

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

"I Accuse! (The Media)" – Is It True? Binyamin Netanyahu – A Case Study

Dr. Gila Shilo

Head, Department of the Culture and Humanities Division,
Faculty of Society and Culture, BeitBerl Academic College, Kfar Saba, Israel

Abstract:

This study, based on a case study, examines the argument that no unadulterated objectivity exists, even in the news. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu accused Noni Moses, Yedioth Ahronoth's publisher, of incessant attacks and slander. I compared texts in 25 issues of two papers: Yedioth Ahronoth, and Israel Hayom, and employed linguistic-rhetorical and pragmatic criteria, in order to illustrate resultant implications according to Grice's (1975) conversational maxims. The comparison showed that the details were correct, but the difference between the papers lies in the choice of details and the item's placement. Thus, both sources were not objective, but rather conveyed a subjective message, which employed diverse rhetorical means while violating the maxims of cooperation.

1. Introduction

In the past, at the close of the 19th century, objective journalism was a demand, i.e., the differentiation between news reports, which meant exclusive presentation of facts devoid of standpoints, and points of view that were expressed, for example, in opinion pieces. A demand for fairness and balance was an additional prerequisite. A new writing style evolved in the 1950s, called new journalism, which meant that journalists were no longer merely objective bystanders; now their opinions were part of the report in which they expressed their ideas. In the 1970s it was believed that this style would govern and replace objective journalism, but this was not to be. And indeed, the Glasgow Group (Glasgow University Media Group, 1980) pointed out that a distinction exists between a news report which presents facts, and articles in which the authors express their views. Today we are aware of the fact that no unadulterated objectivity exists, even in news; nonetheless, we hope that balance (presenting both sides), neutrality (refraining from taking a stand), and reliance on facts, devoid of any emotional load, prevails.

Based on his studies, (Post, 2015) argues that journalists and academicians believe that it is possible and desirable to achieve objectivity in journalism, but scientists, more than those involved in humanistic studies, maintain that an objective presentation of news is preferable. The perception of objectivity depends on one's profession: journalists believe that one should let the facts "speak for themselves," while academicians contend that objectivity demands painstaking method. (Donsbach, 2004) argues that journalistic investigation often sets out as assumptions, but these must be studied scientifically.

I sought to examine these arguments in a case study which involved Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in a confrontation with the daily *Yedioth Ahronoth*, which was manifested in news items that appeared in the daily *Israel Hahom*, by his inner circle or by journalists who represented the paper and who related to all matters pertaining to him, his family, and the regime which he represents. I intend to uncover the overt and covert means through which news is conveyed to the addressee, and to what extent objectivity is preserved or violated.

Netanyahu accuses Noni Moses, *Yedioth Ahronoth's* publisher, of incessant attacks and slander: "The public should know the truth: Noni Moses is the leader of a campaign fighting against the Likud party and against me which is based on business interests. His objective is to reinstate the treacherous and undemocratic monopoly that characterized his paper..." Similar accusations against *Yedioth Ahronoth* were voiced yesterday by journalist Yoav Yitzhak in an article published on his news website: [...]" Netanyahu is right, and even tempers his accusations [...] Moses brought this about through his poisonous reports on Netanyahu..." (*Hadashot Hayom*, 15.3.2015).

The study was carried out by comparing the texts in both papers: *Yedioth Ahronoth*, which is identified with Noni Moses, and *Israel Hayom*, identified with Netanyahu. My point of departure is the assumption that the objective of these news items is to convey information to the papers' readers, i.e., new information, by employing objective language and messages. The question is whether Netanyahu's argument is valid - that the addresser (in this case *Yedioth Ahronot*)- conveys its message through the news item, which in this instance is negative and derogatory. In more general terms, this study will point out several overt and covert means that serve the addresser in delivering a message – which should be neutral as far as possible.

Several researchers who related to the language of journalistic texts, both in news items and in articles, proposed criteria for analyzing writing style (Fairclough, 1992; Weizman & Dascal, 1991., McQuail, 1987; Fowler, 1991, 1979). These criteria could also serve for

the analysis of the style of spoken discourse (conversation). In addition, different act speeches were depicted (Austin, 1962; Searle 1969), and later the studies of (Grice, 1975) were described and accepted. It became clear that we cannot deal with the addresser's words without taking the addressee into account. Textual linguistic analysis, which also provides a pragmatic view, appears to be an extremely appropriate tool for examining objectivity since the theory of style, discourse, and rhetoric creates clear-cut linguistic tools that can render significant results. This is relevant here too, despite the fact that we are dealing with a "gray" area located somewhere between facts and opinions, and particularly when dealing with the precise delivery of the addresser's words, even if they are not "objective," and even if they do not convey facts in an unbiased manner. The objectivity which I will analyze is the precise conveyance of the news item expressed in the addresser's report.

