response for the Cave of the Patriarchs murders that took place in February 1994 in which 29 Muslim worshippers were killed by the Jewish Baruch Goldstein. As the cycle of violence and terrorism have continued unabated often escalating, Hirbawi (2005) offers examples of the actions of both Palestinians and Israelis:

- July 26, 1946 – The bombing of British headquarters at the King David Hotel killed 91 people, 28 British, 41 Arab, 17 Jewish, and 5 others. The bombing was conducted by the militant Zionist organization, the Irgun (Ovendale, 2004).

- April 9 - April 11 1948 – Between 100 to 120 Palestinian Arabs killed at the Deir Yassin village by members of both militant Zionist organizations, the Lehi and the Irgun. This occurred during increasing fighting between Jewish-Arab forces one month prior to the outbreak of the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. This event is historically referred to as the Deir Yassin massacre (Ovendale, 2004; Tessler, 1994).

- September 17, 1948 – Lehi assassination of UN mediator Count Folke Bernadotte. The Lehi organization accused Bernadotte of a pro-Arab stance during cease-fire negotiations. (Fraser, 2004).

- September 5-6, 1972 – Palestinian militant organization Black September, with political ties to Yasser Arafat's Fatah organization, killed 11 Israeli athletes and 1 German police officer during the 1972 Munich Olympics. This event is historically referred to as the Munich Olympics Massacre (Tessler, 1994).

- May 15, 1974 – On the 26th anniversary of Israeli independence, members of the Palestinian militant organization, the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine stormed an elementary school in northern Israel. By the end of the siege, the DFLP had killed 21 schoolchildren. This event is historically referred to as the Ma'alot Massacre (Ovendale, 2004).

- April 16, 1993 – A Member of Palestinian militant group Hamas, parked a car loaded with explosives between 2 buses next to a restaurant. He then detonated the explosives with himself still inside the car. 2 people were killed. This marked the first time a Palestinian organization had used suicide bombings against an Israeli target (Schweitzer, 2000).

- January 10, 2004 – 5 Israeli settlers assault 2 members of the Christian Peacemaker Teams in Hebron who were escorting Palestinian children to school near a Jewish settlement in the area. According to members of the team, settlers beat their 2 colleagues with baseball clubs and chains, inflicting grievous bodily harm (Hirbawi, 2005).

- January 11, 2004 – A 16-year old Palestinian suicide bomber detonates a bomb in a marketplace in Tel Aviv, killing himself and 3 Israelis. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine claim responsibility (Hirbawi 2005).

- January 11, 2004 – 6 Palestinians are killed. 3 of them, members of the al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades, are assassinated in a coffee shop by Israeli undercover soldiers (Hirbawi, 2005).

- February 12, 2004 – 4 Israeli soldiers are killed and 6 others wounded when members of Hamas and Fatah's military wings dynamited a tunnel beneath a military post (Hirbawi, 2005).

- August 4, 2005 – A 19-year old AWOL Israel Defense Forces soldier opened fire on civilians riding on a bus in the Arab town of Shfaram. 4 people were killed and 22 wounded before the shooter was killed as well. This event is frequently referred to as the Shfaram Massacre (Myre, 2005; Khoury, 2006).

- April 17, 2006 – Members of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad along with members of the Al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigade carried out a suicide bombing in Tel Aviv. 11 people were killed. This event is historically known as the Old Central Bus Station Massacre (BBC News, 2006)

Lesser (1999) explains that, for Israel, terrorism is an extension of war, and counterterrorism is often and naturally discussed as part of a "war paradigm". Israeli officials and analysts are among the most sensitive to the potential for unconventional terrorism (the term is understood in Israel to include suicide bombings), including the use of WMD (Lesser, 1999). According to Lesser (1999), "factors such as Israeli geography, the intermixture of Arab and Israeli populations, and the capacity of regional terrorist networks and their supporters lead Israeli experts to worry, foremost, about chemical agents, and only secondarily about biological and nuclear terrorism".

Lesser (1999), suggests that, "Israel's exposure to terrorism is longstanding and intensive, and perhaps as a result various myths have arisen with regard to Israeli counterterrorism policy". According to Lesser (1999), these myths include the notion of "no negotiation" and the doctrine of preemption and prompt retaliation. Israel has, in fact, negotiated in detail with a variety of Palestinian and Shi'ite groups over prisoner exchanges and other matters (Lesser, 1999). Lesser (1999) reveals that, Israel is engaged in a seemingly ongoing process of signaling and bargaining in the cycle of terrorism and response. Not all terrorist attacks on Israel provoke a response, and much

of Israel's counterterrorism activity is primarily targeted at preemption, prevention, and disruption rather than retaliation (Lesser, 1999).

Countermeasures taken by Israel can be categorized according to whether they are intended to reduce terrorist's resources, terrorist's propensity to strike, or the damage inflicted by terrorism (Hanan, 1980). Four types of countermeasures have been taken by Israel in accord with these goals: counterforce measures, impeding, passive defense, and punishment (Hanan, 1980). Hanan (1980), explains that, "the policy question faced by Israel is how to live with terrorism. The related policy objectives are to reduce the discrepancy in resource allocation among all casualty-preventing programs, to adjust society's subjective probabilities with regard to terrorism to the objective probabilities, and to seek a policy with less exaggerated perceptions and less distinctive reactions". According to Hanan (1980), "in addressing these policy objectives, a psychological dimension is added to the physical passive defense measure: downgrading the effects of terrorism (i.e., not reacting as expected by the terrorists)".

According to senior Israeli officials, current counterterrorism priorities are (in this order): intelligence, operational capabilities for counterterrorism, and protection (Lesser, 1999). The question then becomes, has Israeli counterterrorism policy been successful in strategic terms (Lesser, 1999)? Not surprisingly, Israeli observers are divided on this question (Lesser, 1999). Terrorism has not eliminated the state of Israel, so the most extreme terrorist objective has clearly been thwarted (Lesser, 1999). However, according to Lesser (1999), most terrorism aimed at Israel has had more limited goals. Lesser (1999), states that, "it is true that Israel has outlasted most of the

terrorist groups with which it has been engaged over the last decades, but terrorist groups have their own life cycles and the systematic threat remains". By this measure, Israeli success is mixed (Lesser, 1999). Though it can be said that existential threats to the state have been largely avoided, the future of Israeli society and the overall quality security are still overwhelmingly affected by terrorism in Israel and its surrounding region (Lesser, 1999).

<div align="center">2.3.6 Future Acts of Terrorism</div>

Viewed in the current formulation of terrorism that has been set down, terrorism is seen as a game of fixed quantities (Cooper, 2001). No "new terrorism" is possible in the new millennium because it is impossible to conceive of anything else that might accomplish the goal of creating the massive fear, or terror that is at the heart of terrorism (Cooper, 2001). However, according to Cooper (2001), "the bad news is that with each passing moment, ever newer and more horrible ways of undertaking these things and carrying out the principles of terrorism are being imagined and made possible by the implacable, onward sweep of technology".

The expression "weapons of mass destruction" has now entered firmly into common currency and the concept has dominated futuristic theorizing about the direction terrorist escalation might take (Cooper, 2001). According to Cooper (2001), "nuclear terrorism has, thankfully, remained in the realm of fiction to date although the knowledge and the materials have long been available to those who might have been tempted to engage in some feat of superterrorism. A simple nuclear device in the possession of competent terrorist would demolish much property, alter the landscape,

and kill and horribly maim a great many human beings while in the process altering the face of terrorism and the way we think of terrorist acts being carried out".

Cooper (2001), asserts that, "the fearful instruments of chemical and biological warfare, largely eschewed by a majority of civilized nations, have acquired the soubriquet of 'the poor man's nuclear bomb'. Certainly, as death-dealing implements, the term is well applied in that there is a kind of inevitability about the employment of these weapons by terrorists". Additionally, Cooper (2001) explains that, modern society is becoming more and more computer dependent. Everything from electronic commerce to the supply of energy is vulnerable, and although this may not be the immediate objective of the perpetrators, the potential for the associated loss of human life is considerable (Cooper, 2001). According to Cooper (2001), this cyberterrorism is still very much in its infancy; the methods are primitive and unsophisticated but effective. The methods are new, but the principles behind their application are as old as terrorism itself (Cooper, 2001). Cooper (2001) explains that, "the technology employed has enabled the terrorists to reintroduce a useful, from their point of view, element of mystery into the process".

2.4 The Role of Media within the Israel/Palestine Conflict

This portion of the literature review will be devoted to examining the role that the media has in depicting both the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the terrorist events that have in the past, and continue, to transpire throughout the course of the conflict. Beginning with a broad overview of the media's role in providing the public information and knowledge as well as the role that the media plays in regards to

68

terrorist events, this section will proceed to examine what the media shows, why terrorism is covered by the media, and how the media can be seen as a theater for terrorism. This section concludes with the effects of the media on the public as well as how the media can be used as a tool to be manipulated within the terrorism sphere.

2.4.1 Role of Mass Media

Research on the influence of the mass media on people's attitudes and emotional states has a long and contentious history (Slone, 2000). Arguments range from those that cite the mass media as a powerful propaganda tool capable of molding the attitudes of a susceptible public (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, and Lee, 1990) to those that claim the media has a very limited influence (Curran, Gurevitch, and Woollacott, 1982). According to Slone (2000), "debate in Israel has pondered the effects of uncensored broadcasts of the horrendous aftermath of suicide bombings and other terrorist activities. Unlike news coverage in other domains, the dependence of terrorist organizations on propaganda and media dissemination of the effectiveness of their activities raises searching ethical concerns for media presentation decisions".

The Oslo peace process that took place between Israel and the Palestinians throughout the 1990's was continuously interrupted by terrorist attacks (Liebes and Kampf, 2007). Liebes and Kampf (2007), explain that, "accordingly, television's coverage of the process vacillated between live showing of the series of peace ceremonies that marked its progress (in Washington, Cairo, and Gaza) and of the violent disruptions that set it back. This confusing reality led to two opposite variations of live television coverage". The much anticipated ceremonial events (Dayan and Katz,

1992) were juxtaposed by totally unexpected, chaotic "disaster marathons" that left the broadcasters in charge but without a script (Liebes, 1998).

According to Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), the world has come to witness a new type of terrorism characterized by a blatant orientation towards the media and designed to attract its attention. Anzovin (1986), states that, "without television, terrorism becomes rather like the philosopher's hypothetical tree falling in the forest; no one hears it fall and therefore it has no reason for being. And television, without terrorism, while not deprived of all interesting things in the world, is nonetheless deprived of one of the most interesting".

Several explanations may clarify why a considerable proportion of people prefer to seek detailed and rich information about terrorist acts, even if this information is threatening and painful (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003) assert that, the first explanation is based on the information seeking theory (Berlyne, 1960), which states that people seek information because they strive for certainty. Uncertainty causes conflict and increases arousal, which information helps to reduce (Berlyne, 1960). Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), state that another explanation can be derived from the safety signal theory (Seligman, 1968 and Weiss, 1970), which holds that people seek information about aversive events because such information helps them to discriminate between dangerous and safe periods, thus producing a relaxing effect. The last explanation rests on the notion of personal control (Folkman, 1984 and Keinan, 1994), according to which individuals tend to seek

information to achieve a sense of control over the situation (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003).

Gunther, Christen, Liebhart, and Chia (2001), explain that media research on the "persuasive press influence" indicates that third-person perceptions influence climate of opinion perceptions. According to this theory, people think that what the media say today has an influence on what the distribution of public opinion will be tomorrow (Tsfati and Cohen, 2005). Thus, perceptions of strong media influence on the image of unfavorably depicted political groups often result higher political inefficacy (Tsfati and Cohen, 2005).

<div align="center">2.4.2 Media as a "Theater of Terror"</div>

Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), argue that, "over the last three decades, international terrorism has come to occupy a prominent position on the public agenda of many countries. The Middle East has been a center stage of terrorist activity and statistics show large numbers of casualties in this region as compared to other regions in the world". Since terrorist acts are by their very nature unexpected, dramatic, exceptionally violent, and extremely distressing, they are perceived by the media as sought-after news items deserving of extensive coverage (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003).

According to Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), "the ultimate target of this terrorism is the media consumer rather than the victim". Schmid and de Graaf (1982), describe the victim as "the skin on a drum beaten to achieve a calculated impact on a wider audience". Weimann (1990), and Rubin and Friedland (1986), explain that this

development has prompted the term, *theater of terror*, which underscores the fact that the terrorists choreograph a "show of terrorism" whose objective is to be as spectacular and dramatic as possible to capture the media's attention.

Whereas terrorist attacks of the 1990's were a relatively rare event, from the year 2000, Liebes and Kampf (2007), report that, "they became much more frequent, making the disaster marathon (in spite of its absence from the published television schedule) a rather common genre. As in media events, disaster marathons are characterized by breaking into television's schedule. Unlike media events, there is no contract between the government, the television, and the public, and editors and anchors have to construct the story as it emerges in the field".

According to Liebes and Kampf (2007), "television took viewers to the site of the attack, exposing them to the horrors of dead and injured victims and to the words of shocked witnesses, broken-hearted relatives, and politicians. Then there were reports from the police, the hospitals, and the repeated recycling of bloody images and of the most emotional sound bites". Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), explain that repeated broadcasting of distressing reports, interviews with victims in extreme states of despair, close-ups of bodies or body parts, or allotting air time to terrorists who threaten the audience, are examples of what the media includes in its coverage of terrorist acts.

