

A MOMENT OF NATIONAL PRIDE: ISRAELI MEDIA COVERAGE OF THE TAKEOVER OF JERICHO PRISON

April 2006

Keshev's Management

President: David Grossman

Chairman: Dr. Daniel Dor

Executive Director: Yizhar Be'er

Members of the Board: Dr. Tamar Ashuri, Manuala Dviri, Prof. Galia Golan, Adv. Dr. Yuval Karniel, Avi Katzman, Ram Loevy, Dr. Adel Man'a, Dr. Lea Mandelzis, Hagit Ofra, Prof. Frances Raday, Anat Saragusti, Prof. Dov Shinar, Dr. Zvia Valden, Yiftach Ya'akov

Academic Supervision: Dr. Daniel Dor

Keshev's Staff

Research and Writing: Shiri Iram, Michal Har'El, Carmi Lecker, Ofer Vloday, Shimri Zameret.

Spokesperson: Noam Hoffstater

Program Development & Translation: Dr. Eitan Schiffman



This project was carried out with support from the European Union.
The contents of the report reflect the opinions of Keshev alone and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union.

Introduction

On March 14, 2006, a sizeable Israeli force broke into the prison compound in Jericho, partially destroying it and arresting its inhabitants. Television stations from around the world broadcast live pictures of dozens of Palestinian men in their underwear looking defeated and humiliated.¹ This report examines media coverage of the action in Jericho from March 14 to March 17 in the three major Israeli newspapers, *Yedioth Ahronoth*, *Ma'ariv* and *Ha'aretz*, and in the three major nightly television newscasts on Channel 1, Channel 2 and Channel 10. As we shall see, in the first day following the action the entire Israeli media united to justify the Israeli action and debase the Palestinian side in an extraordinary display of national pride. On the second day, the television newscasts tried to raise some critical questions that begged to be asked. The newspapers, for their part, continued to emphasize the victory celebration.

The first day's coverage: "fast and elegant"

In the first day following the action, as recounted above, the media showed a sense of unity and pride. For example, in a front-page commentary in *Yedioth Ahronoth* on March 15, under the headline **A MOMENT OF NATIONAL PRIDE** military affairs commentator Alex Fishman wrote: "We can momentarily put aside the cynicism and chatter of the elections. We have the right to be proud today. There are decisions that are cornerstones in building the national ethos [...]" This mood dominated the Israeli media coverage, as indicated by the following examples:

GOT THEM (*Ma'ariv*, March 15, 2006, main headline and caption accompanying pages 2-8).

ACCOUNT CLOSED (*Yedioth Ahronoth*, March 15, 2006, main headline and caption, pages 2-6).

IDF PRESENTS: JUDGMENT DAY (*Ma'ariv*, March 15, 2006, main headline, pages 2-3).

FAST AND ELEGANT (*Ma'ariv*, March 15, 2006, page 3).

"Haim, first of all there is no action more justified than this one, I think you will agree with me on that..." (Correspondent Yoav Limor at the beginning of Channel 1 newscast on March 14, 2006).

GOT THEM



Ma'ariv, 15.3.06, front page

ACCOUNT CLOSED



Yedioth Ahronoth, 15.3.06, front page

ACCOUNT CLOSED THE SEIGE AND THE SURRENDER

Yedioth Ahronoth, 15.3.06, p. 3



FAST AND ELEGANT

Ma'ariv, 15.3.06, p. 3



Ma'ariv 15.3.06, pp. 2-3.

IDF PRESENTS: JUDGMENT DAY

¹ In Israel, pictures of the prisoners in their underwear appeared in all of the major media outlets except for *Yedioth Ahronoth*.

Yedioth Ahronoth outdid the other outlets with this headline on page 4:

DURING A VISIT TO ARIEL, MOFAZ TOOK OLMERT ASIDE AND WHISPERED TO HIM: "THE BRITISH OBSERVERS HAVE LEFT THE PRISON IN JERICHO, THE IDF IS READY TO ACT" * "ALL RIGHT," REPLIED OLMERT, "CONTINUE THE OPERATION" * WHEN CONCERNED FOREIGN MINISTERS FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD CALLED LIVNI SHE REPLIED "A MAN'S GOTTA DO WHAT A MAN'S GOTTA DO" * A FEW HOURS LATER OLMERT CALLED MINISTER ZE'evi'S WIDOW AND TOLD HER: "THERE IS JUSTICE IN ISRAEL".