2. Methods

In order to examine the way of conveying messages, I compared two newspapers by employing linguistic-rhetorical criteria that relate to the text's literal meaning. These criteria comprise a choice of vocabulary, and particularly the choice of specific words taken from a semantic field – the choice of positive or negative words that heighten the emotional load. In addition, they comprise a choice of linguistic forms, such as active or passive verbs, syntactical means such as the sentence's word order, the use of modal sentences, the use of certain conjunctions that bear meaning, the choice of using a parenthetical expression (although this is a para-linguistic examinational tool, it attends syntax as well as meaning when dealing with the study of texts). When examining the texts, I also made use of rhetorical means, such as enhancers, figurative language, play on words, paradox and the misuse of accepted patterns, slang, and more on.

I employed pragmatic criteria that assist the addressee in comprehending the implications of the circumstances of that stated. I chose to demonstrate the implications by using Grice's conversational maxims (Grice, 1975). Grice claims that we cannot rely on a simple formalistic analysis of linguistic maxims; we should rely on rules that do not overtly demonstrate that which was said, but emerge from it, in other words, that which is implied. He believes that both the addresser and the addressee, who participate in the discourse, contribute that which is required according to objectives and circumstances. In the present context, we would seemingly expect the conveyance of an unbiased message, with no violation of the maxims. Grice suggested the following maxims:

Maxims of quantity

Contribution to conversation will be informative to the extent that is appropriate to the course of the conversation; one should not provide more information than needed, but the speaker conveys to the addressee all the information he or she possesses.

Maxims of quality

Effort should be made to make the contribution to the conversation truthful; do not say anything that you believe is untrue, and facts that do not have proper proof should not be reported.

Maxims of relevance

Provide only relevant details.

Maxims of manner

One should be precise. One should avoid ambiguities and double meaning; articulation should be succinct and orderly.

Cooperation between interlocutors is expected, but they often violate the rules: they lie or utter half truths, provide partial information, give irrelevant answers to questions, and speak unclearly (Livnat, 2014/227b)

Meaning can be derived from the overt violation of the maxims of cooperation, in other words, conversational implicature is derived. The addressee hears what is said and understands the implications.

Violation of the maxims of quantity is manifested by providing insufficient or superfluous information.

Violation of the maxims of quality is manifested in the following ways: irony, metaphor, understatement, exaggeration, contradiction.

Violation of the maxims of relevance occurs when the addresser uses words that are irrelevant to the subject of the conversation.

Violation of the maxims of manner occurs when the addresser intentionally uses vague language in order to achieve a specific objective.

The objective is to examine whether there is any basis for Netanyahu's argument, by using linguistic and implicative tools. In other words, how close the news item is to the real facts.

I examined 25 issues in two newspapers; each pair of issues bore the same date. The objective was to compare the two articles that appeared in the papers on the same date. Were the same items published? Were they worded in the same way? From the point of view of content and the way in which the message was conveyed, did a difference exist between them? If so, how were these differences expressed? Which pragmatic structural linguistic means were employed by the writers in order to convey their message?

3. Results and Discussion

Following I will quote the relevant news items that dealt with the Likud party, Prime Minister Netanyahu and his inner circle, and the news items that reported on the same subject on the same day in the two papers. I will analyze these items in accordance with linguistic-stylistic textual criteria, and in summary I will see whether these items fell in line with or deviated from Grice's maxims (what were the implications), and in their diversion conveyed their overt and covert message in order to bear an impact on the addressee.

➤ Example no. 1: 25.5.2015

Yedioth Ahronoth: (page 14, Itamar Eichner) Headline:

"Disappointment in the Arab world: discussion of the demilitarization of the Middle East of nuclear weapons is postponed

3.1. America Comes to the Rescue at the Eleventh Hour

It was very close. The convention for the non-proliferation of nuclear arms dealt with the initiative advanced by Egypt. The demand: convening a special discussion within the next ten months for the demilitarization of the Middle East of atomic weapons. At the very last moment the United States thwarted the proposal. The prime minister contacted Secretary of State Kerry and thanked him and President Obama.”