One of the dilemmas that preoccupy the public and professionals alike concerns the extent to which the public should be exposed to details of terrorist acts (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). According to Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, (2003), there is a question whether the media should uncover all the details of a terrorist act including

72

extremely violent and frightening ones, or whether it should provide selective coverage or even ignore the terrorist act (such a public debate had taken place in Israel after a series of fatal bus explosions in 1996, during which the public was exposed to extremely cruel visual materials by the media). The central argument in favor of detailed coverage is that of the public's right to know – in a democracy, neither the government nor the media have the right to prevent public access to news material (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), state that, "defenders of selective coverage retort that horrifying scenes are bound to sow panic and distress, cause demoralization, and even harm mental health".

Only a number of surveys have assessed the public's attitude to this dilemma and its preferences with regard to the type of media coverage (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). According to de Boer (1979), in a survey conducted in 1977 by the American Institute for Public Opinion, survey outcomes suggested that about 50% of the respondents felt that the public should be fully informed, 47% believed that terrorism was overemphasized, and 3% had no opinion on the subject. According to Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), in another survey, conducted by Times Mirror in 1986, a considerable part of the respondents felt that newspaper coverage of terror acts benefits the public more than it causes harm. More specifically, almost two thirds of the respondents felt that the media coverage of terrorism aids "the public interest", while only 23% held that it harms the public interest and 12% had no opinion on the matter (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003).

In another relevant survey, it was found that public support for the U.S. news media was stronger during the very massive and sensational coverage of the hijacking of TWA Flight 847 in 1985, than during a much quieter period two months later (Grossman, 1986). Schmid (1992), commented that "Apparently, the gripping social drama co-produced by the terrorists and the networks has a high appeal for an overwhelming majority of the public".

2.4.3 Effects of Media Influence

"One of the most salient channels through which information and perceptions are gleaned is through mass media coverage of political events, which may mediate assessment of threat", states Sloane (2000). However, according to Giner-Sorolla and Chaiken (1994), "the absence of neutrality in the majority of media reports has been cited by critics across the political spectrum, suggesting that the public is exposed to biased coverage of political events that may influence attitudes and feelings in particular directions". People act on their perceptions of media influence, regardless of whether these perceptions are accurate (Tsfati and Cohen, 2005). According to Gunther and Storey (2003), this process is called "the influence of presumed influence".

Tsfati and Cohen (2005), explain that, "perceptions of strong influence of biased media coverage may lead to an increased willingness to resort to violent protest. In other words, perceiving that democratic decisions are swayed by unfair media coverage may lead members of politically oppositional groups, threatened by these decisions, to justify the use of violence". Because media are supposed to act as an unbiased source of political information, allowing citizens to form logical political attitudes, any

suggestion of bias in the media could compromise the percieved legitimacy of the political process (Tsfati and Cohen, 2005). According to Tsfati and Cohen (2005), "when people feel that news media coverage is biased against their group, and that this coverage has an excessive influence on their public image, and hence, on democratic decisions, they may feel that the democratic process is unfair, and as a result, illegitimate. Thus, perceptions of strong effects of biased coverage might indirectly lead people to justify the use of political violence to resist democratic decisions (that are perceived as illegitimate decisions), and consequently, even to violently resist these decisions".

Bandura (1986), explains that in general, findings have demonstrated that media documentation of violence and brutality creates feelings of fear even among individuals who have not been directly exposed to such violence and anticipate no immediate personal threat. Slone (2000), says that most individuals do not assess threat to personal and national security on the basis of direct experience but rather on the basis of more indirect forms of exposure. Slone (2000), states that, "this is particularly pertinent in the case of television, which so vividly and immediately portrays occurrences that may not be part of the direct experiential repertoire of the individual". According to Slone (2000), "the visual medium provides a dramatic concretization of images and scenes that draw the viewer into the events. This often invokes a powerful emotional response even in individuals removed in time and space from direct personal threat".

2.4.4 Media as a Tool

Many authors have pointed out the interdependence, or even symbiotic relations, between the media and terrorism (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). Each side, it would seem, uses the other to achieve its objectives (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). Terrorists exploit the media to achieve political recognition, present their cause, transmit messages and demands to the government, and induce fear in the general public (Hacker, 1980, Kramer, 1990, and Paletz and Boiney, 1992). According to Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen (2003), sometimes terrorists use the media to manipulate anti-terrorist fighters, to communicate with other terrorists, or as a way of getting critical information in real-time. The media, on the other side of the equation, exploits terrorism for attaining one of its major objectives, that of providing the public with up-to-date news (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003).

Inspection of terrorist acts and their associated media coverage in different countries reveals numerous examples of the high incentive for each side to achieve its objectives by exploiting the other side (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). Terrorists often pose an unconditional demand for the presence of news reporters or for immediate access to broadcasting time (Keinan, Sadeh, and Rosen, 2003). Keinan, Sadeh and Rosen, explain that by the same token, reporters rush to the site of a terrorist act and continue to attempt to obtain interviews with terrorists or their victims in order to aquire the maximum number of close-ups or video recordings of terrifying and violent scenes.

According to Tsfati and Cohen (2005), "from a communication perspective, political violence is often depicted as a backdoor entrance to politics". Tsfati and

Cohen (2005), explain that political violence can be used as a tactic by the relatively unnewsworthy to attract the attention of the news media to achieve political goal. However, according to Kelley (2003), the media can also be used as a tool to bring attention to non-violent movements within the conflict. International Solidarity Movement is a Palestinian-led movement of Palestinian and international activists working to end Israeli occupation through non-violent, direct-action to confront and challenge illegal Israeli occupation forces and policies (Kelley, 2003). According to Kelley (2003), co-founder of the ISM George Rishmawi stated, "Participating in ISM actions and being an eyewitness is choice number one for individuals wishing to have a real effect on protecting Palestinian civilians. Rishmawi went on to say, "If we have 10,000 Palestinians marching I don't think the media will pick it up, but if a lot Americans are involved, the media will show up to report it" (Kelley, 2003).

<u>2.5 Public Perceptions Regarding the Israel/Palestine Conflict</u>

This section of the literature review focuses on the public perceptions of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The public perception forms the foundation for the present study which seeks to determine if public perception of the conflict influences how acts of terrorism are identified and defined. This section will begin with global public perceptions of the conflict and how both the Israeli side and the Palestinian side are viewed. Next, specifically American public perceptions of the two sides involved in the conflict will be examined and the section will conclude with American opinion on current US foreign policy in relation to the conflict.

2.5.1 Global Public Perceptions

Since 1967, the American public has regularly expressed more sympathy for Israelis [than Palestinians] by a margin of at least four to one (Gilboa, 1986). In the year 2007, two recent polls show that Israel is relatively popular among Americans and the subject of considerable antipathy among European democracies (Jones, 2007). Jones (2007), states that "the data suggest that Americans see themselves with Israelis in the same boat, while Europeans have an almost opposite point of view". According to Jones (2007), the US poll, conducted by Gallup, found that Americans are more pro-Israel than they were 10 and 20 years ago and now sympathize with Israel three times more than with the Palestinians: 58% to 20%. According to Jones (2007), since 2000, Gallup polls have shown that fewer Americans express no preference on the conflict, with most of the shift from the undecided column moving in Israel's favor.

In the second poll, the BBC asked people in 27 nations to rate a group of countries and found that Iran and Israel were almost tied for the spot of the country most people saw as a "mainly negative influence" (Jones, 2007). According to Jones (2007), only in the U.S. and Nigeria did a plurality see Israel as a "mainly positive" influence". By contrast, in Germany, France, and Great Britain, 77%, 66%, and 65%, respectively, viewed Israel as having a "mainly negative" influence (Jones, 2007).

Complicating the U.S. position on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is the great imbalance in the way the United States is viewed by both sides of the conflict (Saad, 2006). Recent Gallup World Poll surveys in Israel and Palestine document the deep animosity that Palestinians feel toward the United States while Israelis, by contrast,

78

have mostly favorable views of the United States (Saad, 2006). According to Saad (2006), while this is not new, Gallup trends in the region document that the pattern has intensified in recent years. Saad (2006), argues that, "despite its image problem among the Palestinians, the United States is likely to remain the main peace broker in the Middle East by virtue of its leading position in world affairs, and because of the influence the United States has with both sides through foreign aid".

2.5.2 U.S. Public Perceptions

According to Moore (1999), a Gallup poll survey, conducted before the al-Aqsa intifada, showed that Americans seemed somewhat more optimistic than they had been in the past that eventually Israel and the Arab nations will be able to settle their differences and live in peace. The poll showed an even split, with 49% saying peace would eventually come and 47% saying it would not (Moore, 1999). Moore (1999) explains that, this response was more positive than the one given by Americans in a Gallup poll in December 1998 when only 40% believed peace was achievable, and 56% said it was not.

Although Americans may not want the U.S. to pressure the parties involved, an overwhelming majority, 81%, still believe that achieving a peaceful solution to the conflict between the Palestinians and Israelis should be an important foreign policy goal of the United States (Moore, 1999). Forty-one percent say it should be a "very" important goal, and another 41% say it should be a "somewhat" important goal (Moore, 1999). According to Moore (1999), just 15% say that achieving peace between the Israelis and Palestinians is "not too" or "not at all" important.

Jones (2007), reports that in Gallup polls conducted after the al-Aqsa intifada began, optimism for a peaceful settlement between the two sides involved with the conflict has dropped precipitously. According to Jones (2007), a Gallup's annual World Affairs poll, conducted February 1-4 2007, showed that just 34% of Americans say that there "will come a time when Israel and the Arab nations will be able to settle their differences and live in peace". Jones (2007) goes on to reveal that, sixty-three percent reject this notion.

There seems to be a marked difference of opinion about the conflict between younger and older Americans with older Americans generally holding a more pessimistic view towards the likelihood of a peaceful resolution to the conflict (Newport, 1997). According to Newport (1997), in a Gallup news service poll conducted in 1997, when asked if there will ever come a time when "Israel and the Arab nations will be able to settle their differences and live in peace," only 36% of those polled said yes, while 56% said no. Older Americans who have lived through more years of Middle Eastern wars and aborted peace settlements are considerably more pessimistic than younger Americans: only 25% of Americans 65 and older say that Middle East peace will ever be possible compared with 44% of those 18-29 (Newport, 1997).

Another problem with the Palestinian-Israeli situation from American perspectives is that many people are confused by the conflict (Whitlatch, 2004). Many American citizens are not fully informed about the nature of the conflict and don't fully comprehend the nature of the conflict, the root of the crisis, or the events that are

transpiring in the Middle East (Whitlatch, 2004). For mainstream middle America, the concept of occupation is a confusing one, as is the history of Israel's creation and the 1967 War (Whitlatch, 2004). Settlements are frequently viewed in a positive manner, with the idea of a "community of Jews built in a larger community of Arabs" seen as diversity, according to a focus group in Kansas City (Whitlatch, 2004). However, when the same focus group was shown photos of Israel's Separation wall and told about the effects it has on Palestinians, the reaction was strong and negative with words like prison, concentration camps, and reservations used to describe what the Wall represents (Whitlatch, 2004). According to Whitlatch (2004), the lesson from this focus group is that, "the US media and government have their work cut out for them in order help American citizens fully comprehend the conflict because if the US is to remain the central peace broker in the Middle East conflict, than they must strive to help both the Palestinians and the Israelis reach a peace that is in the best interest of both sides".

The importance of a peaceful resolution is a rising movement even amongst many Jewish organizations (Polner and Simms, 2002). According to Polner and Simms (2002), despite the popular opinion that conservative American Jewish organizations such as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and others represent the majority opinion on the formulation of U.S. foreign policy toward the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and Israel's security in general; the fact remains that most American Jews would prefer to see a peaceful and just resolution of the conflict, with a Palestinian state established alongside an unthreatened and democratic Israel.

2.5.3 U.S. View of Foreign Policy Related to the Conflict

In June 2002, a Gallup Poll found 61% of Americans saying U.S. President Bush was doing enough to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, while 28% said he was not (Jones, 2007). Since that time, the Israel-Palestinian situation has been put on the back burner as the conflict in Iraq has dominated U.S. foreign policy (Jones, 2007). Now, the latest poll finds a slight majority (51%) saying that President Bush is not doing enough to find a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, though 44% still believe he is (Jones, 2007).

Americans' basic views of the conflicting nations are far more pro-Israel than pro-Palestinian, as they have been on nearly every Gallup measure taken in the last 20 years (Jones, 2007). According to Jones (2007), by a nearly three-to-one margin, Americans say they are more sympathetic to the Israelis (58%) than the Palestinians (20%). Additionally, 63% say they have a favorable view of Israel compared to just 16% for the Palestinian Authority and that three-quarters of Americans have an unfavorable view of the Palestinian Authority (Jones, 2007). While Americans have shown significantly higher sympathy for the Israelis than the Palestinians in the Middle East conflict for many years, there has never been a great level of American support for the Palestinians (Newport and Carroll, 2006). According to Newport and Carroll (2006), sympathies for the Palestinians have ranged only between a low point of 7% in 1991 to 18% in the recent years of 2004 and 2005.

Despite a largely sympathetic view of Israel, Americans have been reluctant to say that the United States should take Israel's side in negotiations (Jones, 2007).

According to a Gallup poll in 1999, Americans disagreed by a two-to-one majority that the U.S. should pressure either party towards a peace agreement (Moore, 1999). Moore (1999) reports that, just 31% say that the U.S. should pressure the two parties, while 66% say the U.S. should let the Israelis and Arabs settle the peace process on their own. In a Gallup Poll conducted in 2007, when asked whether the U.S. should put more pressure on the Israelis or the Palestinians to "make the necessary compromises" in order to resolve the conflict, American opinion had changed dramatically (Jones, 2007). According to Jones (2007), Americans *agreed* by a two-to-one margin that pressure should be applied to the parties in an effort to reach a peaceful resolution. Jones (2007), states that even more interesting, almost as many Americans chose the Israelis (30%) as the party that need to be pressured towards a peaceful resolution as they chose the Palestinians (39%). The remaining 31% did not have an opinion (10%), volunteered that the U.S. should put pressure on both sides (11%), or should not put more pressure on either side (Jones, 2007).