In the first day following the operation the media refrained from any critical discussion of the operation or its justifications and did not address questions that begged to be asked, such as: What are the action's implications for Israel's relations with the Palestinian Authority and the stability of the Palestinian Authority? To what extent were these considerations taken into account when the action was decided upon? Were alternative options considered? Was the agreement on holding the wanted men violated, and if so, by whom? And what evidence ties the wanted men to the murder of Minister Ze'evi?²

On this day especially the media built up a story maintaining that senior officials in the security system, government ministers and Israeli society as a whole all backed the operation and the way it was handled. It was a story of moral revenge, in which "our" side, the Israeli side—righteous and omnipotent—routed the treacherous, agreement-breaking and cowardly opposing side. This sentiment came through in extensive coverage ridiculing the cowardice of Ahmad Sa'adat, who promised to "fight until death" but did not keep his "promise". The main headline on page 2 of *Ha'aretz* on March 15 read: **"WE WILL FIGHT TO THE DEATH," DECLARED SA'ADAT AND TURNED HIMSELF IN AFTER 10 HOUR SIEGE.** The sub-headline on the front page of *Yedioth Ahronot* read: **THE OPERATION: SIX WANTED PALESTINIANS THAT PROMISED TO ENTRENCH THEMSELVES UNTIL DEATH IN JERICHO PRISON LEFT IT DEFEATED WITH RAISED HANDS AND FALTERING STEPS.**



◀ *Ha'aretz*, 15.3.06, page 2.

The discussion at the beginning of the Channel 1 newscast on March 14 was carried out in a similar atmosphere:

Anchor Haim Yavin: "We are with you Amir Bar-Shalom in Jericho. Sa'adat threatened to fight until death but turned himself over to IDF soldiers. What lessons can be drawn from this dramatic event that has accompanied us all day?"

² On March 20, the following headline appeared on page 10 of *Ma'ariv*: **MAZUZ: "IT IS NOT CERTAIN THAT THERE IS ENOUGH EVIDENCE AGAINST ZE'evi'S MURDERERS"**. The significant contradiction between the lack of evidence and the basic assumption that these are the murderers was not discussed in the media. See page 9.

Military correspondent Amir Ben Shalom: "He turned himself in, very frightened, Haim. That's what an IDF officer that met him and identified him told me. He and Fuad Shubaki, we are told, emerged very, very scared from the compound."

Later, Haim Yavin turned to Yoav Limor saying, "...it turns out that the head of the Popular Front is a hero until it comes to his own life..."

Limor continued in the same vein:

Regarding Ahmad Sa'adat, whom you mention: Look, he can be a hero over others. These people are very good at sending suicide bombers to their deaths and to our deaths. It turns out that when it comes to their own deaths they are very small heroes. He just saw the IDF soldiers—he and the others—promised to become martyrs and then didn't keep the promise. Now what awaits him is a small holding cell, investigations by the General Security Service in the coming days, and further on, of course, indictments and, I suppose, many long years in Israeli prison.

Yavin did not let up and put a similar question to the Arab affairs commentator: "Oded Granot, how do you explain that the man who swore to die surrendered?"

Though the headlines in the same day following the operation told a simple story, a story justifying the operation in Jericho and the way it was handled, in the coming days several reports appeared that began to temper this outlook. With few exceptions, these reports appeared only in the inside pages, in commentaries and deep into the television newscasts. Deep in the reports, commentators and correspondents expressed a more complicated state of affairs and referred to the ramifications of the action and the way it was carried out. Among other things, they wrote that the action itself and especially the undressing of the policemen and the destruction of the prison—two symbols of Palestinian sovereignty—before the television cameras, would contribute to weakening Abu Mazen's stature, destabilizing the Palestinian Authority and strengthening Hamas. For example, in a commentary column on page 6 of *Yedioth Ahronoth* on March 15, correspondent for territories affairs Roni Shaked wrote under the headline **A GIFT TO HAMAS, A BLOW TO ABU MAZEN**:

The action in Jericho is a blow below the belt to the moderate camp led by Abu Mazen and another gift that strengthens the stature of Hamas. [...] The action in Jericho drove another nail into Abu Mazen's coffin especially because of its timing. Only two days after Peres and Abu Mazen's meeting in Amman and at a time when Abu Mazen is trying to consolidate in Europe means for bypassing Hamas, the moderate Palestinian camp was buried yesterday under the rubble of the compound in Jericho. This camp, led by Abu Mazen, expected smart policies from Israel that would drive a wedge between the fundamentalist Hamas and the Palestinian public that wants to live alongside Israel without terrorism but with socioeconomic welfare and a political horizon.