Israel Hayom: (page 13, Shlomo Tsezana, Yuri Yalon and Yoni Hersh). Headline:

- “An achievement for Israel: the committee for the demilitarization of the Middle East of nuclear weapons was thwarted

Satisfaction in Jerusalem: pressure exerted on the prime minister and American, British, and Canadian opposition brought about the annulment of the initiative. The meaning: the proposal was blocked until 2020 at least.

Discussion of the example:

It appears that there is a difference between the reports on the same item in these two papers:

Vocabulary: The choice of positive and negative words which convey the addresser’s message. *Yedioth Ahronoth* ‘America comes to the rescue compared to *Israel Hayom*’s: ‘an achievement for Israel’. *Yedioth Ahronoth* attempts to show that help came from the United States and not from Netanyahu, who represents Israel, and therefore the paper presents the situation as a rescue carried out by America. *Yedioth Ahronoth*’s report does not cite Netanyahu’s words but conveys the reporter’s standpoint: The United States saved, rescued, vs. *Israel Hayom* that presented, quoting Netanyahu’s words, the achievement of Israel, which he, Netanyahu, doubtlessly led. Not only is this not a rescue, but it is an achievement, seemingly an act on the part of Israel.

The choice of words in this item heightens the emotional load: *Yedioth Ahronoth*: “The discussion was postponed” and only later does the paper state “at the last moment the United States thwarted...” *Israel Hayom*: “The demilitarization convention was thwarted. The word ‘thwarted’ is emotionally loaded, in comparison with ‘postponed’ that leaves the possibility of returning to this issue, as this is merely a postponement.

Word order and reference to the prime minister: *Yedioth Ahronoth*: The *prime minister contacted [...] and thanked*. The word order in this sentence does not give any credit to the prime minister; it is merely the act of thanking the United States for granting an act of kindness. On the other hand, in *Israel Hayom* the word order presents the ‘pressure’ as a source of impact, ‘*pressure exerted by the prime minister and American, British and Canadian opposition*’ and only later ‘American, British and Canadian opposition.’

Active and passive: *Yedioth Ahronoth*: ‘the United States thwarted’; the ‘United States’ appears in active voice and it carried out an achievement, compared to ‘was thwarted’ in *Israel Hayom*, a passive form which does not state who thwarted, and thus ‘an achievement for Israel’ remains in effect.

In summary: One may say that this example seemingly shows no violation of the maxims of cooperation, but shows use of linguistic means in order to place emphasis on the message of each paper, i.e., each paper delivered relevant details but presented them from its own point of view, and thus, through linguistic measures, conveyed a message that steers to its intentions.

- Example no. 2: 8.12.2015

Yedioth Ahronot: (page 36, Amir Ben David). Headline:

- “Netanyahu vs. the Economic Affairs Committee

Against the background of the Egyptian decision to freeze discussions for the import of gas from Israel: the prime minister and Minister Steinitz will appear this morning in the Knesset for a loaded discussion regarding the gas outline. The main topic: is there any justification to circumvent the authority of the Anti-Trust chief in order to approve the compromise reached with the gas corporations.”

Israel Hayom: (page 15, Hezi Sternlicht). Headline:

- “Today: the prime minister is conducting a dramatic discussion in the Economic Affairs Committee with regard to the gas outline

A moment before the outline sets out on its way, the supporters and the opposers step on the gas. Steinitz underscored: “It is imperative to put an end to the delay in the development of the gas fields.’ Governor of the Bank of Israel Dr. Flug reiterated her support: ‘the outline is reasonable; in negotiations you cannot achieve everything you want to achieve.’”

Discussion of the example:

Connectives: use of connectives that express a specific intention. In *Yedioth Ahronot* use of the connective ‘vs.’, which means opposition, represents confrontation and opposition to the prime minister on the part of the Economic Affairs Committee, and thus this use, which was selected by the addressor, weakens the prime minister’s status. This issue is presented in a softer way in *Israel Hayom*: ‘The prime minister in a dramatic discussion at the Economic Affairs Committee’, i.e., a dramatic presentation rather than a confrontation.