As illustrated in polls both recent and old concerning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, American opinions and perceptions on the situation have tended to fluctuate over time. What has not changed markedly and instead stayed relatively constant has been the majority of feelings of sympathy for the Israeli side of the conflict. Americans, when asked to choose where their sympathies lie in regards to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have repeatedly chosen the side of Israel.

While the conflict has been a continual source of turmoil, violence, and tragedy, as well as a breeding ground of sorts for terrorism and terrorist actions, it is interesting

to determine how perceptions have come to be shaped and formed. When asked to identify terrorism and terrorist acts, on what information are the definitions and identifications based? Will UTA students be able to provide an objective and accurate identification of terrorism and terrorist acts through observing tumultuous events that have occurred throughout the conflict and will there be a significant difference between responses from Criminology/Criminal Justice students and Political Science students? It is the aim of this paper to address these questions.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will include topics relevant to the manner in which the data for this study were obtained, analyzed, and evaluated. The purpose of this study was to examine differences in perceptions and knowledge by Criminology and Criminal Justice (referred to as CRCJ) majors and Political Science majors. Regarding the Palestinian and Israeli conflict, UTA students were asked to identify scenarios related to actions taken by both Palestinians and Israelis as they pertain to terrorism. The research gathered was cross-sectional and quantitative in nature.

The survey instrument in this study was created by the author to measure the perception and knowledge of CRCJ students and Political Science students concerning terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Using the literature review as a construct, the survey instrument included questions measuring demographics, knowledge, and perception respectively. The survey instrument was submitted and approved by the University of Texas at Arlington's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) working within the University of Texas at Arlington's Office of Research Integrity and compliance.

This study is exploratory due to the limited previous research into this topic. The survey instrument implementation is considered a proper method to use in this study because participation is voluntary and participants were able to respond to

questions without feelings of pressure. This section will review the criteria for survey participants, survey sample size, implementation of the survey instrument, and the analysis of the survey questionnaire.

3.1 Sample and Sample Size

A quantitative, cross sectional, empirical approach was used to measure UTA students' knowledge and perception pertaining to terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. A non - probability convenience sample for this study was utilized at the University of Texas at Arlington. Convenience sampling is the use of subjects that are easily accessible and available to the researcher. Due to the specifications of the study for which CRCJ majors and Political Science majors were necessary, the subject pool consisted of University of Texas at Arlington students that were enrolled in either CRCJ courses or Political Science courses.

Each CRCJ class currently offered at the University of Texas at Arlington was eligible to participate in the study as was each Political Science class. For this particular study, there were 200 total respondents that participated by completing the survey. Despite the total number of 200 respondents, only 151 respondents were eligible to be included in this particular study's sample size. The remaining 49 respondents were excluded on the basis that they declared majors other than CRCJ or Political Science. The total number of participants in this study was 151 (N=151), exceeding the requirements needed to achieve statistically significant results.

The Criminology/Criminal Justice Department at the University of Texas at Arlington has fifty-seven enrolled graduate students and four hundred seventy-five

undergraduate students enrolled for the Spring 2007 semester as reported by the UTA registrar. Excluding graduate level conference courses and thesis classes, there were six graduate courses offered during the Spring 2007 semester. Twenty undergraduate level courses were offered in the Criminology and Criminal Justice department during the Spring 2007 semester. For the purposes of this study, three graduate level courses and three undergraduate level courses were randomly selected to have the survey instrument administered. Random selection is defined in that each course had an equal chance of being selected for participation in this study.

The graduate level courses randomly selected were: Theoretical Criminology (5350), Correctional Theory and Practice (5332), and Women, Crime, and Criminal Justice (5352). The undergraduate level courses selected were: Introduction to the Criminal Justice System (2334), The American Judicial System (4301), and Theoretical Criminology (3300). Participants were issued the survey instrument in class and were allowed by professors the appropriate amount of time to complete the survey. Prior to completing the survey, all participants were informed that their participation was voluntary, asked to complete the survey only once, and were requested not to participate if they had already completed the same survey in a previous class.

For the purposes of obtaining the necessary sample size for Political Science majors, both undergraduate and graduate level Political Science courses were randomly selected to have the survey instrument administered. The Political Science department at the University of Texas at Arlington has seventy-three enrolled graduate students and six hundred thirty undergraduate students enrolled for the Spring 2007 semester as

reported by the UTA registrar. Excluding graduate level conference courses and thesis courses, there were seven graduate courses offered during the Spring 2007 semester. There were forty-three undergraduate courses offered during the Spring 2007 semester. The author randomly selected three undergraduate and three graduate level Political Science courses to participate in the study. Identical to the process utilized in administering surveys to the CRCJ student participants, the respondents were issued the survey in class and were given the appropriate amount of time to complete the survey by their professors. All participants were informed that the survey was voluntary, asked to complete only one survey, and were requested not to participate if they had already completed the survey in another class.

The three graduate level Political Science courses selected randomly were: Topics in Comparative Politics and International Relations (5312), Topics in U.S. National Politics: Institutions, Process, and Behavior (5311), and Topics in Public Administration and Policy Making (5314). The undergraduate level courses selected randomly for this study were: The Politics of International Conflict (3329), U.S. Constitutional Law: Government Power (4331), and State and Local Government (2312).

The sampling size for this study was calculated using Cohen's Size Categories. This allowed the researcher to reasonably estimate the sample size required to conduct the study. Participation in the survey was voluntary and all participants were given the opportunity to discontinue the survey instrument at any time during the process if they chose. As previously mentioned, 200 surveys were returned fully completed but 49

were excluded for the purposes of this study due to the respondents declaring collegiate majors other than CRCJ or Political Science. For the purposes of this study, a final sample of 151 usable, fully completed surveys (N=151) were returned with 72 CRCJ majors participating and 79 Political Science majors participating in the study.

<u>3.2 Survey Instrument</u>

A self-administered survey instrument was created by the researcher to collect demographical datum of the UTA students and to measure perception and knowledge pertaining to terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of both CRCJ majors and Political Science majors. The survey instrument was derived from the academic information in Chapter Two and is composed of forty-two questions. Questions measuring knowledge and perception were distributed evenly throughout the survey. The last seven questions on the survey were included with the intent of collecting demographical information from the UTA students. Demographical datum was collected with regards to gender, race/ethnicity, age, college major, class standing, and how many credit hours at UTA the respondent had completed.

The 5-point Likert scale was used on questions #9, #11, #13, #14, #34, and #35 to measure knowledge and perceptions of the participating respondents. Pertaining to these questions, the survey participants were asked to select a response on a scale from "1" to "5" with "1" often signifying the strongest possible agreement and "5" representing the opposite extreme in the spectrum of responses provided. A universal example cannot be applied to these six Likert scale questions because the responses provided are often phrased differently in each. For questions #9 and #11, the "1"

signifies "Very Well Informed" and the "5" represents "Not Informed At All" with choices "2", "3", and "4" representing values falling somewhere within the extremes of "1" and "5" on a positive to negative scale. On question #13, the value "1" represents "Very Confident" while "5" represents "Not Confident at All". Choices "2" through "4" represent values of Confident, Neutral, and Not Confident, respectively. On question #14, the value "1" represents "Strongly Conservative" while the value "5" signifies "Strongly Liberal". Choices "2" through "4" represent values of Conservative, Neutral, and Liberal, respectively. On question #34, choice "1" expresses "Strongly Affected" while choice "5" signifies "Not Affected at All". Choices "2" through "4" represent responses of Affected, Neutral, and Not Affected, respectively. On question #35, value "1" represents "Strongly Agree" while response option "5" represents "Strongly Disagree". Response options "2" through "4" provide the values of Agree, Neutral, and Disagree.

While the 5 - point Likert scale is used on numerous questions in the survey instrument, the researcher's intent was to measure the knowledge and perception data from respondent answers to scenarios presented to the participants. These scenarios are presented in a two part question format. The participating respondents were provided a scenario and asked to answer two questions. First, if the participant viewed the scenario as a terrorist act and second, whether or not they attributed the act to the Palestinians or the Israelis. These two part scenario oriented questions are found from question #15 through question #28.

The survey instrument and appropriate forms were submitted to the IRB for evaluation and authorization. The researcher received approval from the IRB and Office of Research and Compliance to execute this study. A copy of the survey instrument is located in the appendix.

3.3 Survey Implementation

In the Spring 2007 semester, the researcher obtained permission from professors from both the Criminology and Criminal Justice Department and the Political Science Department at the University of Texas at Arlington to implement the survey to Political Science and CRCJ students in their classes. IRB sent the researcher a letter of approval for this study and survey instrument to be implemented starting in April of 2007. Surveys were distributed to the previously mentioned six CRCJ and six Political Science courses. The selection criteria were that all courses included in the selection pool were required to be designated as a CRCJ or Political Science course. Each course was randomly selected from the list provided by each departmental office detailing all courses offered in the Spring 2007 semester, providing equal chance for selection. The professors of the selected courses granted permission to administer the surveys to the students in their classes.

The researcher distributed a manila envelope containing thirty copies of the survey instrument with an additional handout that contained a typed consent form to the professors of each selected course. The professors distributed the copies of the survey instruments to their students after reading aloud the consent form disclaimer and the survey instructions. Once complete, the professors placed the surveys back into the

manila envelope and left them in their office mailboxes where the researcher subsequently retrieved them.

The survey instrument included a consent form that was read aloud by the professor to the student participants prior to the administration of the survey. The consent form was a disclaimer that declared that participation in the survey was entirely voluntary, and that participants could stop completing the survey at any time without resulting in a penalty of any kind. Participants were also informed that the completion of the survey would not result in any form of reward: monetary, scholastic, or the like. It was also stated that participant's personal identities and responses were to be kept confidential and that their participation would not result in physical or mental harm (A copy of the consent form is located in Appendix A). All survey instruments were placed in a manila envelope to maintain the confidentiality of the participant. The survey instrument was administered to students in the CRCJ and Political Science classes during April 2007.

3.4 Analysis Procedure

The researcher utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 13.0 to code and analyze the data obtained from the completed survey instruments. The data compiled from the responses of UTA students, specifically CRCJ majors and Political Science majors, was compared and contrasted. The survey items measured on a 5-point Likert scale were coded to reflect their respective nominal values. The response choices for each of the demographical items were coded to reflect their respective categorical and ordinal values. The survey participants' responses were

recorded in SPSS and frequencies were generated with regard to the number of responses from each variable.

The author additionally chose to use an independent one sample t-test. The main purpose for using statistical manipulation was to find possible differences in knowledge and perception pertaining to terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict between students with CRCJ majors and students with Political Science majors at UTA. The one sample t-test was selected because it was determined that these tests were the most appropriate to compare the means and to determine if statistical significance existed between CRCJ and Political Science majors. According to Babbie (2004), a t-test is designed to determine whether a statistically significant difference exists between the means of two variables. The significance levels for a t-test are represented by the .05 and .01 levels.

The following items from the survey instrument were analyzed using the one sample t-test: survey questions #9, #11, #13, #14, #34, and #35 (See Appendix B for complete survey instrument). These six questions were the only ones selected for one sample t-test analysis because they comprise the only 5 - point Likert scale questions on the survey instrument and one sample t-test analysis is primarily used in conjunction with Likert scale questions. In Chapter Four, the author will display findings of the survey instrument in tables and charts that are relevant to the study.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings in this chapter will include the results from the respondents who participated in the survey. These results provide an overview of perceptions and knowledge of terrorism within the conflict as well as demographical information about the respondents themselves. For the purposes of this study, descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the data collected because, according to Babbie (2004), descriptive statistics are statistical computations describing either the characteristics of a sample or the relationship among variables in a sample.

The data collected for this study were analyzed using an independent one sample t-test. The t-test is most appropriate for this study because two groups are being compared (CRCJ and Political Science majors). Independent one sample t-tests are used to describe the differences, if any, of variables regarding these two sample populations. The data was entered and analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Services (SPSS) because it provided the most rigorous and reliable software available in order to analyze data and run frequencies from the survey participants' responses.

The findings of this study are presented in this chapter in three main sections. The first section will present the demographical information of the respondents surveyed in terms of both percentages and N values. The second section presents the

findings from questions #15 - #28 (See Appendix B). These questions consisted of a scenario presented to the respondent who was asked to answer a two part question directly related to that scenario. These questions represent the perception and knowledge section of the survey instrument and the findings to these questions are presented in percentages. The third and final section will present results of the t-test findings run on the six 5-point Likert scale questions from the survey. These findings are included to explain whether or not there were statistically significant differences found between CRCJ majors and Political Science majors with regards to specific variables. In this final section, the data will be presented through one sample t-test comparisons of the means of each group (CRCJ majors and Political Science majors). It is important to note that all percentages reported in this chapter have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

<div align="center">4.1 Demographical Information</div>

The demographical data will be presented in two tables illustrating both frequencies and percentages. Because both CRCJ majors and Political Science majors were surveyed and represent two separate sampled populations, the demographical information will be presented in two different tables respectively. As mentioned in Chapter Three, there were 200 completed survey instruments however only 151 surveys were usable for this particular study due to 49 respondents declaring majors other than CRCJ or Political Science. This section will first look at the demographical breakdown of the CRCJ majors.

