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Delegitimization is defined as the categorization of groups into highly negative social categories, which excludes them from the sphere of human groups acting within the limits of acceptable norms and values.¹ Delegitimization in practice occurs in a variety of methods, including dehumanization, outcasting, trait characterization, political labeling, moral exclusion, infrahumanization, and demonization. What seems to unify common delegitimizing techniques is the role they play in freeing human beings from their normative and moral restraints, thus justifying participation in violence.²

The phenomenon of Israel’s delegitimization in the international arena is well known: across Europe, demonstrations against Israel equate Israel and Zionism with colonialism, apartheid, ethnic cleansing, genocide, and other evil activity. The ongoing coupling of Israel with such anathemas creates an intellectual environment in which physically ridding the world of Israel would be considered desirable or even noble.³ This sentiment is at times reinforced by the mainstream European media, which has been noted occasionally to question Israel’s very right to exist.⁴ While the campaign to vilify Israel is led by a movement that defines itself as non-violent, in practice protests against Israel have regularly featured violent incidents obliging police forces to monitor, tone down, and at times even disperse such events.⁵

Strategic thinkers working to assess and quantify the amorphous phenomenon of Israel’s delegitimization are faced with a double challenge.
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On the one hand, if importance is assigned to every manifestation of a heated, or even borderline anti-Semitic debate relating to Israel, the result stands to be loss of sight of the larger picture, conflating legitimate criticism with delegitimizing rhetoric, and over-estimating the campaign’s intensity and impact. On the other hand, assessing the phenomenon based solely on tangible benchmarks such as severed diplomatic and corporate ties between Israel and Western states poses a high threshold that if reached will result in devastating diplomatic damage for Israel.

This article addresses this double challenge by seeking to unravel processes relating to Israel’s standing and potential delegitimization, as reflected in local newspaper articles covering Israel in a specific region and during a defined timeframe. The choice for this methodology is based on literature showing that foreign news reporting impacts on public opinion, and in turn, the shaping and implementation of policy directives. In considering this, it becomes evident that highlighting some news stories over others can have far reaching consequences. Naturally, this carries particular importance for countries engaged in conflicts, as international support may well alter their outcome.

The context chosen for this article’s analysis is the general elections in the Netherlands in March 2017. With this event the first major political event after Brexit and the election of US President Donald Trump, the Netherlands elections were perceived as a litmus test for populism in Europe. This paradigm was reinforced by the growing public support for controversial candidate Geert Wilders, whose right wing Party for Freedom (PVV) – known for its nativist, anti-establishment, anti-Muslim, and anti-EU rhetoric – grew significantly stronger in the run-up to the elections, eventually coming in second place. Following the elections, the pro-immigrant party DENK, whose leader refused to shake hands with PM Benjamin Netanyahu during Netanyahu’s visit to The Hague in 2016, won parliament representation for the first time. Furthermore, in the coalition agreement of the new Dutch government, announced in late 2017, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was the only international conflict mentioned. Against this backdrop, this article considers the scope of articles relating to Israel, and how Israel was framed in the local Dutch media in the run-up to the March 2017 general elections in the Netherlands.

Even though the Netherlands is an integral part of Europe and certain trends characterize most European states, Europe does not behave as a monolithic bloc. Thus, while findings regarding the Netherlands cannot be
assumed to represent larger parts of Europe, this research has two primary contributions: first, it reduces the abstract, amorphous phenomenon of Israel’s delegitimization in the international arena to a concrete, tangible, and measurable parameter. Second, it invites similar studies in other states (in and outside of Europe), which thereby, piece by piece, can create a more comprehensive, global understanding regarding Israel’s international standing both in general and vis-à-vis particular issues.