The choice of details and their use in words bearing a positive or negative connotation: In *Yedioth Ahronot* items which denigrate the issue, which is a step taken by the prime minister: ‘The Egyptian decision to freeze contact,’ ‘to circumvent the authority of the Anti-Trust chief, in comparison with *Israel Hayom*: support, there are not only opposers but ‘supporters and opposers’ as well as a citation from the governor of the Bank of Israel ‘the outline is reasonable...’

Emotional load: in *Yedioth Ahronot*: “A loaded discussion; the words ‘main topic’ are emotionally loaded.

3.2. In summary: Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation

In *Yedioth Ahronot*, the background sentence appears, ‘against the background of the Egyptian decision...’ Here we see a violation of the maxim of quantity. This sentence is superfluous in the report on the discussion of the gas issue.

In *Israel Hayom*: ‘Step on the gas’ violates the maxim of quality; it is imperative to convey the precise intention of the addresser. ‘The supporters and the opposers’ refers only to the supporter and there is no mention of the opposers, violation of the maxim of quantity; no details regarding them are presented, and it is only natural that the addresser wishes to underscore the supporters.

➤ Example no. 3: 10.12.2015

Yedioth Ahronot: (page 1 and 4, Nahum Barnea). Headline:

- “The president is in love (with the president)

Rivlin compared Obama to the Hanukkah lamp *shamash* (literally, the attendant). ‘The *shamash* is in fact the leader. He lights the candles. Over the past seven years, you have shown the path to your people and to the entire world, and you will do the same in your eighth year.’

In the article: “Obama’s face revealed the difference: following years of loaded meetings with Netanyahu, a relaxed meeting with the representative of the State of Israel, a meeting in which neither party needed to act against their beliefs. ‘Immense enjoyment’ Obama said in his opening words. Surely there was no suffering there...”

Page 6; Headline:

3.3. Women Give Light

Obama did everything in order to make President Rivlin feel at home – he took care that everyone saw how much he was enjoying himself. His wife, Michelle, also enlisted to the cause, when she made room in her schedule for meeting and lighting candles with Nechama Rivlin.”

Yisrael Hayom: (page 1 and 5, Yuri Yalon). Headline:

Candles in the White House

President Rivlin was President’s Obama’s guest and together they lit the Hanukkah candles. Earlier Rivlin published an article in the *Washington Post* in which he argued that Israel had neglected Eastern Jerusalem. They were furious in the Likud.”

Page 5: “Rivlin to Obama: ‘Israel has no greater friend than the United States’

Israel’s president following a meeting his American counterpart: ‘Obama is not optimistic with regard to renewal of negotiations with the Palestinians.’ Rivlin lit candles in the Hanukkah lamp in the White House, and Obama emphasized: “Light conquers darkness”

On the same page: “The Likud: furious about Rivlin’s article.

- ‘A president is not supposed to criticize the government when abroad’

Discussion of the example:

- Choice of details: in *Yedioth Ahronot* an additional news item, “Women give light,” which depicts the respect demonstrated by the wife of the United States president and the time she devoted to the wife of Israel’s president, with the objective of illustrating the harmony and preference of the United States toward President Rivlin, in comparison with his relationship to Prime Minister Netanyahu. In *Israel Hayom* this meeting was not mentioned, but an item appeared that indicated the Likud’s dissatisfaction with Rivlin’s statements in a newspaper in the United States. This article shows that Netanyahu is not alone; the Likud backs and supports him.
- Emotional load: illustrated by the choice of positive words in *Yedioth Ahronot* that describe the relationship between Obama and Rivlin: *in love*, and when describing his relationship with Netanyahu: ‘Loaded meetings with Netanyahu’, ‘immense enjoyment’ said Obama’ ‘no suffering there’, ‘a relaxed meeting,’ ‘to act against their belief.’
- A modal sentence: the choice of such a sentence, which clearly expresses the addresser’s intention, is aimed at conveying an unambiguous clear-cut message. *Israel Hayom*: ‘a president is not supposed to criticize the government when abroad.’

3.4. In summary: Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation

In *Yedioth Ahronot*: ‘The president is in love’, violation of the maxim of quality by way of exaggeration.

Yedioth Ahronot chose to describe details from the meeting that convey a positive emotional message. If the goal is to convey messages alone, we see here a violation of the maxim of quantity. *Israel Hayom* offers only vital information regarding the meeting. For example, lighting the candles, but not as described by *Yedioth Ahronot*, i.e. underscoring emotions and the immense enjoyment experienced by President Obama, in stark contrast with his meetings with Netanyahu.