Of the 151 surveys considered usable for this study, 72 survey respondents were CRCJ majors. Of the 72 CRCJ majors surveyed, 39 were males representing the majority of participants at 54%. There were 32 female participants representing 44% of the respondents. The overwhelming majority of the CRCJ respondents were between the ages of 22-26 with 43 participants or 60% declaring this their age range. The next largest age group for the CRCJ respondents was that of participants falling between ages 18-21. Eighteen respondents comprising 25% of the population selected this age range. There were six participants representing 8% of the sample who selected the age range of 32-37 and five respondents comprising 7% of the population that selected the age range of 27-31 respectively. There were no CRCJ respondents who selected the age range of 38 or older.

The CRCJ survey participants most often answered that they were graduate students or seniors. Twenty-four respondents comprising 33% of the sample population declared that they were graduate students while 22 participants representing 31% of those surveyed selected senior as their class standing. The remaining class standing breakdown was 21% juniors, 11% sophomores, and 4% freshman respectively. The majority of the CRCJ respondents identified themselves as Caucasian with 46 participants representing 64% of the sample population selecting this answer. The remaining race/ethnicity breakdown was 17% Hispanic, 11% African American, 7% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1 respondent selecting the option marked Other. For a complete summary of demographics, including credit hours completed at UTA (refer to Table 4.1).

TABLE 4.1 CRCJ Demographics: Frequency and Percentage

CRCJ Demographic		Frequency	Percent
36. What is your class standing you have achieved to date?	Freshman	3	4
	Sophomore	8	11
	Junior	15	21
	Senior	22	31
	Graduate	24	33
37. How many credits hours have you completed at UTA?	0-15	14	19
	16-30	4	6
	31-45	8	11
	46-60	4	6
	61-75	9	13
	76-90	9	13
	91-105	4	6
	106-120	18	25
	121+	1	1
38. Are you a CRCJ Major?	Yes	72	100
	No	0	0
39. If you are not a CRCJ Major, what is your Major?	N/A	72	100
40. Are you:	MALE	39	54
	FEMALE	32	44
41. How old are you?	18-21	18	25
	22-26	43	60
	27-31	5	7
	32-37	6	8
42. Are you:	Caucasian	46	64
	Hispanic	12	17
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	7
	African American	8	11
	Other (specify)	1	1

Of the 151 surveys usable for the purposes of this study, 79 survey respondents were Political Science majors. Of the 79 Political Science majors surveyed, 43 were female representing the majority of participants at 54%. Males represented 46% of the respondents with 36 participants. Similar to the CRCJ respondents, the overwhelming majority of Political Science respondents were between the ages of 22-26 with 41 participants comprising 52% of the sample population choosing this option. The next largest age group was 18-21 with 19 respondents representing 24% of the sample selecting this answer. The remaining percentage of Political Science participants were as follows: 13% were in the 27-31 age range, 9% selected the 32-37 age range, and 3% chose 38 or older as their age group.

Similar to CRCJ respondents, Political Science participants most often answered that they were graduate students or seniors. Thirty-one students representing 40% of the sample population declared that they were graduate students while 24 respondents comprising 30% of the sample selected senior as their class standing. The remaining class standing breakdown was 20% juniors, 9% sophomores, and 1% freshman. The majority of the Political Science participants identified themselves as Caucasian with 43 respondents representing 54% of the sample population selecting this response. The remaining race/ethnicity breakdown was 17% Hispanic, 14% African American, 9% Asian/Pacific Islander and 5% who selected the Other response option. For a complete summary of demographics, including credit hours completed at UTA, (refer to Table 4.2).

TABLE 4.2 Political Science Demographics: Frequencies and Percentages

Political Science Demographic		Frequency	Percent
36. What is your class standing you have achieved to date?	Freshman	1	1
	Sophomore	7	9
	Junior	16	20
	Senior	24	30
	Graduate	31	40
37. How many credits hours have you completed at UTA?	0-15	8	10
	16-30	9	11
	31-45	6	8
	46-60	8	10
	61-75	9	11
	76-90	7	9
	91-105	7	9
	106-120	16	20
	121+	9	11
38. Are you a CRCJ Major?	Yes	0	0
	No	79	100
39. If you are not a CRCJ Major, what is your Major?	Political Science	79	100
40. Are you:	MALE	36	46
	FEMALE	43	54
41. How old are you?	18-21	19	24
	22-26	41	52
	27-31	10	13
	32-37	7	9
	38 or older	2	3
42. Are you:	Caucasian	43	54
	Hispanic	13	17
	Asian/Pacific Islander	7	9
	African American	11	14
	Other (specify)	4	5

4.2 CRCJ and Political Science responses to knowledge and perception questions

Items in this section of the survey instrument were presented in order to measure the knowledge and perception of UTA students as it pertains to terrorism and terrorist acts within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. These questions were presented to the participants in the form of a two part question based on specific scenarios. In the first part of the question, respondents were asked to review the scenario provided and then answer whether they felt the actions described in the presented scenario represented a terrorist act or not. Respondents were given the option of choosing "No" the action was not a terrorist act, or "Yes" the action committed was a terrorist act. The second part of the question asked the respondents to identify which party they believed to have committed the act described within the given scenario. The participants were given the option of "Palestinians" or "Israelis".

The results of the findings for this section of the chapter are presented in two separate tables. Table 4.3 presents the findings from the first part of the question; that of whether the action committed within the given scenario represents a terrorist act, and compares how participants declaring CRCJ majors answered this part of the question against responses given by participants declaring Political Science majors. Table 4.4 presents the findings from the second part of the question; that of which party was believed responsible for the action committed in the given scenario. Similar to Table 4.3, in Table 4.4 the selected answers from CRCJ majors are compared against those of Political Science respondents. In both tables, the response rate of CRCJ majors and Political Science majors is presented in percentages.

100

Table 4.3 lists the first scenario as, "Gunman opens fire inside bus and kills four people while seriously injuring five." The responses provided as to whether or not this action represents a terrorist act, are presented in the table in a manner which clearly indicates the percentage of Political Science majors who chose both "Yes" or "No" to this question compared to the responses of the CRCJ population sample. With regard to this first scenario, 66% of Political Science majors answered "Yes" the action was a terrorist act while 33% answered "No". For the CRCJ respondents, 58% answered "Yes" the action was a terrorist while 40% answered "No".

The following variable presented was "Five men assault two members of humanitarian group who are attempting to escort children to school." Fifty-two percent (52%) of Political Science respondents answered "Yes" the action represented a terrorist act while 46% answered "No". Sixty-one percent (61%) of CRCJ respondents answered "Yes" the action was a terrorist act while 38% answered "No".

The subsequent situation was "Sixteen year old suicide bomber detonates bomb in marketplace killing him and three others." The Political Science majors responded accordingly: 92% answered "Yes" and 8% answered "No". Ninety percent (90%) of CRCJ participants viewed the action as a terrorist act and answered "Yes" while 10% answered "No" it was not a terrorist act.

The next scenario provided was "Four men are killed and six wounded when a tunnel beneath their location is dynamited." Sixty-six percent (66%) of Political Science respondents selected "Yes" while 34% selected "No". Sixty percent (60%) of

CRCJ majors answered that "Yes" the action was a terrorist act while 39% responded that it was not.

The subsequent example given was "Three men are assassinated in a coffee shop in Tel-Aviv." Sixty-three percent (63%) of Political Science majors selected "Yes" this act represented a terrorist act while 35% answered "No" it did not. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of CRCJ respondents answered "Yes" while 40% answered "No".

The following circumstance provided was "A group of people attack a religious procession in which the archbishop is present. The archbishop is punched in the face, has his cap torn off, and is bombarded with insults." Political Science participants responded accordingly: Forty-one percent (41%) answered "Yes" this act was a terrorist act while 58% answered "No" it was not a terrorist act. Fifty-four percent (54%) of CRCJ respondents answered "Yes" the act was a terrorist act while 44% answered that it was not.

The next variable presented was "The military is responsible for house demolitions. Close to 40% of the demolished houses are occupied by residents with no suspected involvement in militant activity. Less than three percent of the occupants are given advance notice before demolition." Forty-one percent (41%) of Political Science respondents answered "Yes" this was a terrorist act while 57% responded "No". Thirty-six percent (36%) of CRCJ majors answered this represented a terrorist act while 60% responded "No" that it did not.

The condition presented next was "91 people killed in hotel bombing. Perpetrators claim responsibility in effort to bring attention to their cause." Political

Science respondents answered accordingly: Ninety-eight percent (98%) answered "Yes" while 3% answered "No". Ninety percent (90%) of CRCJ participants responded that "Yes" this action was a terrorist act and 8% answered that it was not a terrorist act.

The subsequent scenario given was "Several men break into a home and kill one man. A young girl and elderly woman are wounded." Twenty-three percent (23%) of Political Science participants answered "Yes" the act was a terrorist act while 77% answered "No". Thirteen percent (13%) of CRCJ respondents selected "Yes" it was an act of terrorism while 88% answered "No".

Next, the variable presented was "Helicopter fires missiles at car killing leader of oppositional political party. Car is destroyed as subsequent missile is fired at growing group of onlookers. 7 killed and 53 wounded." Political Science majors responded as follows: Seventy-seven percent (77%) answered "Yes" while 23% answered "No" it was not an act of terrorism. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of CRCJ respondents answered "Yes" it was an act of terrorism while 21% responded "No" it was not an act of terrorism.

The following situation provided was "Gunman opens fire on large group of tourists. One woman is killed and four are wounded." Political Science participants answered accordingly: Seventy-three percent (73%) selected "Yes" the action was an act of terrorism while 27% answered "No" it was not an act of terrorism. Sixty-one percent (61%) of CRCJ participants answered "Yes" the act was one of terrorism while 38% answered "No".

The example presented next was "Two men lynched for entering the wrong neighborhood." Thirty-seven percent (37%) of Political Science respondents answered "Yes" this was an act of terrorism compared to 63% of respondents that answered "No." Thirty-one percent (31%) of CRCJ participants selected "Yes" compared to 69% that answered this act was not one of terrorism.

The subsequent scenario given was "Teacher and driver killed in a van by a drive-by shooting." Twenty-seven percent (27%) of Political Science participants selected "Yes" this was an act of terrorism compared to 73% that answered "No". CRCJ respondents answered accordingly: Twenty-six percent (26%) answered "Yes" this was an act of terrorism compared to 72% that answered "No" it was not.

The final variable provided was "In retaliation for the death of two of their friends, several men kill 14 people and destroy their houses." Forty-nine percent (49%) of Political Science respondents answered "Yes" it was an act of terrorism whereas 49% selected "No" it was not. CRCJ participants responded as follows: Thirty-six percent (36%) answered "Yes" this was an act of terrorism compared to 64% that answered it was not an act of terrorism.

For a complete summary of responses cataloged according to major, (refer to Table 4.3). It is important to point out that percentages may not total 100% due to surveys with incomplete responses.

Table 4.3 Act of Terrorism by Major

Item	Major	Act of Terrorism	
		Yes %	No %
15. Gunman opens fire inside bus and kills four people while seriously injuring five.	Political Science	66	33
	CRCJ	58	40
16. Five men assault two members of humanitarian group who are attempting to escort children to school.	Political Science	52	46
	CRCJ	61	38
17. Sixteen year old suicide bomber detonates bomb in marketplace killing him and three others.	Political Science	92	8
	CRCJ	90	10
18. Four men are killed and six wounded when a tunnel beneath their location is dynamited.	Political Science	66	34
	CRCJ	60	39
19. Three men are assassinated in a coffee shop in Tel Aviv.	Political Science	63	35
	CRCJ	57	40
20. A group of people attack a religious procession in which the archbishop is present. The archbishop is punched in the face, has his cap torn off, and is bombarded with insults.	Political Science	41	58
	CRCJ	54	44
21. The military is responsible for house demolitions. Close to 40% of the demolished houses are occupied by residents with no suspected involvement in militant activity. Less than three percent of the occupants are given advance notice before demolition.	Political Science	41	57
	CRCJ	36	60

Table 4.3 (continued)

Item	Major	Act of Terrorism	
		Yes %	No %
22. Ninety-one people killed in hotel bombing. Perpetrators claim responsibility in effort to bring attention to their cause.	Political Science	98	3
	CRCJ	90	8
23. Several men break into a home and kill one man. A young girl and elderly woman are wounded.	Political Science	23	77
	CRCJ	13	88
24. Helicopter fires missiles at car killing leader of oppositional political party. Car is destroyed as subsequent missile is fired at growing group of onlookers. 7 killed and 53 wounded.	Political Science	77	23
	CRCJ	78	21
25. Gunman opens fire on large group of tourists. One woman is killed and four are wounded.	Political Science	73	27
	CRCJ	61	38
26. Two men lynched for entering the wrong neighborhood.	Political Science	37	63
	CRCJ	31	69
27. Teacher and driver killed in a van by a drive-by shooting.	Political Science	27	73
	CRCJ	26	72
28. In retaliation for the death of two of their friends, several men kill 14 people and destroy their houses.	Political Science	49	49
	CRCJ	36	64

*Percentages may not total 100% due to surveys with incomplete responses.

The findings of the second part of the question are displayed in Table 4.4. This table presents the findings of the respondents' answers to the second part of the question involving a specific scenario; to which party (Palestinians or Israelis) do respondents attribute the actions committed in the given scenarios? As in Table 4.3, Table 4.4 presents the respondents' answers from CRCJ majors compared to those of Political Science respondents.

