Table 1.1

A typology of conflict vs. non-conflict situations

		subjective conflict	
		yes	no
objective conflict	yes	real conflict	latent conflict
	no	false conflict	non-conflict

Table 4.1

Ground rules of peace journalism

Ground rules of peace journalism

- None of the parties has absolute standards of truth.

- Conflicts are always open to being conceptualized either as a competitive (WIN-LOSE) or as a cooperative (WIN-WIN) process.

- Conflicts can take a constructive course only if they are conceptualized in the framework of a WIN-WIN model.

- War culture is biased towards WIN-LOSE interpretations.

- Peace processes must be based on creativity: they must give a voice to the voiceless.

- Peace journalism must provide an alternative motivational logic and rechannel outrage at the enemy into outrage at war itself.

- Peace journalism must adopt an unconditional commitment to encompasing standards of truth.

Table 4.2

The four-factor news communication model

		Person		Structure	
		Negative	**Positive**	**Negative**	**Positive**
Elite country	**Elite people**	No problem: any rumors; however false (4)	Happy family events (3)	Cabinet falls (3)	Elections, even minor change (3)
	Non-elite people	Accidents (3)	Prizes, lottery, wealth (2)	Economic crashes (2)	Economic growth (1)
Non-elite country	**Elite people**	Scandals (drugs) (3)	Prizes, lottery, wealth (2)	Coup d'état (2)	Elections, but major change (1)
	Non-elite people	Mega-accidents (2)	Miracles (1)	Revolutions, 'trouble', riots (1)	No chance: however true (0)

Table 4.3

Absolute frequencies of escalation- and de-escalation oriented aspects in the article

	Escalation-oriented aspects	**De-escalation-oriented aspects**
Conceptualization of the conflict	zero-sum / win-lose orientation (7)	win-win orientation (10)
	refutation of peaceful alternatives (12)	
	emphasis on antagonism (10)	emphasis on seeing all sides (3)
Evaluation of the opponent's rights & intentions	'demonization' of the opponent's intentions (1)	
	denial of common interests (5)	
Evaluation of the opponent's actions	denial of possibilities for cooperation (9)	description of cooperative behavior and interpretation of a 3. party's role as mediator (5)
Emotional involvement in the conflict	mistrusting the opponent (1)	new perspective for peace possible through empathy (2)
Social identification and personal entanglement	devalorization of positive (emotional) reactions to the prospect of peace (1)	'humanization' / respect for peace makers (7)
Motivational logic		definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future (2)

Table 4.4

Distribution of escalation- and de-escalation-oriented aspects throughout the article (1)

	Escalation oriented aspects	De-escalation oriented aspects
Subheading (heading 1)		• description of cooperative behavior...
Heading (heading 2)	• peaceful alternatives rejected or questioned	• win-win orientation
Paragraph I: presentation of the treaty		• win-win orientation • description of cooperative behavior and interpretation of a 3. party's role as mediator • new perspective possible through empathy • definition of peace as a bridge to a brighter future • humanization / respect for peace makers
Heading 3	• emphasis on antagonism	
Paragraph II: description of the treaty	• zero-sum- / win-lose orientation • refutation of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism	• description of cooperative behavior... • emphasis on seeing all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters

Table 4.4

Distribution of escalation- and de-escalation-oriented aspects throughout the article (2)

	Escalation oriented aspects	De-escalation oriented aspects
Paragraph III: comments on the treaty by both sides politicians ‚*Personalization*‘	• rejection of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism	• win-win orientation
Paragraph IV: comments on the treaty by both sides politicians ‚*Personalization*‘	• rejection of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation	• win-win orientation
Paragraph V: background treaty ‚*Personalization*‘	• rejection of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism • denial of common interests	
Paragraph VI: background treaty ‚*Personalization*‘	• emphasis on antagonism • denial of common interests • zero-sum- / win-lose orientation • denial of the opponent's good intentions	