➤ Example no. 4: 10.12.2015

Yedioth Ahronot: (page 1 and 18, Itamar Eichner). Headline:

→ Page 1: “Netanyahu’s dog bit a Likud MK

Embarrassment while lighting the candles: The dog Kaya turned aggressive and bit MK Sharan Haskel and the husband of Deputy Minister Hotobelly”

→ Page 18: “A bite from Kaya Netanyahu

The festive lighting of the candles conducted at the prime minister’s residence for the Likud members scared the Netanyahu’s dog. Ten-year-old Kaya, who was recently adopted, turned aggressive and bit the newly appointed MK Sharan Haskel. Deputy Minister Tsipi Hotobelly’s husband was also bitten. The prime minister hastened to apologize. Haskel, a veterinary nurse by profession, said last night: ‘a little bite will not intimidate me.’”

Israel Hayom: (page 27, Shlomo Tsazana). Headline:

- “MK Haskel: A little bite from a dog will not intimidate me”

Kaya, the Netanyahu’s dog, stole the show at the Likud’s candle lighting. She bit the newly appointed MK and Deputy Minister Hotobelly’s husband”

Discussion of the example:

- Placement of the item: in *Yedioth Ahronot* on page 1, and in *Israel Hayom*, on page 18: page 27 illustrates emphasis on the mishap in *Yedioth Ahronot*, in comparison with its concealment in *Israel Hayom*.
- Emotional load: words with negative connotation in *Yedioth Ahronot*: ‘embarrassment’, ‘turned aggressive.’ In *Israel Hayom*: use of the collocation ‘stole the show’ which conveys a positive, forgiving, non-negative message.

3.5. *In Summary: Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation*

The sentence ‘a little bite will not intimidate me’ was indeed uttered by the deputy minister, which shows keeping with the maxims of cooperation, but placement of the sentence in the article arouses interest: at the end of the *Yedioth Ahronot* item, which manifests forgiveness and acceptance of the act in a positive form, while in *Israel Hayom* it appears in the headline. In this way the action of Netanyahu’s dog is mitigated. It seems that the choice of placement constitutes violation of the maxim of manner; the objective is to convey precise information at the appropriate place with no intention of any biased understanding of the message. In addition, violation of the maxim of quantity, as the sentence does not convey information in a direct manner, like in *Yedioth Ahronot*: “*Netanyahu’s dog bit...*” but rather indirectly. The sentence that appears in *Israel Hayom*, “*stole the show*” while lighting the candles by the Likud - modifies the severity of the act, and violates the maxim of quality.

It appears that there are irrelevant details in *Yedioth Ahronot*: ‘*recently adopted*’ ‘*the newly appointed MK.*’ If the objective of the item was to make the dog’s biting public information, violation of the maxim of relevancy exists.

- Example no. 5: 22.12.2015

Yedioth Ahronot: (page 20 Tova Tsimuki). Headline:

"Attorney Weinrot to Attorney General of Israel: Close the inquiry

3.6. *The Sara Netanyahu Case and the Strange Request*

Eyebrows were raised in the Ministry of Justice: Sara Netanyahu’s attorney requested to close the case against her with regard to the residences of the prime minister. However, high ranking officials in the Ministry believe that Attorney General Yehuda Weinstein will soon request the police to question her under caveat.”

Israel Hayom: (page 9, Zvi Harel). Headline:

- "After his denial, Weinstein was forced to confess; I met with Attorney Weinrot

An announcement of the Ministry of Justice was delivered after Sara Netanyahu’s defense attorney spoke about their meeting some three weeks ago. Netanyahu’s coteries spoke about the publication last night regarding his wife: “Nonsense, another attempt to blemish the prime minister with false accusations.”

Discussion of the example:

- Emotional load: *Yedioth Ahronot*: negative connotation: ‘*strange request*’, ‘*raising an eyebrow*’; *Israel Hayom*: ‘*the denial... forced to admit*’
- Imperative verb: *Yedioth Ahronot*: use of a sentence in the imperative: ‘*close the case*’ heightens emotional load, and is added to the word ‘*strange*’, in other words, is neither proper nor legitimate.