Table 4.4 lists the first scenario as, "Gunman opens fire inside bus and kills four people while seriously injuring five." The responses provided as to which group this act is attributed, are presented in a manner which clearly indicates the percentage of Political Science participants that chose either "Palestinians" or "Israelis" to each question compared to the responses of the CRCJ population sample. With regard to this first scenario, 66% of Political Science respondents attributed this act to the "Palestinians" while 23% attributed the act to the "Israelis". Fifty-one percent (51%) of CRCJ respondents answered "Palestinians" when asked to whom this act was attributed compared to 15% that selected "Israelis".

The following scenario presented was "Five men assault two members of humanitarian group who are attempting to escort children to school." With regard to the question of which group this act is attributed, 51% of Political Science respondents selected "Palestinians" and 37% selected "Israelis". Forty-six percent (46%) of the CRCJ respondents selected "Palestinians" and 24% answered "Israelis".

The next variable provided was "Sixteen year old suicide bomber detonates bomb in marketplace killing him and three others." Eighty-two percent (82%) of

Political Science participants attributed this act to "Palestinians" whereas 6% selected "Israelis". Fifty-eight percent (58%) of CRCJ respondents attributed this act to "Palestinians" and 21% attributed the act in the scenario to "Israelis".

The subsequent situation was "Four men are killed and six wounded when a tunnel beneath their location is dynamited." Political Science respondents answered as follows: 54% selected "Palestinians" as to who the act is attributed and 33% selected "Israelis". Thirty-five percent (35%) of CRCJ respondents attributed this act to "Palestinians" whereas 33% selected "Israelis".

The next circumstance presented was "Three men are assassinated in a coffee shop in Tel-Aviv." With regard to the question of which group this act is attributed, 46% of Political Science respondents selected "Palestinians" and 43% selected "Israelis". Thirty-nine percent (39%) of CRCJ participants answered "Palestinians" and 28% selected "Israelis".

The example given next was "A group of people attack a religious procession in which the archbishop is present. The archbishop is punched in the face, has his cap torn off, and is bombarded with insults." Fifty-two percent (52%) of the Political Science respondents attributed this act to "Palestinians" and 35% selected "Israelis". Forty-two percent (42%) of CRCJ respondents answered "Palestinians" while 26% selected "Israelis".

The following condition was "The military is responsible for house demolitions. Close to 40% of the demolished houses are occupied by residents with no suspected involvement in militant activity. Less than three percent of the occupants are given

advance notice before demolition." Political Science respondents' answers as to which group the act is attributed are as follows: Thirty percent (30%) selected "Palestinians" and 58% selected "Israelis" compared to 31% of CRCJ respondents that answered "Palestinians" and 33% that selected "Israelis".

Next, the scenario provided was "91 people killed in hotel bombing. Perpetrators claim responsibility in effort to bring attention to their cause." Eighty percent (80%) of Political Science respondents answered "Palestinians" when asked which group the act was attributed while 9% selected "Israelis". Sixty-five percent (65%) of CRCJ participants selected "Palestinians" and 14% answered "Israelis".

The subsequent situation presented was "Several men break into a home and kill one man. A young girl and elderly woman are wounded." With regard to which group the act was attributed, Political Science participants answered accordingly: Forty-six percent (46%) selected "Palestinians" and 44% answered "Israelis". CRCJ respondents answered as follows: 36% answered "Palestinians" and 18% selected "Israelis".

The following variable was "Helicopter fires missiles at car killing leader of oppositional political party. Car is destroyed as subsequent missile is fired at growing group of onlookers. 7 killed and 53 wounded." Thirty-seven percent (37%) of Political Science participants selected "Palestinians" as to which group the act was attributed. Fifty-one percent (51%) of Political Science participants answered "Israelis" as to which group the act was attributed. CRCJ respondents answered accordingly: Forty-three percent (43%) selected "Palestinians" and 32% answered "Israelis".

The next circumstance provided was "Gunman opens fire on large group of tourists. One woman is killed and four are wounded." With regard to which group the act was attributed, Political Science respondents answered accordingly: Seventy percent (70%) selected "Palestinians" and 20% selected "Israelis". CRCJ participants responded as follows: Forty-four percent (44%) answered "Palestinians" and 21% answered "Israelis".

The following example given was "Two men lynched for entering the wrong neighborhood." Fifty-four percent (54%) of Political Science respondents chose "Palestinians" as to who the act was attributed, and 33% answered "Israelis". Eighteen percent (18%) of CRCJ participants selected "Palestinians" whereas 38% answered "Israelis".

The subsequent variable presented was "Teacher and driver killed in a van by a drive-by shooting." Fifty-six percent (56%) of Political Science participants selected "Palestinians" when asked which group the act was attributed. Thirty-two percent (32%) answered "Israelis". Thirty-six percent (36%) of CRCJ respondents chose "Palestinians" and 15% answered "Israelis".

The final scenario given was "In retaliation for the death of two of their friends, several men kill 14 people and destroy their houses." With regard to which group this act was attributed to, Political Science respondents answered accordingly: Fifty-three percent (53%) selected "Palestinians" and 33% selected "Israelis". CRCJ participants responded as follows: Thirty-three percent (33%) answered "Palestinians" whereas 25% selected "Israelis".

Table 4.4 Act Attributed To by Major

Item	Major	Act Attributed To	
		Palestinians %	Israelis %
15. Gunman opens fire inside bus and kills four people while seriously injuring five.	Political Science	66	23
	CRCJ	51	15
16. Five men assault two members of humanitarian group who are attempting to escort children to school.	Political Science	51	37
	CRCJ	46	24
17. Sixteen year old suicide bomber detonates bomb in marketplace killing him and three others.	Political Science	82	6
	CRCJ	58	21
18. Four men are killed and six wounded when a tunnel beneath their location is dynamited.	Political Science	54	33
	CRCJ	35	33
19. Three men are assassinated in a coffee shop in Tel Aviv.	Political Science	46	43
	CRCJ	39	28
20. A group of people attack a religious procession in which the archbishop is present. The archbishop is punched in the face, has his cap torn off, and is bombarded with insults.	Political Science	52	35
	CRCJ	42	26
21. The military is responsible for house demolitions. Close to 40% of the demolished houses are occupied by residents with no suspected involvement in militant activity. Less than three percent of the occupants are given advance notice before demolition.	Political Science	30	58
	CRCJ	31	33

Table 4.4 (continued)

Item	Major	Act Attributed To	
		Palestinians %	Israelis %
22. Ninety-one people killed in hotel bombing. Perpetrators claim responsibility in effort to bring attention to their cause.	Political Science	80	9
	CRCJ	65	14
23. Several men break into a home and kill one man. A young girl and elderly woman are wounded.	Political Science	46	44
	CRCJ	36	18
24. Helicopter fires missiles at car killing leader of oppositional political party. Car is destroyed as subsequent missile is fired at growing group of onlookers. 7 killed and 53 wounded.	Political Science	37	51
	CRCJ	43	32
25. Gunman opens fire on large group of tourists. One woman is killed and four are wounded.	Political Science	70	20
	CRCJ	44	21
26. Two men lynched for entering the wrong neighborhood.	Political Science	54	33
	CRCJ	18	38
27. Teacher and driver killed in a van by a drive-by shooting.	Political Science	56	32
	CRCJ	36	15
28. In retaliation for the death of two of their friends, several men kill 14 people and destroy their houses.	Political Science	53	33
	CRCJ	33	25

*Percentages may not total 100% due to surveys with incomplete responses.

This section will present results of the t-test findings run on the six 5 - point Likert scale questions from the survey instrument. Variables which show significant differences at a 95% confidence coefficient between CRCJ students and Political Science students are the focal point of this analysis. The results of the t-test analysis are presented in Table 4.5 where the means of both CRCJ students and Political Science students are displayed next to the comparative results represented by the p-value data.

The first variable within this group was "How well informed do you consider yourself to be on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict?" For this variable, CRCJ majors had a mean of 3.57 compared to a mean of 3.16 for Political Science majors. The t-test comparison (p-value) for this variable computed to .004 and represented the only statistically significant comparison within this group of variables.

The second variable within this group "How well informed do you consider yourself to be about terrorism?" returned a p-value of .201 and held no statistically significant difference. The CRCJ respondents produced a mean of 2.68 while the Political Science respondents had a group mean of 2.53.

The subsequent variable "How confident do you feel in your ability to identify terrorist acts?" produced a p-value of .688 indicating there was no statistically significant difference among the responses of CRCJ participants and Political Science respondents. The mean value of CRCJ respondents was 2.71 and the mean value for Political Science respondents was 2.66.

For the variable, "How do you categorize your political views?", findings revealed a t-test comparison of .198 indicating no statistically significant difference between CRCJ and Political Science responses. The mean value of CRCJ respondents for this variable was 2.94 while the Political Science mean value was 3.08.

The following variable, "To what extent do you feel that your opinion of the Israel-Palestinian conflict has been affected by the media?" displayed a mean value of 2.93 for CRCJ respondents and 3.1 for Political Science respondents. The t-test comparison (p-value) for this variable was .207 concluding that there was no statistically significant difference.

The final variable within this section, "Do you agree that terrorist acts can ever be justified for the greater good?", produced a p-value of .178. This t-test comparison indicated that no statistically significant difference was found between the CRCJ and Political Science respondents. The mean value of responses for this particular variable for CRCJ respondents was 3.82 while Political Science respondents had a mean value of 4.00.

TABLE 4.5 Means and p-Values among CRCJ and Political Science Majors

Item	Means		p-Value
	Political Science	**CRCJ**	
9. How well informed do you consider yourself to be on the Palestinian/Israeli conflict?	3.16	3.57	.004**
11. How well informed do you consider yourself to be about terrorism?	2.53	2.68	.201
13. How confident do you feel in your ability to identify terrorist acts?	2.66	2.71	.688
14. How do you categorize your political views?	3.08	2.94	.198
34. To what extent do you feel that your opinion of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict has been affected by the media?	3.10	2.93	.207
35. Do you agree that terrorist acts can ever be justified for the greater good?	4.00	3.82	.178

* Statistically significant at the 0.05 confidence level
**Statistically significant at the 0.01 confidence level

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The focus of this study was the examination of perception and knowledge by UTA students as it relates to terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Specifically, this study has attempted to examine differences of perception and knowledge as they pertain to terrorism within the Israeli/Palestinian conflict between two sample populations of students: Criminology/Criminal Justice majors and Political Science majors. To support this focus, the study also explored how CRCJ and Political Science students gained their knowledge of both terrorism and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

In Chapter 4, the responses of 151 participants that completed the survey instrument were presented. These responses were divided into two separate and distinct populations, analyzed through SPSS 13.0 to determine the frequency   distributions, and presented in tables that displayed comparisons between the two populations. The responses were also analyzed by SPSS 13.0 in an effort to determine statistically significant differences in the responses while controlling for major. In this chapter, the author will discuss these results in greater detail in an attempt to clarify what these results reveal. The author will conclude the chapter by discussing the limitations of this study, what the study and its findings signify for potential policy implications, and the importance of future research in this area of interest.

5.1 Perception and Knowledge of Acts of Terrorism Compared by Major

After consolidating the results from Chapter 4 and presenting them in a more clearly defined analysis, it is the author's intention to demonstrate the relevance of these results. As illustrated within the terrorism section of the literature review in chapter 2, defining terrorism and what constitutes an act of terrorism is difficult and unclear as demonstrated by no less than 109 different definitions of terrorism provided by academic scholars (Schmid and Jongman, 1988). The terrorism section within the literature review in Chapter 2 also illustrates the extreme importance of being able to reach a universal definition of terrorism. Without a universal agreement of what constitutes terrorism and terrorist acts, definitive laws cannot be enacted in order to combat and extinguish those terrorist acts and the people who engage in terrorist activities.

The importance of the findings in this study is to examine the differences or gaps in knowledge and perceptions, if any, between CRCJ and Political Science students in relation to terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The author's intent is to examine if students within different majors perceive terrorism and terrorist acts as a constant, and concrete definition, or if their perceptions and knowledge of terrorism differ.

The variables used to determine the perception and knowledge of CRCJ and Political Science students in relation to acts of terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict were presented to the participants in the form of specific scenarios. Within these scenarios, there were 14 variables used to measure the responses of CRCJ and

Political Science students. The results are displayed in Table 4.3. Of these 14 variables, the findings showed that responses by both CRCJ and Political Science students were relatively similar in their identification of acts of terrorism. There were seven variables, consisting of the majority of participant responses, in which the responses by both majors proved to have a discrepancy of 6% or less. While the answers to each of these seven scenarios differed as to whether or not the described act was viewed as an act of terrorism, the consensus of responses of CRCJ majors mirrored those given by Political Science majors.

Out of the fourteen given scenarios, ten scenarios demonstrated a notable similarity of 9% or less discrepancy in responses between the two majors. These findings seem to suggest that both academic disciplines, Criminology/Criminal Justice and Political Science, have succeeded in teaching their students an objective and concrete way to identify terrorist acts. The findings suggest that students within both disciplines are receiving scholastic training that allows them to use more sophisticated, universal, and definitive methods to identify terrorist acts and are relying less on a subjective and fluctuating definition in their identifications.

These findings also demonstrate several variables in which a discrepancy between responses between the majors should be considered notable. In four of the variables measured, responses between the two majors differed at response rates of 10%, 12%, 13% and 13% respectively. Of significant interest is that three out of four of these variables illustrate that Political Science respondents were more likely to identify one of the scenarios presented as an act of terrorism than those respondents within the

118

CRCJ discipline. This discrepancy recalls the definition provided by Jenkins (1984) that, terrorism is the use or threatened use of force designed to bring about a political change. This finding could indicate the significant influence of the political aspect of terrorism.