Amit Cohen also wrote about the action's ramifications for Israel's relations with the Palestinian Authority. In a commentary column in *Ma'ariv* on March 15, on page six, under the headline **THE SILENCE OF HAMAS**, he wrote:

The action in Jericho once again illustrates what Abu Mazen and those surrounding him are trying to repress. The "no partner" conception, whose goal was to justify unilateral action, is expanding. From now on, it is no longer only a matter of withdrawals and diktats of the de facto border, it is also complete disregard for the effects that Israeli actions will have on the Palestinian Authority.³

³ The article was referred to on the front page but these words were not mentioned there.

In the sixteenth minute of the Channel 10 newscast on March 14, the following dialogue took place between anchor Ya'akov Eilon and Arab affairs commentator Zvi Yehezkeli:

Eilon: "Zvi Yehezkeli, you are talking about two aspects of humiliation today: First, the Palestinian Authority, led by Abu Mazen; Second, the manner in which the Palestinian prisoners exited the prison."

Yehezkeli: "Exactly. However you look at it, it was humiliating. It was humiliating for Palestinians to see their officers removing their clothes and getting on trucks; to hear Ahmad Sa'adat say all day that he will only come out in a coffin and that he will be a martyr, when, ultimately, he raises his hands; and finally, it was a humiliation for the Palestinian Authority, which today consists of both Abu Mazen and Hamas. [...] In the end, there is one big problem: Right now is a very fragile time to be putting the Authority to this kind of test [...]"

Yehezkeli conducted himself differently than other speakers. Rather than jumping on the humiliation bandwagon and ridiculing Sa'adat, he explained how the gap between Sa'adat's statements and his actions also represented a humiliation for Palestinians.

In the first day of coverage following the operation, as can be seen, discussion of the action's implications did not make headlines in the newspapers or on the television newscasts.

On the margins of the reporting, far from the headlines, evidence also appeared suggesting that there were other courses of action that Israel could have adopted. For example, it was reported that there had been international efforts to mediate between the sides, to ensure that the wanted men would remain in prison. On March 15, in an article on the foreign media's coverage of events, on page 8 of *Ma'ariv*, it was reported that "the media in Spain focused on efforts by the Spanish foreign minister, Miguel Moratinos, to mediate between Israel and the Palestinian Authority." More testimony on this course of action came from a lone sentence in the Channel 2 newscast on March 14: "In Meretz, MK Zehava Gal-On says that diplomatic means needed to be exhausted before the military operation." In *Yedioth Ahronoth*, a sub-headline on page 4 on March 15 read: **AHMAD TIBI DELIVERED A MESSAGE THAT ABU MAZEN IS WILLING TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE MURDERERS. POLITICAL SOURCE: "WE DIDN'T EVEN CONSIDER THOSE IMAGINARY PROPOSALS"**. That was the only time that the diplomatic option received a headline; however, by placing it alongside a caustic disparaging comment from an unidentified political source, the editors at *Yedioth Ahronoth* dismissed its legitimacy out of hand.

There was one question that the media dealt with more extensively: The link between the action and the elections. More than a few reporters and commentators speculated that the Kadima party's electoral calculations were a major consideration in determining the style and the timing of the operation. For example, on the front page of *Yedioth Ahronoth* on March 15, political analyst Sima Kadmon wrote:

The capture of Ghandi's murderers fell at Olmert's feet like a ripe fruit: A smooth operation, whose legitimacy was beyond reproach, in perfect political timing, responding to the right's undecided voters without upsetting the left. Was it just lucky that the observers left in such fantastic timing, or two weeks before the election, did Olmert find his "Iraqi reactor"?

In an item broadcast on the Channel 10 newscast on March 14, MKs Ahmad Tibi and Yossi Beilin appeared and discussed the matter. Tibi said: "It seems that Palestinian blood, or the Palestinian subject, is the fuel that runs the electoral system and Israeli internal competition, as usual." Beilin added: "There is a real danger of a needless deterioration. It's still possible to stop it, to listen to the voice of reason, and not to listen to the sound of the elections." These expressions, of course, did not affect the headlines.

Coverage in the following days: “So the question remains: what is this good for?”

While certain critiques were raised in the first day of the coverage, they did not find expression in the headlines. By contrast, on the following day, March 15, the main headlines of the television newscasts included real critiques of the operation. The main headlines in the newspapers refrained from dealing with the subject and coverage was relegated to the margins, along with critiques of the operation.