3.7. *Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation*

Yedioth Ahronot: use of the word *strange* is inappropriate, as the meaning of the word here is imprecise and therefore violates the maxim of quality. The intention is to convey a negative message by using a word which heightens emotional load.

In *Israel Hayom*: use of the word ‘*nonsense*’ in the sentence: *another attempt to blemish the prime minister by false accusations*’ impairs the maxims of quality and quantity, as it does not say why it is nonsense, nor why these are false accusations. No details, which could complete the picture, were given.

- Example no. 6: 24.12.2015

Yedioth Ahronot: (page 28, Gad Leor). Headline:

3.8. *The Agreement in the Public Sector – An Achievement of the Low-Salaried Employees*

Yesterday the minister of finance and the chairman of the Histadrut signed a new wage agreement that prevented the planned strike. The average addition will reach 7.5% by the end of 2018, when low-salaried employees will receive relatively more. The employees will also be given two days of vacation and a one-time bonus of NIS 2,000.

Israel Hayom: (page 17, Hezi Sternlicht). Headline:

3.9. *Indeed, a Breakthrough: for the First Time They Really Cared for the Weak*

The achievement is mainly that of the Ministry of Finance: as always, the Histadrut secured an increase in salary without giving much in return”

Discussion of the example:

Vocabulary: use of the word 'achievement' is different in the two papers. In *Yedioth Ahronot*: 'The agreement – an achievement of the low-salaried employees' was written about those who were the object of the achievement, and not those who had effected the achievement. In *Israel Hayom*: 'Indeed, a breakthrough. For the first time they really cared for the weak' achieved by enhancers (really, more), use of a word with a positive connotation ('cared for,' 'breakthrough')

Hesger: The objective of the parenthetical expression is to change the mind of the addresser with regard to the issue; in this case criticism is directed toward the Histadrut in two ways: one, use of the parenthetical expression, 'as always,' and second, the paradox: was given a raise but gave nothing in return.

3.10. Summary: Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation

Yedioth Ahronot preserves the maxims but chooses to use a sentence that is inactive, so as to avoid giving credit to the one who brought about the achievement: 'an achievement for low-salaried employees.' If there is a clear-cut statement regarding those who brought about the achievement, it is the violation of the maxim of quality. *Israel Hayom* chose to express its opinion regarding the quality of the agreement, but left out details about the agreement that appeared in *Yedioth Ahronot*. This is a violation of the maxim of quantity, as well as a violation of the maxim of quality, as these details could have confirmed the arguments of *Israel Hayom*.

➤ Example 7: 5.1.2015

Yedioth Ahronot (page 4, Yuval Karni). Headline:

- "The Likud list: embarrassing mishaps

A ballot box in Modiin disappeared. Tzahi Hanegbi received far more votes than the number of voters in Beit Jan. Ballot boxes in several localities were not counted. In Tel Aviv one ballot box was counted twice. Candidates for the primaries received identical results, which aroused suspicion, in two different localities, and Tsipi Hotobelly claims that there were forgeries in the Arab and Druze sectors following a repeat count in which she reduced the gap between her and Dichter to 50 votes.

- In the middle of the counting: following Netanyahu's request the observers were dismissed. One of the observers who left the room: 'There can be no confidence in the results'

Israel Hayom: (page 7, Mati Tuchfeler). Headline:

Leader: Today: The Likud is launching a campaign

Netanyahu will present plans for the coming years. The feeling among activists- a momentum has been created which will enable the increase of the number of mandates, thus turning the party into the largest party in the next Knesset

Sub-leader: after a repeat count in some of the ballot boxes

Because of 55 votes: Dichter in, Hotobelly maybe"

Discussion of the example:

The choice of details and the use of words with positive or negative connotation: both papers pointed out the difference in the number of votes for Hotobelly and Dichter, but *Yedioth Ahronot* preceded with a detail that did not appear in *Israel Hayom*: 'Tsipi Hotobelly claims that there are forgeries.... following a repeat count she reduced the gap between her and Dichter to 50 votes'.

Use of a citation for the purpose of enhancing authenticity in *Yedioth Ahronot*: 'One of the observers who left the room: 'There can be no confidence in the results'

Negative emotional load: in *Yedioth Ahronot*: 'The Likud list: embarrassing mishaps, the observers were dismissed, left [the room]'. In *Israel Hayom*: positive connotation: 'The Likud is launching a campaign'...that increase... and turn into the largest party...'

