

Lesson II:

War Journalism vs. Peace Journalism*

War and/or Violence Journalism	Peace and/or Conflict Journalism
<p><i>I. War and/or violence oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes the conflict arena. 2 parties, 1 aim (victory) war, general zero sum orientation. • Restricted space and time. Reasons and solution sought on the battle field: "who threw the first stone?" • Wars made obscure. • "We-them" journalism. Propaganda, vote for <i>us</i>. • <i>They</i> are seen as the problem. Focus on who gets the upper hand in the war. • Dehumanization of the <i>others</i>, the more so, the worse the weapons. • <i>Reactive</i>: only violence is worth reporting. • Only considers the visible effects of violence (Dead, wounded and material damage) 	<p><i>I. Peace and/or conflict oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigates the formation of conflict. X parties, y aims, z objects general win-win orientation. • Open space and time. Causes and solutions are looked for everywhere, also in history and culture. • Make conflicts transparent. • Giving voice to all parties. Capacity for empathy, understanding. • Conflict/war seen as the problem. Focus on creative conflict solutions. • Humanization of all sides, the more so the worse the weapons • <i>Preventive</i>: prevention of violence/war. • Focus on the invisible effects of violence (trauma and reputation, structural and cultural damage).
<p><i>II. Propaganda oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposes the untruths of the <i>others</i>. • Supports <i>our</i> cover-up attempts/lies. 	<p><i>III. Truth oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposes untruths of all sides. • Discloses all cover-up attempts
<p><i>III. Elite oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on <i>our</i> suffering; the men who make up the military elite; is their mouth piece • Names <i>their</i> wrongdoers. • Stresses that only the elite can make peace 	<p><i>IV. People oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on all suffering; suffering of women, old people, children, gives the voiceless a voice. • Names all wrongdoers. • Stresses peace tendencies in the population.
<p><i>IV. Victory oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peace = victory + armistice • Conceals peace initiatives as long as it is not clear who is winning. • Treaties and institutions are important; a controlled society. • After the war is over turns to the next source of conflict; goes back when the old one breaks out again 	<p><i>IV. Solution oriented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peace = nonviolence + creativity • Points to peace initiatives, also to prevent the expansion of the war. • Structure and culture are important: a peaceful society. • Reports about the post war phase: conflict solution, reconstruction, reconciliation.

*according to Galtung, 1998

Lesson III:

Distortion of the Perception of Conflict during the Escalation of Conflicts*

Escalation step	Cooperation	Perspective divergence	Competition	Struggle	War
Conceptualization of the conflict	Win-win orientation	Bias towards win-lose but win-win still possible	Win-lose (possibly defused by rules of fairness)	Win-lose (increased by threat strategies)	Zero sum orientation. Violence as the appropriate means of solving conflict, emphasis on military values, transfer from win-lose to lose-lose
Evaluation of rights and aims	Mutual respect for the rights of all participants and emphasis on common interests	Focus on one's own rights and needs (including common interests), the rights of others, however, vanish from the field of vision	Focus on one's own rights and needs; common interests, however, vanish from the field of vision	Emphasis on one's own rights and needs combined with questioning the rights of the opponent and condemning his intentions.	Idealization of one's own rights and needs, at the same time contesting the rights of the opponent, demonization of his intentions and denial of common interests
Evaluation of actions	Consideration of the benefits of each of the parties	Focus on one's own benefits (also those resulting from the mutual relationship)	Focus on one's own benefits	Justification of one's own actions and condemnation of those of the opponent	Idealization of one's own actions and demonization of the actions of the opponent
Emotional involvement	Empathy and mutual trust	Conflict between threat and trust	Focus on threat to oneself, that to the opponent disappears from the field of vision, mutual trust is lost	Emphasis on one's own strength and the danger from the opponent creates a delicate balance between threat and confidence of victory; the threat to the opponent is actively denied; mistrust exists	Balance between threat and confidence of victory continues to exist, mistrust directed also against neutral third parties who attempt to mediate the conflict, outrage at the war turns into outrage at the opponent
Identification offer	Mutual	Self-centered	Dualistic	Antagonistic	Polarized

*according to Kempf, 1999b

Lesson IV:

War Discourse vs. Peace Discourse*

	War discourse	Peace discourse
Key questions	Who is the aggressor? How can he be stopped?	What is the object of the conflict? How can it be transformed?
Identification offer	Polarized <ul style="list-style-type: none">• humanizes "our" political and military leaders and dehumanizes those of the other side• humanizes "our" soldiers and dehumanizes those of the other side• humanizes "our" victims and ignores or dehumanizes those of the other side• humanizes "our" civilian population for their loyalty and willingness to make sacrifices and dehumanizes that of the other side because of their nationalism• humanizes the anti war opposition of the other side and ignores or dehumanizes one's own as treasonous.	Universal <ul style="list-style-type: none">• avoids identification with political and military leaders on each side• avoids identification with military personnel on each side• humanizes (at least respects) victims on each side• humanizes (at least respects) civilian society and avoids identification with warmongers on each side• humanizes (at least respects) peace forces on each side
Truth orientation	Sees truth simply as raw material and harmonizes the frames of reference <ul style="list-style-type: none">• tells stories about "our" heroic deeds and the atrocities of the other side• construes the context of the conflict as insoluble antagonism• founds "our" values by means of political, historical, and ethnic myths	Is unconditionally committed to standards of truth and also exposes inconsistencies <ul style="list-style-type: none">• also reports about "our" atrocities and the suffering of the other side• explores the opportunities for a constructive transformation of the conflict• deconstructs mythological interpretations and looks for common values
Motivation logic	Presents the war as a bulwark against destruction and/or as a bridge to a better future	Focuses on the price of victory, the destruction of cultural, economic and social values
Conflict reporting	Escalation oriented with respect to <ul style="list-style-type: none">• conceptualization of the conflict• evaluation of the rights, aims, and actions of the conflict parties• inducement of emotional involvement in the conflict	De-escalation oriented with respect to <ul style="list-style-type: none">• conceptualization of the conflict• evaluation of the rights, aims and actions of the conflict partners• inducement of emotional involvement in the conflict

*according to Kempf, 1999b