For example, over a background of the destroyed Palestinian prison, Channel 1 opened its newscast with the following headline: **“ABU MAZEN RETURNS TO THE AREA SHOCKED AND HUMILIATED, THIS IS HOW ‘CAMP HANAN’ - THE COMPOUND, THE SYMBOL OF PALESTINIAN RULE, LOOKS TODAY”**. Afterwards, Abu Mazen appeared on screen and said, “What occurred today is without a doubt an unforgivable crime.”

Later in the broadcast, the following dialogue took place between anchor Haim Yavin and Arab affairs analyst Oded Granot in the studio:

Yavin: "Oded Granot, an unimaginable humiliation – is that what this was?"

Granot: "There was a humiliation, and Abu Mazen arrives after cutting short his visit, after he was told, 'You have to return because there is a leadership vacuum and everyone is saying, where is Abu Mazen?'"

[...]

Yavin: "So the question remains: What is this good for? Why is it good for the state of Israel to push them so far against the wall? Tonight Hamas is being urged to take control of the government."

Granot: "It's true that Hamas is the one taking advantage of the situation. Hamas is saying, look, Israel did not honor the agreements, as we see it, so therefore we don't need to honor the agreements between the Authority and Israel."

On the same evening the Channel 2 newscast opened with the following: **“PILGRIMS TO THE RUBBLE OF JERICHO PRISON. OUR REPORTER MET WITH THE PRISONERS THAT WERE FREED.”** On screen appeared a Palestinian man who said, "They stripped us and dragged us..."

In a report that began in the ninth minute of the Channel 2 newscast that evening, territories affairs correspondent Yoram Binur said, "There is also concern, as usual, that in the end Hamas will benefit. Yesterday's arrest of the men from the Popular Front relieves the Hamas government in the Authority from responsibility for their well-being, while now Abu Mazen needs to provide an explanation."

Immediately afterwards, the broadcast shifted to the studio where the following dialogue took place between anchor Yonit Levy and Arab affairs analyst Ehud Ya'ari:

Levy: "So, Ehud Ya'ari, our analyst, not only Israelis are busy calculating who gained politically from the Jericho prison."

Ya'ari: "Correct. One of the candidates to be Hamas's partner in the coalition, Mustafa Barghouti, says what do we need security apparatuses for if Israel strips them down to their underwear at will? It is in this situation of absolute weakness by Abu Mazen that Hamas, tonight, in these very hours, is attempting to finish putting together a government [...]"

On Channel 10, the second headline of the broadcast declared: **"PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY CHAIRMAN FURIOUS IN JERICHO."** Afterwards, Abu Mazen was shown saying, "this is an unforgivable crime."

This line of coverage continued with anchor Miki Haimovich opening the broadcast by saying: "An unforgivable crime and an insult to the Palestinian people, that's what the Palestinian Authority Chairman today called the Israeli action in Jericho prison. Hamas is demanding that Abu Mazen resign and they claim that he is responsible for the deep humiliation."

In the newspapers, in contrast to the television newscasts, criticism continued to remain on the margins in the days that followed. For example, on March 16, on page 4 of *Yedioth Ahronoth*, an article appeared depicting severe anarchy in the Palestinian Authority. The article's headline, which determined that **THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY IS ON THE VERGE OF COLLAPSE** did not raise the possibility of a connection between the action in Jericho and the Authority's deteriorating condition. Though the sub-headline read: [...] **"THIS IS AN UNFORGIVABLE CRIME TO HUMILIATE THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE," THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCED**, quotations by Palestinians suggesting this linkage could only be found within the text of the article:

Fatah activists yesterday called on Abu Mazen to dismantle the Authority "because of its inability to cope with the occupation." They claim that Abu Mazen needs to demand that the nations of the world assume responsibility for the fate of the Palestinians "in light of their humiliation in the eyes of the entire world and the fact that the Authority cannot protect its prisoners."

Ma'ariv also presented critiques only on the edges of its coverage. In an opinion column published on March 16 in the daily supplement of *Ma'ariv*, Yael Paz-Melamed wrote:

This kind of euphoria and consensus has not been seen in these parts for many years. It's something reminiscent of the victory joy following the Six-Day War or the operation in Entebbe. It's not just joy, it's mostly pride. Here again the IDF strikes our enemies quickly and elegantly, humiliates them and causes them to look ridiculous and pathetic. What happened to their declarations that they would not surrender—in light of the humiliating surrender a few hours later? That's the IDF that we love: Determined, aggressive, clever, and most importantly, victorious.