3.11. Summary: Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation

Yedioth Ahronot observes the maxims of quantity and relevance. In *Israel Hayom* details described in *Yedioth Ahronot* are missing. In addition, there is no reference in *Israel Hayom* to forgeries in relation to Hotobelly. This entails a violation of the maxims of quantity and relevance.

➤ Example no. 8, 2.3.2015

Yedioth Ahronot: (page 1-2, Nahum Barnea). Headline regarding the prime minister's trip to the United States to speak to the congress:

➤ "Historic? Hysterical

Unfortunately, Netanyahu will appear in congress in a way that destroys everything that he ostensibly wishes to fix"

➤ Instead of history, hysteria

2. (Page 1-2 Itamar Eichner)

➤ "At loggerheads"

A day before the prime minister's speech in congress the president of the United States will present his view to the public about the visit that was not coordinated with him. Netanyahu: 'This is a historic mission, I represent the entire Jewish people, including those who do not agree with me.' Criticism is heightening in the United States Jewish community against the speech"

3. (Page 4, Shimon Shiffer)

➤ A speech of failures

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stood there, yesterday afternoon next to his wife, Sara, under his feet the red carpet, behind him the El Al aircraft, and before him the microphones which his loyal assistant, Ezra Seidof, had prepared beforehand – and spoke about

the fact that he was leaving on “a fateful and historic mission.” A former senior member of the security forces who watched the event, muttered through his teeth quietly: “He’s barking up the wrong tree.” Or in other words: fateful – my eye.

Israel Hayom: (Page 1-5, Haim Shein, Shlomo Tsezana, Erez Lin). Headline:

- “The journalist, Jeffrey Goldberg, a close associate of the White House: “Netanyahu has a case”
- “Dangerous compromises”

Just before midnight the prime minister landed in Washington. A senior member of his entourage: ‘The details of the emerging agreement are known.’ ‘It contains compromises that will leave dangerous capacities within Iranian hands.’ Surprising support: a senior reporter of the *Atlantic*, who usually attacks the prime minister: ‘The agreement is disturbing; this is a decisive moment for Obama and for the entire world.’ Bennett: The agreement – a disaster of historical dimensions. Is Kerry lowering the flames? ‘Netanyahu is invited to speak in the United States.’

2. (page 2-3)

- “A fateful mission

The prime minister landed in Washington, and his entourage made it clear: ‘It is a bad agreement, with dangerous compromises.’ Netanyahu highlighted before leaving: “I am leaving on a historic mission.” Meanwhile, Kerry is lowering the flames: ‘Netanyahu is invited to speak in the United States.’

Discussion of the example:

- Play on words: in Yedioth Ahronot: Historic? Hysterical. Instead of history, hysteria; at loggerheads
- Emotional load: Yedioth Ahronot: words with negative connotation: destroy, a speech of failures, muttered
- Israel Hayom, quite the opposite, positive connotation: fateful mission, surprising support, however negative when speaking of the opposite side: ‘dangerous compromises, dangerous capacities, disaster of historical dimensions
- Figurative speech: Israel Hayom: Is Kerry lowering the flames?
- Slang: Yedioth Ahronot: Fateful - my eye
- Parenthetical expression: transferring the addresser’s disagreement and feeling: in Yedioth Ahronot: seemingly, unfortunately
- Proximity of issues: Yedioth Ahronot presents details one next to the other with no connection between them, but the very fact of their proximity generates a paradox: ‘I represent the entire Jewish people... Criticism is heightening in the United States Jewish community against the speech”

3.12. Summary: Violation of the Maxims of Cooperation

- Yedioth Ahronot: Historic? Hysterical. Instead of bringing details that verify the argument that this was not history, we are presented with a play on words, i.e., violation of the maxims of quality.
- Yedioth Ahronot: “He is barking up the wrong tree” – the intention is unclear. Use of a collocation the intention of which is to express opposition to Netanyahu is not sufficiently clear, violation of the maxims of manner.
- Yedioth Ahronot: A speech of failures, under this headline appear irrelevant details that mock the prime minister with regard to pomp such as the carpet, the fact that his wife is joining him and so on, but there are no details that report on the s from any angle. In other words, violation of the maxims of relevance and quantity: a plethora of details.