The discrepancies of responses for these four variables may indicate that Political Science majors are trained within their discipline to be more sensitive to the political aspects of a presented scenario. They may further imply that the academic training provided to CRCJ students predisposes them to identify acts based on their criminal aspects and whether the act breaks the rule of the local, state, or federal law. A possible suggestion for these findings is that all four of the variables in question could conceivably be considered either a terrorist act or a stand alone criminal act based solely on the observer's context. CRCJ students may have interpreted the scenario as a stand alone act of criminal activity while the Political Science respondents might have viewed the act within a political context.

Another interesting difference found between the CRCJ and Political Science respondents was the variable which involved the archbishop being physically and verbally assaulted. This variable marked the only scenario of the four in question in which CRCJ respondents identified the act as one of terrorism at a more significant rate than did the Political Science participants. This finding may suggest that, similarly to the implication above that Political Science majors are more sensitive to the political aspects of an act, CRCJ students may have a more difficult time distinguishing a crime from a terrorist act (political aspect) and look to religious symbols within a crime to

justify declaring it a terrorist act. In other words, the finding suggests that the inclusion of the archbishop in the scenario acted as a trigger for CRCJ respondents to declare it a terrorist act whereas Political Science students, more sensitive to political aspects of terrorism, were less likely to declare it a terrorist act.

The implication of this section of the study suggests that while both Political Science and CRCJ disciplines are successfully training their students to identify terrorist acts based on objective and concretely defined methods, there still remains a notable difference in perception of what constitutes a terrorist act. Perhaps, the fact that the Political Science discipline focuses more detail on the political aspect of acts increases the likelihood that these scenarios will be seen more often as acts of terrorism compared to CRCJ respondents who view these scenarios in more of an isolated vacuum in which the action committed represents more of a criminal act than a terrorist act. Despite the difference in these four variables, the findings indicate that out of 14 variables, CRCJ and Political Science respondents answered similarly on 10 variables and that the knowledge and perception of terrorist acts appears to be relatively constant throughout both academic disciplines.

5.2 Perception and Knowledge Pertaining to Whom the Acts are Attributed

The variables used to measure perception and knowledge pertaining to which party was viewed as responsible for the commission of the act was the same fourteen variables used to measure responses to the question of whether or not the act was viewed as one of terrorism. These variables were presented to the survey participants in the form of a specific scenario which the respondents were asked to determine if the act

was a terrorist act and then to respond as to which group they believed was attributable for the act. These results are presented in Table 4.4 found in the previous chapter.

Compared to the results from Table 4.3, the results from Table 4.4 proved to be much more divergent with very little similarity between responses given by CRCJ and Political Science participants. As opposed to Table 4.3, which found that ten out of the fourteen variables were answered similarly and within a 9% range of response agreement, the findings of Table 4.4 are better explained by drawing attention to the differences among the responses given by CRCJ and Political Science participants. Only the minority of responses demonstrate any level of similarity in responses given by the two sample populations.

In attempting to discuss first the similarities among responses, the author highlights the fact that out of fourteen variables, only four show a relative similarity among responses between both CRCJ and Political Science participants in that these acts are primarily attributed to the Palestinians. When the author attempts to analyze the findings for response rates that attribute the acts to the Israelis, the similarities are more frequent but the differences are not significantly less volatile. The fascinating aspect of this discovery is that none of the variables that show similarities of responses that attribute the acts to the Israelis are the same variables that display similarities of responses that signified Palestinian attribution.

Adding to the volatility of the results of this portion of the question was the fact that many participants within both major classifications chose to abstain from answering the second part of the question regarding which party they attributed the act.

121

Often, many of the survey respondents would answer "Yes" or "No" to the first part of the question: identifying whether or not the scenario was a terrorist act, but often the participant abstained from answering the second part of the question. This resulted in the author entering a missing value for the second portion of the question and contributed to the volatility of the findings.

An example of the unpredictability of the results can be observed by looking more closely at variable 28. This scenario states, "In retaliation for the death of two of their friends, several men kill 14 people and destroy their homes." Fifty-three percent (53%) of Political Science participants attributed this act to the Palestinians and 33% attributed it to the Israelis. Thirty-three percent (33%) of CRCJ respondents attributed this act to the Palestinians whereas 25% attributed it to the Israelis. This adds up to a discrepancy of 20% between majors in their selection of attribution to the Palestinians and 8% discrepancy in their selection of the Israelis. Further analysis however, shows that when all percentages are added together, only 86% of Political Science participants answered the question and only 55% of CRCJ students responded to the question.

The dissimilar nature of the responses between the populations can be partially attributed to the aforementioned decision of some respondents to abstain from answering the question. Further analysis of the findings however, suggests another possible explanation. This explanation proposes that only a relatively few amount of students in either discipline surveyed were familiar with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in general. Both CRCJ and Political Science participants were asked how many classes they had completed that discussed Israeli/Palestinian foreign policy and the conflict in

general. Eighty-one percent (81%) of CRCJ respondents answered none and 54% of Political Science participants answered none. When the respondents were asked, "What is your primary source of information concerning the Israeli/Palestinian conflict", 19% of CRCJ respondents answered that they do not pay attention and 6% of Political Science participants said they do not pay attention. Perhaps most telling, when the participants were asked, "How well informed do you consider yourself to be on the Palestinian/Israeli conflict?", 44% of Political Science majors answered either "Not Informed" or "Not Informed at All" while 53% of CRCJ majors answered similarly.

Whereas the unpredictable nature of responses might be explained through a general lack of understanding and familiarity with the conflict, what is not as easily explained is why eleven out of fourteen variables share the similarity that both majors attribute these acts more consistently to the Palestinians. Only one out of the fourteen variables presented to the participants demonstrate findings that show a consensus of responses by both CRCJ and Political Science that attribute the act described in the scenario to the Israelis.

The scenario that respondents attributed to Israelis involves the military and house demolitions; fifty-eight (58%) of Political Science majors attributed this act to Israelis while 33% of CRCJ respondents attributed the act to the Israelis. Despite the consensus of both majors attributing the act to the Israelis, the Palestinians were still chosen as attributable for the act by 31% of CRCJ majors and 30% of Political Science majors despite the fact that Palestine has no standing military. The other two variables that differed from the 11 that shared similarities between majors as related to the

consensus of act attributed, were variables in which the two sample populations did not agree on a consensus and one major's majority attributed the act to the Palestinians and one major's majority attributed the act to the Israelis.

One of the most notable examples of these findings concerns the variable "Ninety-one people killed in hotel bombing. Perpetrators claim responsibility in effort to bring attention to their cause." This specific scenario was taken from T.G. Fraser and his historical overview of the conflict described in The Arab-Israeli Conflict (2004). This scenario involved the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, Israel which was bombed in July, 1946 by the Israeli militant Zionist group Irgun in an effort to weaken British resolve to control Palestine. As this scenario relates to the present study, when asked to attribute this act to one party or another, 80% of Political Science respondents answered Palestinians and 65% of CRCJ respondents answered Palestinians. Nine percent (9%) of Political Science respondents answered Israelis and 14% of CRCJ respondents chose Israelis.

Another variable of specific interest is that of "Sixteen year old suicide bomber detonates bomb in marketplace killing him and three others." This scenario was taken from a chronology of events within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict documented by Nagat Hirbawi (2005). This scenario involved a suicide bomber from Nablus who detonated a bomb in Tel-Aviv. Responsibility was claimed by The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. This specific scenario, presented to the survey respondents, resulted in 82% of Political Science majors attributing the act to the Palestinians and 58% of CRCJ majors attributing the act to the Palestinians. Six percent (6%) of

Political Science majors attributed the act to the Israelis and 21% of CRCJ majors attributed the act to Israelis.

The purpose of highlighting these specific variables is to illustrate the point that despite an acknowledged lack of familiarity of events that have transpired over the course of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, student respondents in this study consistently attributed acts to the Palestinians more frequently than the Israelis. The fact that the scenarios presented for example purposes were carried out by both Palestinians and Israelis is of less importance than the findings that clearly reveal the perception and knowledge of CRCJ and Political Science respondents. In an attempt to further understand the results of these findings, the analysis of additional findings specific to how students received information regarding the conflict were included in the discussion.

5.3 Analysis of how Student Knowledge and Perception was Gained

One variable in the survey instrument asked the respondents to identify their primary source of information concerning the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. Of 72 CRCJ respondents, the findings revealed that 64% of respondents received their information from a combination of the television and internet and only 1% received their information from academic journal articles. For Political Science participants 62% answered they received their primary information regarding the conflict from television and the internet while 13% received their information from academic journal articles. These findings comprised with those that demonstrate 44% of Political Science respondents and 53% of CRCJ participants are either "Not Informed" or "Not Informed

at All" about the conflict, suggest that not only are a large percentage of the surveyed populations uninformed about the conflict, they are receiving information primarily from media outside of accepted scholarly avenues that document the history of the conflict. When both of these findings are considered jointly, it suggests the possibility that the reason for the volatility of the responses and the consistency in attributing acts to one group over another is based on perceptions conceived from information gained primarily from the internet and television media.

The primary purpose of the present study was to examine the perception and knowledge of CRCJ and Political Science students on terrorism as it pertains to the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. In support of this focus, the study also explored how students gained their knowledge and perceptions. Based entirely on the findings in this portion of the study, the indications are that a relationship between the media and the influencing of perception and knowledge as it pertains to this conflict does exist. These findings further support the sections of the literature review that explored the role and effects of mass media within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the public perceptions towards the conflict. With regard to the perception and knowledge of CRCJ and Political Science respondents as to whom the acts are attributed, the findings reveal that a combination of general unfamiliarity and lack of information pertaining to the conflict is further augmented by a strong reliance on media such as television and the internet. The result is skewed student perceptions and limited knowledge about the two adversaries involved in the conflict.

5.4 t-Test Results

This particular study contained only six variables that were analyzed to determine if a statistical significance existed. A t-test analysis was run on the six Likert scale questions included in the survey instrument. Of the six variables tested, only one variable produced a p-value finding of statistical significance. The variable "How well informed do you consider yourself to be on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict?" produced a statistically significant difference between CRCJ and Political Science respondents. This finding suggests that Political Science students consider themselves more informed about the conflict than CRCJ students. Despite the similar percentages of respondents within each major that answered they were "Not Informed", a higher percentage of Political Science participants answered that they were either "Well Informed" or "Very Well Informed" than did the CRCJ respondents. This finding suggests the possibility that, due to the perceived political nature of the conflict, more Political Science students seek out information regarding the conflict than do CRCJ students. An additional explanation might be that Political Science respondents are more likely to discuss the conflict within their classes due to the nature of their academic discipline compared to the nature of CRCJ respondents' scholastic discipline.

5.5 Implications of this Study

The implications of this study are multiple. First, the results of this study will hopefully provide a positive endorsement of the academic disciplines of Criminology/Criminal Justice and Political Science concerning the manner with which students are educated about terrorism and terrorist acts. As mentioned in the literature

review section concerning terrorism, the field of terrorism is often filled with diverse and disparate opinions as to what constitutes an act of terrorism or how terrorism should be universally defined. It can be argued from reading the current literature that terrorism is often viewed as a subjective concept without concrete and universally agreed construct boundaries. The noted danger of this dilemma is that it prevents a united manner in which to combat terrorism and terrorist acts due to the discrepancy in determining what constitutes these acts and the fluctuating nature of identifying them.

The current literature on the topic of terrorism stresses the importance of reaching an agreed ideology and definition of terrorism with which to teach students, legislators, diplomats, and other people throughout the world. The implications of this study demonstrate a positive endorsement of the academic disciplines of CRCJ and Political Science at the University of Texas at Arlington. Due to the similar nature of participant responses regarding what constitutes a terrorist act, the results of this study indicate that both populations of students within the two academic disciplines are being scholastically trained to identify terrorism and terrorist acts through a similarly defined construct. The implication of this study is to illustrate the advancement subsequent to previous researchers' calls to unify the teaching of terrorism, the acceptance of a concrete definition, and the exclusion of the subjective nature of the concept. The results of this study indicate that after decades of researchers continually drawing attention to the importance of this issue, CRCJ and Political Science disciplines are demonstrating a movement towards an agreed upon definition of terrorism and terrorist acts.

The second implication from the results of this study concerns the knowledge and perception of respondents towards the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The findings suggest that while both CRCJ and Political Science respondents similarly identified terrorist acts within the conflict, they demonstrated an overall lack of knowledge of the conflict in general and of either the Palestinians or the Israelis actions specifically. Despite this admitted lack of knowledge of the conflict, the respondents attributed these acts to the Palestinians more consistently than the Israelis. Based on the findings that the majority of respondents received their primary information from television media or the internet rather than academic journals or academic channels, it is reasonable to suggest that the respondents' perception and knowledge is influenced primarily by the internet and television media.

The findings of this study indicate that both CRCJ and Political Science respondents share a relative similarity in their knowledge and perception towards identifying terrorist acts. In addition, the results of this study's findings indicate that there is a low level of understanding of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in general and of the two groups engaged in the conflict specifically. The findings indicate that despite the acknowledged lack of familiarity and knowledge concerning the conflict, the respondents are receiving information from media mediums that either directly or indirectly influences them to consistently attribute the acts in question to Palestinians more than Israelis. What is not as clear from the findings is whether it is the lack of knowledge of the conflict or it is the forms of media from which the respondents receive their primary information that proves the greater reason as to why their

responses are so volatile and unpredictable when asked to attribute these acts to one party or the other.