"[WE] GOT THEM" announced a headline in *Ma'ariv*. "ACCOUNT CLOSED" *Yedioth Ahronoth* exclaimed in its main headline. For each paper—two words. Two words expressing the return of the proud Israeli spirit. Had we lost faith in the IDF and in ourselves to such an extent that we got carried away with such superlatives over an action which there was no doubt would end in victory for the IDF? That's not to cast doubt on the justification and necessity of the action. No government can permit the murderers of an Israeli minister to go free. Neither was the timing of the operation problematic, though we are at the height of an electoral campaign. The timing was determined by the British observers who decided to leave and the acting Prime Minister decided correctly when he ordered the operation.

The problem is with that Israeli spirit, which is only lifted when force is used. We like to see the Palestinians humiliated. The euphoria that enraptured part of the public does not only stem from the operation's success. It is intensified by the sight of dozens of Palestinians in their underwear, with their hands bound, being put on trucks to be interrogated in Israel.

Benny Ziffer voiced similar sentiments in his column on page 11 of part B in *Ha'aretz*, on March 17:

I tried but could not find even one person on television, all day on Tuesday, who would reflect for a moment on the legitimacy or the wisdom of the decision to put an entire army on its feet [...]

No one availed themselves to ponder the wisdom of the operation, because the moment a military operation gets underway the military correspondents' eyes gleam and they feel the adrenaline surge in their blood. This included Alon Ben-David who reported from "the outskirts of Jericho" for Channel 10 and Roni Daniel who celebrated the war party with the same enthusiasm on Channel 2. The only journalist in the club of commentators who I heard clearly blaspheme the wisdom of the operation was Shlomi Eldar, who was a guest on "Mish'al Ham" (Channel 2, Tuesday, 22:10) [...].

The conquest of the Jericho prison also looked completely different on the evening newscast of France 2 (Tuesday, 21:00) than it did in Israel. There it was presented as some kind of Israeli display—a not especially responsible one—because of which four French nationals and other innocent foreigners were kidnapped in Gaza. The impression that Israeli television tried to create, as if the entire Western world praised the operation, was not entirely accurate, to say the least.

Other reporters and commentators pointed to the possibility that the Jericho operation signaled a watershed in Israeli conduct towards the Palestinian Authority—a strategic change in government policy that was also identified by senior officials in the defense establishment. In his column in the weekend supplement of *Yedioth Ahronoth*, Alex Fishman wrote:

It was clear that the Jericho operation would create reverberations. Military intelligence spoke about the possibility of furious responses in the Palestinian street, about massive fire of Qassams from the [Gaza] Strip, about actions by the Popular Front on the northern border. [...] Besides all this, military intelligence estimated that there would also be an increase in the number of attacks within the green line. ... They also spoke of issues such as: What would the forced entry into the prison do to Abu Mazen's stature; what would it do to the [Palestinian] Authority; and what would the Egyptians, the Quartet, the Russians, the Americans, etc... have to say? These are factors that usually influence the amount and scope of force that is employed.

Fishman continued,

This time, and not just because it concerned the capture of Rehav'am Ze'evi's killers, 'the political aspect' was shunted to the margins and its influence on the plans was minuscule. The forced entry into Jericho prison was a turning point with respect to the weight that Israel assigns to political factors relating to the stability of the Authority. Of all the questions asked, the question of what this would do to Abu Mazen no longer interested anyone.

He concluded,

And this will be the pattern of action and thought against the Palestinian Authority in the future as well. The scepter is being passed from political considerations to security-military ones. Until now, they shared half-and-half. Military personnel admit: the new situation is more convenient for us.

Ben Caspit expressed similar views in his column in the weekend supplement of *Ma'ariv* on March 17:

What did we have there? One of the simplest operations that is imaginable. Jericho is a quiet city from which terror is completely absent. There aren't more than ten Kalashnikovs there. The best army in the Middle East enters and takes over, with tanks, bulldozers, helicopters, drones, special forces, snipers and what have you. [...] It's worrying that this kind of action receives such heroic superlatives from the military establishment. It's worrying that no one details the damage that happened, or could still happen. It's worrying that the conception paralyzed us [...]. Tactically, Olmert recorded a victory this week. And strategically? It depends from where you look. It may be that for several years already we have all been sharing in a continuing, painful and unalterable loss [...]. From a historical perspective, the events in Jericho will be seen as another big step toward the almost complete shelving of the Palestinian option. Ariel Sharon's approach, according to which "there is no one to talk to" and "you can't believe the Arabs" is taking shape before our eyes and becoming the consensus. The rest of the world will soon get used to it too.