4. Summary

The comparison shows that in both papers the details are correct, but the difference between them lies in the choice of details in the news items. The comparison shows which details were selected for the report and the way in which they were presented. The choice is the result of the addresser’s – the paper’s - beliefs and intentions. In *Israel Hayom* the details selected were in most instances those that praised the prime minister and the Likud government, while in *Yedioth Ahronot* the selected details are not complimentary to the prime minister or to the Likud government.

An additional issue is the item’s placement; *Yedioth Ahronot* tends to publish mistakes made by Netanyahu or the Likud on the first pages, while often these same mistakes are published on the inner pages of *Israel Hayom* (Example no. 4).

In addition to the choice of details and placement, use was made of linguistic issues, whose function was to bear an impact on the addressee, such as vocabulary. This relates to the choice of specific words such as ‘achievement’ and ‘thwarted’ which carry a positive or negative emotional load, as well as linguistic forms, for example, the use of active or passive verbs, such as ‘thwarted’ or ‘thwarts.’ The question is how are these words presented? The word ‘achievement’ is presented in Example no. 6 by each of the journalists in a way that suits their individual needs: in *Israel Hayom* it was the achievement of the Ministry of Finance, which received credit, while in *Yedioth Ahronot* the word does not relate to those who brought about the achievement. The word ‘thwarted’ in Example no. 1: *Yedioth Ahronot* says that ‘The United States thwarted,’ an active form of the verb, in order to underscore on the United States’ enormous contribution, but *Israel Hayom* uses the verb’s passive form in order to attribute all credit to the regime. In syntax as well we have seen the impact of the conveyance of the message, for example in word order. Example no. 1 in *Yedioth Ahronot*: “The prime minister contacted... and thanked: the word order in this sentence does not attribute credit to the prime minister, but rather to the act of the one who thanked the United States. The use of parenthetical expressions, modal sentences, connectives or their absence in specific places, such as the use of the connective ‘versus’ in Example no. 1, (interpreted as against), in other words, against Netanyahu – all these steer the addressee in the direction which the addresser wishes, and thus attempts to bear an impact on the addressee to see things from his or her perspective.

In addition, rhetorical issues were examined (enhancers, figurative language, play on words, slang, paradox) whose function was to present reality in the way in which the addresser desired.

Based on these issues it was possible to examine whether the addresser fell in line with Grice's conversational maxims. We have seen that the maxims were violated, and at times, two were violated in the same sentence.

It is worthy of note that violation of the maxims of cooperation serves the addresser who wishes to influence addressees and convey his/her real message to them. The results show that the addresser employs overt and covert means for conveying messages. A covert way could be selecting and placing details presented in the news item. An overt way means using words with positive or negative connotation, for example, in the *Speech of Failures* that appeared in *Yedioth Ahronot* (Example no. 8). The use of this word (created on the basis of the collocation, a speech of victory) reveals the addresser's intention, in comparison with use of the collocation 'fateful mission' in the same item in *Israel Hayom*, that delivers Netanyahu's collocation, showing objective conveyance.

Thus both the sources of Netanyahu and Noni Moses are not objective, but rather convey a subjective message, which employs diverse rhetorical means while violating the maxims of cooperation which I examined.

5. References

- i. Austin L. (1976). *How to do Things with Words* (2nd ed). London, O&b: universiyy Press.
- ii. Donsbach W. (2004). Psychology of news decisions: Factors behind journalists' professional behavior. *Journalism* 5(2): 131–157
- iii. Fairclough N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- iv. Fowler R, R Hodge, G Kress & T Trew. (1979). *Language and Control*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- v. Fowler R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, London & New York: Routledge.
- vi. Glasgow University Media Group (1980). *More Bad News*, London, Boston & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- vii. Grice H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In: P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press: 41–58.
- viii. Livnat Z. (2014). *Introduction to the Theory of Meaning: Semantic and Pragmatics 2*. Raanana: The Open University of Israel.
- ix. McQuail D. (1987). *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. London, Newbury Park, Beverly Hills, & New Delhi: Sage, 2nd .ed.
- x. Post S. (2015). scientific objectivity in journalism? How journalists and academics define objectivity, assess its attainability, and rate its desirability. *Journalism* 2015, Vol. 16(6): 730–749
- xi. Searle J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- xii. Weizman E, & Dascal M. (1991). On clues and cues: Strategies of text Understanding. *Journal of Literary Semantic*, 20(1): 18 - 30