Methodology
To assess empirically the scope and framing of Israel in the Netherlands, the current research analyzes the following six largest distribution daily Dutch newspapers (available on and offline), from January 2016 to February 2017, i.e., a 14-month period culminating in the Netherlands’ general elections:

a. *Het Algemeen Dagblad*: the largest Dutch newspaper, which profiles itself as a neutral publication, without political or religious binding and with an outreach of 9.2 percent of the Dutch population.12

b. *De Telegraaf*: the second largest Dutch daily, with one of the biggest news websites in the Netherlands and an outreach of 9 percent.

c. *Metro*: the largest free daily in the Netherlands, distributed in the national railway and metro stations, post offices, libraries, universities, and schools, with an outreach of 7.5 percent.

d. *De Volkskrant*: a medium sized centrist compact daily, largely considered a quality newspaper targeting the higher educated and progressive Dutch population, with an outreach of 5.2 percent.

e. *NRC Handelsblad*: a liberal oriented Dutch daily, traditionally linked to research journalism, with a highly educated target audience. It is the fourth largest selling Dutch newspaper, with an outreach of 2.5 percent.

f. *Trouw*: considered to be a quality daily, with features from the religious and philosophical realms and an outreach of 2.4 percent.

As part of the research, over 350 articles from all sections of each daily were accessed through the online newspapers, using a spectrum of search terms pertaining to Israel, ranging from positive (e.g., “Israel and technology,” “Israel and start-up,” and “Israel and innovation”), through neutral terms (e.g., “Israel and democracy,” “Jewish state”), to terms with a negative connotation (e.g., “Israel and apartheid,” “Israel and boycott,” and “Israel and occupation”).13
Findings
Although the interest of Dutch media in Israel varies, Israel is featured regularly in all six newspapers, with most articles focusing on events related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.\(^\text{14}\) In keeping with the research aim, articles reporting on civil society efforts geared toward delegitimizing Israel, and articles covering Israel on issues detached from the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have been aggregated into categories in order to learn about their issue areas, and not because the quantitative analysis justifies their inclusion.

Israeli Settlements
All six newspapers deal with Israeli settlements in a total of 221 articles, with *NRC Handelsblad* featuring the highest number of articles (n=103 items) and *Metro* featuring the lowest number of articles on this issue (n=5 items). Articles refer to settlements as a central obstacle to peace (e.g., “the great obstacle to talks...is the construction of settlements by Israel”),\(^\text{15}\) and illegality is mentioned in 66 articles, with a range of phrases to describe their status: from “unlawful”\(^\text{16}\) and having “no legal validity”;\(^\text{17}\) through “in conflict with international law”;\(^\text{18}\) and “a flagrant breach of international law”;\(^\text{19}\) to asserting that Israeli settlements in the West Bank are nothing less than a “war crime.”\(^\text{20}\)

Particularly in two newspapers (*NRC Handelsblad* and *Trouw*) residents of the settlements are stereotyped as “sandal-wearing,”\(^\text{21}\) “religious right wing,”\(^\text{22}\) and “trigger-happy,”\(^\text{23}\) and their conduct is generally reduced to burning their Palestinian neighbors’ olive trees\(^\text{24}\) and chanting “this land is ours...death to the Palestinians.”\(^\text{25}\) Settlements are often documented in the context of violent incidents, provoked either by their Jewish residents (e.g., “volunteers have to protect Palestinians from attacks by colonists”),\(^\text{26}\) or by security forces in and around settlements (e.g., “Palestinians were killed near the Gush Etzion settlement, where many [security] incidents have taken place”).\(^\text{27}\)

While not directly delegitimizing Israel, the abundance of reports on charged issues can certainly be expected to nurture negative perceptions of the state.

Articles in this category testify to a gaping divide between the international community’s perception of Israeli settlements, and Israel’s perception of the same issue. This is apparent, for example, in ascertaining that “pretty much the entire world – aside from Israel”\(^\text{28}\) perceives the settlements...
as illegal; that “international opinion perceives the two-state solution to be endangered with the expansion of settlements”,29 that on the issue of settlements “Israel and the international community are moving away from each other”,30 and that “the disparity between Israeli politics and the international arena is becoming increasingly clear.”31 While part of the coverage relating to the divide deals with the international community as a monolithic entity, there is also coverage relating to specific leaders who are quoted as criticizing Israel’s settlement policies. These include then-US Secretary of State John Kerry; then-US Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Communications Ben Rhodes; then-UN Secretary General, Ban Ki Moon; United Nations Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process Nikolay Mladenov, and Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte.