The implication of these findings could suggest that while the CRCJ and Political Science academic disciplines are successfully teaching their students about terrorism and terrorist acts, there is a noticeable lack of education specific to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the violence and terrorism that takes place. The results of the respondents' answers suggest that little emphasis is placed by either discipline on the study of the conflict. This finding proves interesting when considered in conjunction with the significant amount of time devoted to the study of terrorism by both disciplines. Considering that both disciplines are teaching terrorism, this researcher suggests that educational opportunities might be gained by examining the terrorism and terrorist acts that take place within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as well as the origins of the conflict itself.

As the following quote by a United States Marines Central Command Press Officer in Iraq to an Al Jazeera journalist illustrates (Rushing, 2004):

> "If I get out of the Marine Corps and do anything, I want to do something with the Palestinian issue. I don't think Americans are getting good information about it. I really don't. No American connects the Palestinian and this issue. They believe they are completely different and might as well be on different sides of the world. But I have yet to meet anyone in this part of the world that sees them as **not** the same issue. Everyone here sees them as the exact same thing."

The implications of this study are that survey respondents are not informed or knowledgeable about the events that take place within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The findings demonstrate that despite the arguable importance of this conflict in relation

130

to the study of terrorism and terrorist acts, neither the CRCJ nor Political Science disciplines are emphasizing the specifics of this conflict in their curriculum. In addition to this admitted lack of knowledge by survey participants, the majority of respondents acknowledge that the information they do receive about this conflict comes primarily from the internet and television media. The findings that illustrate that the respondents consistently attribute acts of terrorism to Palestinians over Israelis in this conflict despite admitted lack of knowledge, suggest that the information they are receiving through these mediums has influenced their perception. The implications of this study are that more educational time within both the CRCJ and Political Science disciplines should be dedicated to the teaching and understanding of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in an attempt to both educate students and provide a balanced and accurate body of knowledge that can serve as a foundation from which to review information gained from television and internet media.

5.6 Limitations of the Study

The author recognizes the limitations within the present study and acknowledges the exploratory nature of the study. The sample population was one of convenience and consisted of college students within two separate academic disciplines from only one university. Additionally, the University of Texas at Arlington is comprised largely of commuter students and may not share similar characteristics to students of other universities. The students chosen for this sample population attend a university in the state of Texas and it might be argued that people within a single state, such as Texas, may have a different perspective towards acts of terrorism and events within the

Palestinian-Israeli conflict than people outside of the state. It might also be argued that the knowledge of the respondents in this study may differ from that of people in other regions of the United States. Because of these possibilities, it may not be feasible to generalize results to the general population, students at other universities, or even the entire student body at UTA.

5.7 Future Research

It is anticipated that this research and study will provide a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in the fields of Criminology/Criminal Justice and Political Science. Previous research suggests that although studies have been conducted that compare differences between CRCJ and Political Science students, none have been conducted concerning terrorism within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This research is notably limited in that only two academic disciplines were surveyed. Future research may attempt to study a wider sample of disciplines, and might also attempt to specifically study how different forms of media influence respondents' perception both of terrorism and events within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict rather than solely seeking to establish a relationship. In addition, comparing students based on life history variables may reveal factors that mold early opinion, perception, and knowledge of terrorism, acts of terror, and events within the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Consent Form

By completing this survey I agree to allow the surveyor to use my answers as part of a continuing research project. I understand that by completing the survey I will not be rewarded monetary, scholastically, or any other way. I understand that this survey is completely optional and that if I refuse to answer any part of the survey that I will not suffer any negative consequences scholastically or otherwise. By agreeing to complete this survey I understand that no harm will come to me physically or mentally and that confidentiality will be maintained by the researcher. Understanding the above conditions, I agree to complete this survey.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. Have you <u>ever</u> completed a criminal justice course at UTA or at any other college or university? If no, skip to question #4.

        No   Yes

2. How many criminal justice classes have you completed?

1 class	4 classes
2 classes	More than 4 classes
3 classes	Other (specify)_____

3. What type of criminal justice classes did you complete?

Introduction to Criminal Justice	Corrections class
Courts class	Community Corrections class
Policing class	Other (specify)_____

4. Have you <u>ever</u> completed a college-level course, at either UTA or any other university that focused on foreign-policy issues in relation to the Palestinian/Israeli conflict? If no, skip to question #6.

        No   Yes

5. How many classes have you completed in which the Israeli/Palestinian foreign policy and the Israeli/Palestinian conflict in general have been discussed?

1 class	4 classes
2 classes	More than 4 classes
3 classes	Other (specify)_____

6. Have you <u>ever</u> completed a college-level course on terrorism at UTA or any other college or university? If no, skip to question #8.

        No   Yes

7. How many classes on terrorism have you taken?

1 class	4 classes
2 classes	More than 4 classes
3 classes	Other (specify)_____

8. What is your primary source of information concerning news, politics, foreign policy issues, and current events?

Television   Internet   Newspapers   Academic Journal Articles

Other (specify)_____   I don't pay attention

9. How well informed do you consider yourself to be on the Palestinian/Israeli conflict?

    1   2   3   4   5
Very Well Informed   Not Informed at All

10. What is your primary source of information concerning the Israeli/Palestinian conflict?

    Television   Internet   Newspapers   Academic Journal Articles

        Other (specify)_____   I don't pay attention

11. How well informed do you consider yourself to be about terrorism?

    1   2   3   4   5
Very Well Informed   Not Informed at All

12. What is your primary source of information about terrorism?

    Television   Internet   Newspapers   Academic Journal Articles

        Other (specify)_____   I don't pay attention

13. How confident do you feel in your ability to identify terrorist acts?

    1   2   3   4   5
Very Confident   Not Confident at All

14. How do you categorize your political views?

    1   2   3   4   5
Strongly Conservative   Strongly Liberal

*** Please Answer YES or NO to the following questions. All scenarios presented in the following are documented events.

- Do you view the following scenarios as acts of terrorism?
- If your answer is yes, do you attribute the act to Palestinians or Israelis?

15. Gunman opens fire inside bus and kills four people while seriously injuring five.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No
    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

16. Five men assault two members of humanitarian group who are attempting to escort children to school.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No
    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

17. 16 year old suicide bomber detonates bomb in marketplace killing him and three others.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No
    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

18. Four men are killed and six wounded when a tunnel beneath their location is dynamited.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No
    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

19. Three men are assassinated in a coffee shop in Tel-Aviv.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No
    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

20. A group of people attack a religious procession in which the archbishop is present. The archbishop is punched in the face, has his cap torn off, and is bombarded with insults.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No
    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

21. The military is responsible for house demolitions. Close to 40% of the demolished houses are occupied by residents with no suspected involvement in militant activity. Less than three percent of the occupants are given advance notice before demolition.
    Act of Terrorism: Yes   No

    Attributed To: Palestinians   Israelis

22. 91 people killed in hotel bombing. Perpetrators claim responsibility in effort to bring attention to their cause.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

23. Several men break into a home and kill one man. A young girl and elderly woman are wounded.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

24. Helicopter fires missiles at car killing leader of oppositional political party. Car is destroyed as subsequent missile is fired at growing group of onlookers. 7 killed and 53 wounded.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

25. Gunman opens fire on large group of tourists. One woman is killed and four are wounded.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

26. Two men lynched for entering the wrong neighborhood.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

27. Teacher and driver killed in a van by a drive-by shooter.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

28. In retaliation for the death of two of their friends, several men kill 14 people and destroy their houses.

Act of Terrorism:	Yes	No
Attributed To:	Palestinians	Israelis

29. In viewing the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, do you believe that one side is "right" and that one side is "wrong"?

               No   Yes

30. If you answered 'yes' to question #30, which side do you believe to be in the "right"?   Israeli   Palestinian

31. In discussing the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, my personal sympathies are mostly with:

      1) Israelis   4) Neither
      2) Palestinians   5) No Opinion
      3) Both

32. Which country do you see as the greatest negative influence in the Middle East?

      1) Iran   4) Iraq
      2) Palestine   5) Other
      3) Israel

33. In my opinion, the US media coverage regarding the Israeli/Palestinian conflict is mostly?

      1) Biased towards Israel   4) Somewhat favors Palestine
      2) Somewhat favors Israel   5) Biased towards Palestine
      3) Non-biased (not favoring either side)

34. To what extent do you feel that your opinion of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict has been affected by the media?

     1   2   3   4   5
Strongly Affected   Not Affected at All

35. Do you agree that terrorist acts can ever be justified for the greater good?

     1   2   3   4   5
Strongly Agree   Strongly Disagree

36. What is the class standing you have achieved to date?
      Freshman   Junior
      Sophomore   Senior

37. How many credit hours have you completed at UTA? (Circle one)
      0-15   76-90

16-30   91-105
31-45   106-120
46-60   Other (specify)_____
61-75

38. Are you a CRCJ Major?

    No   Yes

39. If you are NOT a CRCJ Major, what is your Major? _____

40. Are you: MALE   FEMALE

41. How old are you?
  18-21   32-37
  22-26   38 or older
  27-31

42. Are you:
  Caucasian   African American
  Hispanic   American Indian
  Asian/Pacific Islander   Other (specify)_____

Thank you for participating in this survey.

REFERENCES

Amayreh, K. (2002). Roots of the al-Aqsa uprising. *Journal of Palestine Studies, 32*(1), 109-110.

Anzovin, S. (1986). *Terrorism*. New York: H.W. Wilson.

Ardila, R. (2002). The psychology of the terrorist: behavioral perspective. In C.E. Stout (Ed.), *The psychology of terrorism: a public understanding (psychological dimension to war and peace)* (pp. 3-11). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bacha, J., & Noujaim, J. (2004). *Control Room* [Motion Picture]. United States: Noujaim Films.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory* (1st ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

BBC News. (2006, April 17). Tel Aviv suicide bomb kills nine. Message posted to news://bbc.co.uk

Ben-Ami, S. (2006). *Scars of war, wounds of peace: the Israeli-Arab tragedy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Benjamin, D., & Simon, S. (2002). *The age of sacred terror*. New York: Random House.

Ben-Meir, A. (2006). Lost perspectives in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Humanist, 66*(1), 7-10.

Benvenisti, M. (1995). *Intimate Enemies: Jews and Arabs in a shared land*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bodrero, D. D. (2002). Law enforcement's new challenge to investigate, interdict, and prevent terrorism. *The Police Chief, February,* 41-48.

Bregman, A. (2002). *Israel's wars: a history since 1947* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Bunzl, J. (2005). Mirror images: Perception and interest in the Israel/Palestine conflict. *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, & Culture, 12*(2/3), 8-14.

Campbell, K. M., & Flournoy, M. (2001). *To prevail: an American strategy for the campaign against terrorism*. Washington D.C.: The CSI Press.

Cesarani, D. (2002). A last lesson from the Holocaust: 'thou shalt not be a perpetrator, victim, or a bystander'. *Times Higher Education Supplement,* (1534), 18.

Chai, W. (1991). Resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict: an imperative for permanent peace in the Middle East. *Asian Affairs: an American Review, 18*(1), 13-18.

Chesler, P. (2003). *The new anti-Semitism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, H. H. (2001). Terrorism: the problem of definition revisited. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*(6), 881-893.

Crenshaw, M. (Ed.). (1995). *Terrorism in context*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Crenshaw, M. (2000). The psychology of terrorism. *Political Psychology, 21*(2), 406.

Cromer, G. (2006). Analogies to terror: the construction of social problems in Israel
during the Intifada al-Aqsa. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 18*(3), 389-398.

Curran, J., Gurevitch, M., & Woollacott, J. (1982). The study of the media: theoretical
approaches. In M. Gurevitch, T. Bennett, J. Curran, J. Woollacott (Ed.), *Culture,
society, and the media* (pp. 11-29). London: Routledge.

Davison, W. P. (1983). The third person effect in communication. *Public Opinion
Quarterly, 47*(1), 1-15.

Dayan, D., & Katz, E. (1992). *Media events: live broadcasting of history*. Cambridge,
MA: Harvard University Press.

de Boer, C. (1979). The polls: terrorism and hijacking. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 43*(3),
410-418.

Dickey, C., Hosenball, M., & Johnson, S. (2001, September 24). Training for terror.
Newsweek, 138, 42.

Dugard, J. (1989). International terrorism and the just war. In D. Rapoport & Y.
Alexander (Eds.), *The morality of terrorism* (2nd ed., pp. 77-87). New York:
Columbia University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide*. Glenco: Free Press. (Originally published in 1897)

Fabian, K. P. (2002). The Israel-Palestine conflict; how to cut the Gordian knot? *India
Quarterly, 58*(1), 39-56.

Finkelstein, N. (2003). *Image and reality of the Israel-Palestine conflict* (2nd ed.).
London: Verso.

Finkelstein, N. G. (2005). *Beyond Chutzpah: on the misuse of anti-semitism and the abuse of history*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Folkman, S. (1984). Personal control and stress and coping processes: a theoretical analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(4), 839-852.

Fraser, T. G. (1980). *The Middle East, 1914-1979*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fraser, T. G. (2004). *The Arab-Israeli conflict* (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fromkin, D. (1989). *A peace to end all peace: creating the modern Middle East 1914-1922*. New York: H. Holt.

Furnish, T. (2005). Beheading in the name of Islam. *Middle East Quarterly, 12*(4), 81.

Ganor, B. (2002). Defining terrorism: is one man's terrorist another man's freedom fighter? *Police Practice and Research, 3*(4), 287-304.

Ganor, B. (2002). Suicide terrorism: an overview. In International Institute for Counter-Terrorism (Ed.), *Countering Suicide Terrorism* (pp. 134-145). Jerusalem: Gefen Books.