In conclusion, from the outset the Israeli media enthusiastically supported the IDF action in Jericho and justified it. The media hardly dealt with its possible ramifications for the Palestinian Authority and for the entire area. Only in the days that followed the action did critiques begin to appear that raised serious questions about its efficacy and possible ramifications. On this subject the media followed a familiar pattern in its coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict over the past few years. As Keshev's systematic research has shown, the Israeli media also behaved this way in covering Yasser Arafat's last days. The media adopted from the outset the conception that held him solely responsible for what transpired in our region and critiques of this conception appeared only at later stages. In its coverage of the Sharm el-Sheikh understandings reached with Abu Mazen's government the media ignored Israeli responsibility for the collapse of the agreements and hardly reported on Palestinian actions in keeping with the spirit of the agreements. Coverage of the disengagement was also characterized by acceptance of the establishment's stances; it ignored the implications of this development for the Palestinian population in the Gaza Strip and it disconnected the event from its political and historical context. Research findings on these and other subjects demonstrate that "the almost complete shelving of the Palestinian option" in the eyes of the media began a long time ago.

The State of Israel vs. Ze'evi's "Murderers"

On March 20, on page 10 of Ma'ariv, the following headline appeared:

MAZOS: "IT IS NOT CERTAIN THAT THERE IS ENOUGH EVIDENCE AGAINST ZE'EVIS MURDERERS"

The significant contradiction between the lack of evidence and the basic assumption that these are the murderers was not discussed in the media.

MAZOS: "IT IS NOT CERTAIN THAT THERE IS ENOUGH EVIDENCE AGAINST ZE'EVIS MURDERERS"

The attorney general yesterday said at the cabinet meeting that there may not be enough evidence to bring all of Minister Rehav'am Ze'evi's murderers to trial in an Israeli court.

At the meeting Mazos said that there is no legal obstacle to bringing Ze'evi's murderers to stand trial, even though at least some of them were already tried for their actions in the Palestinian Authority. Mazos added that at the moment the state attorney's office is focused on examining the evidence. "It is not clear that there is sufficient evidence to put all five on trial, within a couple of weeks we will have a clearer picture and we will know if we have enough evidence to bring them to trial." The difficulties pertain to Ahmad Sa'adat and two other senior figures.

General Security Services director Yuval Diskin yesterday reported that following the operation the organization took custody of 33 terror activists, besides Ze'evi's killers. The arrested men being interrogated include terrorists that were involved in shootings, a man involved in the lynch that took place in Ramallah and arms and munitions dealers.

Il'il Shahar

מזוז: "לא בטוח שיש די ראיות נגד רוצחי זאבי"

היועץ המשפטי לממשלה אמר אתמול בישיבת הממשלה שיתכן שלא יימצאו די ראיות כדי להעמיד את כל רוצחיו של השר רהב'ם זאבי לדין בבית משיפט ישראלי.

בישיבה אמר מזוז כי אין מניעה משפטית להעמיד את רוצחי זאבי לדין, למרות שלפחות חלקם כבר נשפטו על מעשיהם ברשות הפלשתינית. עם זאת הוסיף מזוז כי כרגע מתמקדים בפרקליטות בבחינת הראייה. "לא ברור אם יש לנו די ראיות להעמיד את כל החיישים לדין, תוך שבועיים תתבהר התמונה ונדע אם יש לנו מספיק ראיות להעמידם לדין". הקושי מתייחס אל אחמד סע'אדאט ושני בכירים נוספים.

ראש השב"כ יובל דיסקין מסר אתמול כי בעקבות המבצע קיבל הארגון לידיו 33 פעילי טרור, נוסף לרוצחי זאבי. בין העצורים שנחקרים בימים אלה: מחבלים שהיו מעורבים בפגיעה בירי, אדם שהיה מעורב בליניץ' ברמאללה וסוהרי נשק ותחמושת.

איליאל שחר

Not Just Here

The phrasing of the headlines and the pictures of the exposed Palestinian prisoners and policemen is highly reminiscent of the British tabloids' coverage of the capture of suspects in the London attacks. The day after their capture, on July 30, 2005, the main headline in the Daily Mirror exclaimed: GOT THEM, just like the headline in *Ma'ariv*.