**Israel’s Democratic Character**

All six newspapers deal with Israel’s democratic character in a total of 56 articles, with *NRC Handelsblad* featuring the highest number of articles (n=36 items) and *Het Algemeen Dagblad* and *Metro* featuring the lowest number of articles (n=1 item each).

A recurring issue is Israel’s treatment of civil society organizations, both international (e.g., “Israel is now taking firm action against international organizations”)32 and Israeli (e.g., “Activists are put away as traitors and a fifth column, threatened with death and physically attacked. This is part of a broader anti-democratic pattern”).33 Such reports are reinforced by articles dealing with legislative initiatives designed to hamper civil society work (e.g., “the Israeli ultra-right party ‘Jewish Home’ filed a bill to ban the non-governmental organization ‘Breaking the Silence’”),34 and can even refer to Israel’s regime as a “modern autocracy,” akin to the regimes in Russia and China where “it is important to silence the opposition... and restrict civil society organizations as much as possible.”35

Articles in this category also imply that Israel’s democratic character is in a perpetual tug-of-war between the left and right sectors of Israeli society (e.g., “The left has... irritated so many people. Now it is time for us to take democracy back into our own hands”),36 with each side having completely opposing perceptions of preferred state policies (e.g., “Supporters of the bill call it a victory for transparency... those who oppose it see it as proof that Israel increasingly looks like a dictatorship”).37 The differing viewpoints are at times substantiated by a generational shift (e.g., “The old Israeli elite are left, secular, and live in Tel Aviv. Nowadays, the rulers are more
right wing, religious, and are likely to live in an illegal settlement”),38 with Israel’s youth occasionally depicted as at the forefront of undemocratic forces (e.g., “The Israeli Supreme Court ruled that the illegal outpost of Amona has to be evacuated…but Jewish youth travel to Amona in the hope of protecting it”);39 and with large swaths of the Israeli public depicted as undemocratic in other articles (e.g., “One in four Jews in Israel would like to exchange democracy for a theocracy”).40

Transformations in Israel’s democratic character are commented on bluntly (e.g., “Israel was once a country where a soldier would be arrested and tried...Israel is no longer that kind of country...a majority of the Israeli population supports the shooting soldier...is this a sign of the moral rot in Israeli society?”);41 and are at times insinuated, for example in reports on the death of Israeli leader Shimon Peres, who is said to “represent a time in which ...Israel was still a different country.”42

Articles covering policy steps of Israeli decision makers (e.g., “Justice Minister Shaked wants stricter rules for NGOs”)43 contribute to the general anti-democratic sentiment, with Israeli Defense Minister Avigdor Liberman most commonly criticized for his stances on Arab citizens of Israel (e.g., that Israel should “decapitate disloyal Arab Israeli citizens”).44 Of note is the perception of his appointment as “bad for Israel’s image, which is already steadily eroding.”45

Not all is negative, however, and a minority of articles explain that “athletes from every religion and form participate in Israel’s national competitions... Muslim, Druze, and Christian,”46 that Israel “is the only democracy in the region,”47 and that as opposed to some European democracies “in Israel you won’t hear anyone calling for a burkini-ban.”48

Israel’s International Delegitimization
A total of 35 items relating to civil society efforts to delegitimize Israel appeared in all six newspapers, with most articles appearing in NRC Handelsblad (n= 10 items) and with the smallest number published in Metro (n=2 items).