Gilboa, E. (1986). *American public opinion toward Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Giner-Sorolla, R., & Chaiken, S. (1994). The causes of hostile media judgements. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30*(2), 165-180.

Golan, G. (2006). *Israel and Palestine: peace plans and proposals from Oslo*. Princeton, N.J.: Markus Wiener.

Goldberg, J. (2002, October 28). In the party of God: Hezbollah sets up operations in
     South America and the United States. *The New Yorker, ,* 37-43.

Gorny, Y. (1987). *Zionism and the Arabs, 1882-1948: a study of ideology*. Oxford, UK:
     Clarendon Press.

Grossman, L. K. (1986). Television and terrorism: a common sense approach. *TVI*
     Report, 6, 4.

Gunther , A. C., Christen, C. T., Liebhart, J. L., & Chia, S. C. (2001). Congenial public,
     contrary press, and biased estimates of the climate of opinion. *Public Opinion*
     Quarterly, 65(3), 295-320.

Gunther, A. C., & Storey, J. D. (2003). The influence of presumed influence. *Journal of*
     Communication, 53(2), 199-215.

Hacker, F. J. (1980). Terror and terrorism: modern growth industry and mass
     entertainment. *Terrorism: an International Journal, 4,* 143-159.

Hafez, M. M. (2003). *Why Muslims rebel: repression and resistance in the Islamic*
     world. Boulder, CO: Lynnes Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Hanan, A. (1980). *Countering Palestinian terrorism in Israel: toward a policy analysis*
     of countermeasures. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Harms, G., & Ferry, T. (2005). *The Palestine-Israel conflict: a basic introduction*. Ann
     Arbor: Pluto Press.

Hashemi, N. (2006). Israel and the politics of Muslim identity. *Tikkun, 21*(1), 53.

Hatina, M. (2006). The 'Ulama' and the cult of death in Palestine. *Israel Affairs, 12*(1),
     29-51.

Helm, S. (2001, October 1). End the special relationship now... *New Statesman, 130,* 35.

Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: the political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon.

Hirbawi, N. (2005). Chronology of events October 1, 2004 to January 1, 2005. *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics, and Culture, 12*(1), 123-128.

Hoffman, B. (1995). Holy terror: the implications of terrorism motivated by a religious imperative. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, 18,* 271-284.

Hoffman, T. H. (2004). *A new look at terrorism: definitions, tactics, organizational structure, and their implications*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Studies Association Annual Conference. Montreal, Canada.

Iyad, A. (1983). *Without a homeland*. Mifras, Tel-Aviv: Gefen Books.

Jenkins, B. (1986). Defense against terrorism. *Political Science Quarterly, 101*(5), 773-787.

Jenkins, B. (1987). Will terrorists go nuclear? In W. Laqueur & Y. Alexander (Eds.), *The terrorism reader: a historical anthology* (2nd ed., p.). New York: New American Library.

Jenkins, B. M. (1984, November). *The who, what, when, where, how, and why of terrorism*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Detroit Police Department Conference on "Urban Terrorism: Planning or Chaos?. Detroit, MI.

Johnson, K. (1979). Durkheim revisited: why do women kill themselves? *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 9,* 145-153.

Jones, C. (2003). Terrorism, liberation, or civil war? the al-Aqsa intifada. *Civil Wars, 6*(3), 129-137.

Jones, J. (2007, March 13). Americans continue to be pessimistic about Middle East peace. Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Keinan, G. (1994). Effects of stress and tolerance of ambiguity on magical thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(1), 48-55.

Keinan, G., Sadeh, A., & Rosen, S. (2003). Attitudes and reactions to media coverage of terrorist acts. *Journal of Community Psychology, 31*(2), 149-165.

Kelley, E. (2003). Much ado about Palestine and Iraq in Oregon. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, 22*(1), 54-55.

Kennedy, R. (1999). Is one person's terrorist another's freedom fighter? western and Islamic approaches to 'just war' compared. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 11*(1), 1-21.

Kepel, G. (2002). *The trail of political Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ketcham, C. C., & McGeorge, H. J. (1986). Terrorist violence: its mechanics and countermeasures. In N.C. Livingstone & T.E. Arnold (Eds.), *Fighting back: winning the war against terrorism* (p.). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Khoury, J. (2006, June 13). Seven Shfaram residents arrested for lynch of Jewish terrorist. Message posted to news://www.haaretz.com

Killgore, A. I., Curtiss, R. H., Held, C. C., Carolan, T. J., Bernier, C. E., Kruse, D. A., et al. (2004, May 7). Letter to President Bush from former U.S. diplomats.

Kimmerling, B. (2006). The continuation of Israeli-Palestinian conflict by "academic" means: reflections on the problematiques of publishing books and reviewing them. *Contemporary Sociology, 35*(5), 447-449.

Korn, A. (2004). Israeli press and the war against terrorism: the construction of the "liquidation policy". *Crime, Law, and Social Change, 41*(4), 209-234.

Kramer, M. (1990). The moral logic of Hizballah. In W. Reich (Ed.), *Origins of terrorism: psychologies, ideologies, theologies, states of mind* (pp. 131-160). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Laquer, W. (1999). *The new terrorism: fanaticism and the arms of mass destruction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Laquer, W. (2002). A History of Terrorism. In I. Cronin (Ed.), *Confronting fear: a history of terrorism* (pp. 4-16). New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Laqueur, W. (1977). *Guerrilla warfare*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

Laqueur , W. (1987). *The age of terrorism*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Lee, M. A. (1990). *Unreliable sources: a guide to detecting bias in mass media*. New York: Carol Publishing Group.

Lenin, V. I. (1961). Where to begin. *Collected Works, 5,* 19.

Lesser, I. O. (1999). Countering the new terrorism: implications for strategy. In I.O. Lesser, B. Hoffman, J. Arquilla, D. Ronfeldt, M. Zanini, & B.M. Jenkins (Eds.), *Countering the new terrorism* (pp. 107-125). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Liebes, T. (1998). Television's disaster marathons: a danger to democratic process? In

    T. Liebes & J. Curran (Eds.), *Media, ritual, and identity* (pp. 71-86). London:

    Routledge.

Liebes, T., & Kampf, Z. (2007). Routinizing terror: media coverage and public practices

    in Israel, 2000-2005. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics 2007,*

    12(1), 108-116.

Loza, W. (2007). The psychology of extremism and terrorism: a Middle-Eastern

    perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(2), 141-155.

Manning, S. (1994, September 16). The Peacemakers. *Scholastic Update, 127,* 3-4.

Marcus, A. D. (2007). *Jerusalem 1913: the origins of the Arab-Israeli conflict*. New

    York: Viking Books.

Marks, E. (2006). Terrorism in context: from tactical to strategic. *Mediterranean*

    Quarterly, 17(4), 46-59.

McCauley, C. (2002). Psychological issues in understanding terrorism and the response

    to terrorism. In C.E. Stout (Ed.), *The psychology of terrorism: theoretical*

    understandings and perspectives (psychological dimension to war and peace)

    (pp. 3-29). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mendes-Flohr, P. R. (Ed.). (1983). *A land of two peoples: Martin Buber on Jews and*

    Arabs. New York: Oxford University Press.

Moore, D. W. (1999, August 2). Americans take hands-off approach to Middle East.

    Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Myre, G. (2005, August 5). Jewish militant opens fire on bus of Israeli-Arabs, killing 4. *The New York Times,* p. 3.

Newport, F. (1997, September 5). Public skeptical lasting peace will ever come to Middle East. Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Newport, F., & Carroll, J. (2006, March 27). Republicans and religious Americans most sympathetic to Israel. Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Niva, S. (2007, March 28). Israel's apologists distort the truth [Letter to the editor]. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* p. B7.

O'Neil, B. (1978). Towards a typology of political terrorism: the Palestinian resistance movement. *Journal of International Affairs, 32*(1), 17-42.

Ovendale, R. (2004). *The origins of the Arab-Israeli wars* (4th ed.). Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Paletz, D. L., & Boiney, J. (1992). Researchers' perspectives. In D.L. Paletz & A.P. Schmid (Eds.), *Terrorism and the media* (pp. 6-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pasquini, E. (2002). Michael Tarazi says illegal Jewish settlements obstacle to lasting peace. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, 21*(6), 62.

Patterson, M. (2002). Settlements fuel war's fire in Middle East. *National Catholic Reporter, 38*(24), 6.

Pedahzur, A., Perliger, A., & Weinberg, L. (2003). Altruism and fatalism: the characteristics of palestinian suicide terrorists. *Deviant Behavior, 24*(4), 405-423.

Philo, G. (Ed.). (1995). *Glasgow Media Group Reader, Volume 2*. London: Routledge.

Polner, M., & Simms, A. (2002, October 11). When Israel is wrong: Christians shouldn't be afraid to say so. *Commonweal, 129,* 19-21.

Post, J. (1987). Rewarding fire with fire? effects of retaliation on terrorist group dynamics. In A. Kurz (Ed.), *Contemporary trends in world terrorism* (pp. 103-116). New York: Praeger.

Prager, D., & Telushkin, J. (1983). *Why the Jews?: the reason for antisemitism.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Rapoport, D. C. (2004). The four waves of modern terrorism. In J. Ludes & A. Cronin (Eds.), *Attacking terrorism: elements of a grand strategy* (p. 54). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Riddell, P. (2006). Jerusalem in history: the city of peace? *Evangelical Quarterly, 78*(3), 209-219.

Riemer, W. J. (1998). Durkheim's "heroic suicide" in military combat. *Armed Forces and Society, 25*(1), 103-120.

Ross, J. I. (1999). Beyond the conceptualization of terrorism: a psychological-structural model of the causes of this activity. In C. Summers & E. Markusen (Eds.), *Collective violence: harmful behavior in groups and governments* (pp. 169-195). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rubin, E. (2002, June 30). The most wanted Palestinian. *The New York Times Magazine, 151,* 26-31.

Rubin, J. Z., & Friedland, N. (1986). Terrorists and their audience: theater of terror. *Psychology Today, 20*(3), 18-28.

Saad, L. (2005, May 31). Americans stand apart in support for Israel. Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Saad, L. (2006, June 20). Palestinians have little faith in U.S. as peace broker. Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Saad, L. (2007, March 5). Palestinian-Israeli dispute engenders American sympathy for Israel. Message posted to news://www.galluppoll.com

Schmid, A. P. (1983). *Political Terrorism: a research guide to concepts, theories, data bases, and literature*. New Brunswick, CT: Transaction.

Schmid, A. P. (1992). Terrorism and the media: freedom of information vs. freedom from intimidation. In L. Howard (Ed.), *Terrorism: Roots, impact, responses* (pp. 95-117). New York: Praeger.

Schmid, A. P. (2004). *Academic Consensus Definition*. Retrieved March 27, 2007, from United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Web Site: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html

Schmid, A. P., & De Graaf, J. (1982). *Violence as communication: insurgent terrorism and the Western news media*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schmid, A. P., & Jongman, A. J. (1988). *Political terrorism: a new guide to actors, authors, concepts, data bases, theories, and literature*. New Brunswick, CT: Transaction.

Schweitzer, Y. (2000, April 21). Suicide bombings-the ultimate weapon?. In *Articles*. Retrieved March 7, 2007, from ICT - International Institute for Counter-Terrorism Web Site: http://www.ict.org.il/articles

Seligman, M. E. P. (1968). Chronic fear produced by unpredictable electric shock. *Journal of Comparitive and Physiological Psychology, 66,* 402-411.

Silver, E. (1984). *Begin: the haunted prophet*. New York: Random House .

Slone, M. (2000). Responses to media coverage of terrorism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 44*(4), 508-523.

Sprinzak, E. (2000). Rational Fanatics. *Foreign Policy,* (120), 66-73.

Stack, S. (1979). Durkheim's theory of fatalistic suicide: a cross-national approach. *Journal of Social Psychology, 107*(2), 161-168.

Taylor, S. (1982). *Durkheim and the study of suicide*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Tessler, M. (1994). *A history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Thackrah, J. R. (2004). Terrorist activity. In *Dictionary of terrorism* (2nd ed., Vol. 1). London: Routledge.

Tilley, V. (2005). *The one-state solution: a breakthrough for peace in the Israeli-Palestinian deadlock*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tsfati, Y., & Cohen, J. (2005). The influence of presumed media influence on democratic legitimacy: the case of Gaza settlers. *Communication Research, 32*(6), 794-821.

Weimann, G. (1990). Redefinition of image: impact of mass-mediated terrorism. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 2,* 16-29.

Weinberg, L., Pedahzur, A., & Hirsch-Hoefler, S. (2004). The challenges of conceptualizing terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 16*(4), 777-794.

Weiss, J. M. (1970). Somatic effects of predictable and unpredictable shock. *Psychomatic Medicine, 32*(1), 397-409.

White, J. R. (2006). *Terrorism and Homeland security* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Whitlatch, C. (2004). American Christians' responsibility to end the occupation. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, 23*(4), 79-80.

Zulaika, J. (2003). The self-fulfilling prophecies of counterterrorism. *Radical History Review, 85,* 191-201.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Michael Andrew Gossett was born to Jan and Mike Gossett in Austin, Texas in 1978. He grew up in the Central Texas town of San Marcos before graduating from The University of Texas at Austin with a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology in 2002. After moving to Dallas in 2004 and working as a parole officer for the Texas Youth Commission, he earned a Master of Arts degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice from The University of Texas at Arlington in August, 2007. He currently resides in Silver Spring, Maryland with his wife and is pursing his PhD in Criminology at the University of Maryland.