Reports in this category cover initiatives to boycott Israel on the individual level (e.g., “Airbnb has definitively removed a person renting accommodation... because she refused four Israelis”);49 the corporate level (e.g.,”Haskoning and Vitens ended activities in Israel, due to the settlement policy”);50 and the organizational level (e.g., “An American church is boycotting five Israeli banks”).51 They cover a spectrum of opinions,
including condemning the boycott (e.g., “Europe...needs to aim at trust-building: not by disinvesting but by investing, not through boycotts but through cooperation”);\textsuperscript{52} criticizing Israeli policy and boycotting the state alike (e.g., “I completely agree with them with respect to the injustice inflicted on Palestinians. I disagree with the idea that a boycott will help”),\textsuperscript{53} and other articles that suggest that nothing less than a full boycott of Israel should be implemented (e.g., “You...wouldn’t place a stolen bicycle in a store with a sign that it is a stolen bicycle” – in relation to the EU policy to label products manufactured in the West Bank).\textsuperscript{54}

Another dimension reported in this category is efforts countering Israel’s delegitimization and the BDS (Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions) movement spearheading the campaign. Such articles deal with sanctions that international corporations (from the United States, Britain, France, and Canada) imposed on Dutch companies that divested from Israel,\textsuperscript{55} on Israeli officials’ comparison between the EU labeling policy and “wearing the Jewish star,”\textsuperscript{56} along with the common Israeli perception that “BDS is an anti-Semitic attempt to harm Israel.”\textsuperscript{57} The struggle against BDS is also noted for its complexity in that “the BDS movement benefits from Israeli opposition,” and “the initiators prefer to receive a strong attack by Prime Minister Netanyahu: guaranteed attention.”\textsuperscript{58}

\textbf{Israel Detached from the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict}

A total of 23 items surfaced in multiple searches coupling Israel with positive words (e.g. “innovation,” “tech,” “start-up”) detached from the conflict. Most articles in this category appear in \textit{Het Algemeen Dagblad} (n= 8 items), with only one article in \textit{De Volkskrant} (n=1 item). Among other issues, articles in this category reported on success stories of individual Israelis (e.g., “Israeli photographer Adi Barkan conducted a global campaign against anorexia in the fashion world”);\textsuperscript{59} Israeli culinary developments (e.g., “even in the largest restaurant chains in Israel, vegan meals are completely normal”);\textsuperscript{60} and Israeli culture (e.g., “for the first time Israel submits an Arabic-speaking film to the American film awards”).\textsuperscript{61}

\textbf{Discussion}

Quantitative research findings show that Israel is under a Dutch magnifying glass, with over 350 articles in the space of 14 months, i.e., an average of more than 25 Dutch articles, covering different aspects relating to Israel, published per month. While the data refer to the period prior to the March
elections, the fact that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the only conflict mentioned in the newly-established Dutch government’s platform reinforces the validity of this finding in the post-election period. The fact that Israel is engaged in a conflict — whose outcome is likely to be affected by international perceptions — presents Israel with a public opinion challenge, where the state is reduced to the controversial conduct perceived as marring its democracy.

In considering the qualitative analysis, the most prominent issue in the Dutch press vis-à-vis Israel is settlements, with Israel’s democratic character also frequently deliberated. The other two categories — efforts to delegitimize Israel and subject matter relating to Israel detached from the conflict — were specifically sought and are far smaller in scope. This is particularly true of reports on issues detached from the conflict, substantiating the conclusion that the numerous articles dealing with Israel led Dutch minds to perceive the state as synonymous with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Nevertheless, coverage on active efforts to delegitimize Israel remains relatively minimal and appears to be varied, including a range of opinions about the BDS campaign and reporting on strategy and developments, as well as on pushback efforts from opposing forces. As such, it is safe to conclude that at this stage, while the Dutch press reports on specific developments regarding the BDS campaign, it does not play an active role in promoting it or inflaming the phenomenon.

While not directly delegitimizing Israel, the abundance of reports on charged issues can certainly be expected to nurture negative perceptions of the state, which claims to be a liberal democracy. The dominant media framing can be understood to indirectly legitimize, if not directly incentivize and catalyze civil society action designed to play on the gap between Israel’s conduct and international norms. While these findings apply to the Netherlands alone, it can be argued that the traditional international perception of Europe as a leading liberal normative power\(^2\) will lead to similar depictions of Israel in other European countries. On the other hand, growing nationalism and anti-liberal trends that have recently led to an increase in the power of right wing forces in Europe\(^3\) may result in other emphases in European press coverage of the Jewish state. These alternatives should be explored in future research by replicating this study’s methodology in other European states and elsewhere. Such research can potentially contribute to a clarification of the amorphous phenomenon dubbed “Israel’s international delegitimization” by processing cumulative findings along regional and chronological axes.
The findings beg two policy directives. First, methodologically, in assessing, reporting, and evaluating Israel’s international standing, zooming-in exclusively on civil society efforts to delegitimize Israel yields a very partial picture. In other words, a limited approach focusing on the small portion of Dutch articles relating to BDS, without the balanced and comprehensive outlook that articles in this specific category provide, would have yielded a completely different set of conclusions. Thus, strategists working to grasp the phenomenon of Israel’s delegitimization should steer away from devoting too much attention to too many details and, alongside more focused attention to specific events, should aim to broaden the scope of analyses designed to unearth trends in activities and fluctuations in public opinion on relevant issues.

Second, while traditional thinking advocates keeping activities aimed at countering Israel’s delegitimization away from the limelight, this paradigm should be revisited with the necessary caution. This stems from findings that demonstrate that public discourse regarding Israel abounds, and that media coverage of pushback against efforts to delegitimize Israel is central to the balancing of reports dealing with this phenomenon. Above and beyond their ability to successfully counter specific attempts to smear Israel, such counter-efforts are constructive in their ability to balance the coverage of this phenomenon with opposing narratives.

Third, Israeli efforts to actively promote a more substantive process aimed at resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would bolster its international stature. The absence of a political process, amplified by extensive media coverage of controversial developments on the ground, does not serve Israel in the long run. As long as the conflict persists, with or without committed activists working to boycott Israel internationally, Israel will continue to lose diplomatic credit in the international arena and expend precious resources on related side effects.

Notes


11 For example, in considering poll findings that differentiate between European states, the Netherlands was found to be one of twenty member-states where immigration is seen as the main issue facing the EU. See “Public Opinion in the European Union,” *Standard Eurobarometer* 83, 2015, http://ec.europa.eu commfrontoffice/publicopinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_first_en.pdf.

12 The data regarding the readership of the six newspapers analyzed is taken from Mediamonitor van het Commissariaat voor de Media, which performs annual research on developments in the Dutch media sector. All statistics reflect the Dutch populace aged 13 and up and are correct to 2016. See http://www.mediamonitor.nl/nieuws/marktaandelen-en-bereik-nederlandse-dagbladenmarkt-2016/.
The research comprises articles in all sections of the newspapers. Most articles originate in the news sections but a smaller number of opinion pieces were also analyzed. News reports are perceived to reflect the situation on the ground more accurately, but opinion pieces are important in that they communicate commentary beyond “dry” facts, reflecting – and perhaps influencing – local public opinion. The central themes dealt within the research, namely the critical reporting on settlements, Israel’s democracy, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict at large, are primarily sourced in the news reports. The wording and style of reporting, however, differ per newspaper (and per article). As a result, the reporting in certain articles may seem more “neutral” than in others. In Het Algemeen Dagblad and De Telegraaf, searching for particular terms yielded only a few articles. This was overcome by inserting the general term “Israel” in the search engine of both dailies, after which articles were manually sorted according to their content.

In some cases one article dealt with more than one issue. The count was issue-based and not article-based.


32 Walters,“Buitenlandse ngos zijn anti-Israëlisch, vindt Israël.”
38 Walters, “De onwennige nieuwe elite van Israël.”
39 Walters, “Puberprotest tegen ontruiming Amona.”
43 “Ultra-rechts in Israël wil ngo verbieden.”
48 Max van Weezel, “In Israël zal je niemand horen roepen om een boerkini-verbod.”


Derk Walters, “Zo lobbyt Israël tegen de anti-Israël-lobby.”


Demonstrated, for example, by the rise of the AfD party in Germany, the far right nationalist Freedom party in Austria, and France’s National Front (FN), headed by Marine Le Pen.