Table 4.4

Distribution of escalation- and de-escalation-oriented aspects throughout the article (3)

	Escalation oriented aspects	**De-escalation oriented aspects**
Heading 4	• mistrusting the opponent…	
Paragraph VII: statements about the conflict ‚Personalization‘	• emphasis on antagonism • denial of common interests • zero-sum- / win-lose orientation • rejection of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation	• win-win orientation
Paragraph VIII: Statements about the treaty ‚Personalization‘		• win-win orientation • emphasis on seeing all sides • definition of peace as a bridge to a brighter future

Table 4.5

Most frequently covered types of protagonists

Israeli protagonists	Palestinian protagonists
Personalized Israeli Elite (69%, mainly Netanyahu, Rabin, Peres)	Personalized Palestinian Elite (42%, mainly Arafat)
Israeli government (66%)	Palestinian government (31%)
Israeli military (36,6%)	Radical Palestinians (26%)
Conflict oriented segments of Israeli civil society (17%)	Conflict oriented segments of Palestinian civil society (15%)
Israeli Negotiators (13%)	Palestinian Negotiators (15%)

Table 4.6

Most frequently covered types of context

Negative	Positive
Violence (40%)	Measures against one's own side's violence (20%)
Continuous repression (28%)	Willingness to engage in negotiations (20%)
Claims against the opponent (20%)	
Criticism of one's own side (20%)	
Threat to the opponent (19%)	
Short-term repression (16%)	
Criticism of the opponent (16%)	
Claims against one's own side (15%)	

Table 4.7

Combination of contexts and protagonists in the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process

		Context		Total
		Negativ	**Positiv**	**Total**
Israel (Elite Country)	**Elite Persons**	700	399	1099
	Non-Elite Persons	262	117	379
Palestine (Non-Elite Country)	**Elite Persons**	273	276	549
	Non-Elite Persons	287	104	391
Total		1522	896	2418

Table 4.8

Societal beliefs in intractable conflict

Societal beliefs in intractable conflict
• Beliefs about the justness of one's own goals
• Beliefs about personal and national security and how it can be achieved
• Positive self-image
• Own victimization
• Delegitimizing the enemy
• Patriotism
• Unity of one's own society
• Peace as its ultimate aim

Table 5.1

War journalism vs. peace journalism (1)

WAR/VIOLENCE JOURNALISM	PEACE/CONFLICT JOURNALISM
I. WAR/VIOLENCE-ORIENTED	**I. PEACE/CONFLICT-ORIENTED**
• Focus on conflict *arena*, 2 parties, 1 goal (win), war general zero-sum orientation • Closed space, closed time; causes and exits in arena, who threw the first stone • Making wars opaque/secret • 'Us–them' journalism, propaganda, voice, for 'us' • See 'them' as the problem, focus on who prevails in war • Dehumanization of 'them'; the more so the more destructive the weapons • *Reactive*: waiting for violence before reporting • Focus only on visible effects of violence (casualties and material damage)	• Explore conflict *formation*, x parties, y goals, z issues general 'win-win' orientation • Open space, open time; causes and outcomes anywhere, also in history/culture • Making conflicts transparent • Giving voice to all parties; Empathy, understanding • See conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity • Humanization of all sides; the more so the more destructive the weapons • *Proactive*: prevention before violence/war occurs • Focus on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/culture)
II. PROPAGANDA-ORIENTED	**II. TRUTH-ORIENTED**
• Expose 'their' untruths • Help 'our' cover-ups/lies	• Expose untruths on all sides • Uncover all cover-ups

Table 5.1

War journalism vs. peace journalism (2)

WAR/VIOLENCE JOURNALISM	PEACE/CONFLICT JOURNALISM
III. ELITE-ORIENTED • Focus on 'our' suffering; on able-bodied elite males, being their mouth-piece • Give name of their evil-doer • Focus on elite peacemakers	**III. PEOPLE-ORIENTED** • Focus on suffering all over; on women, aged, children, giving voice to the voiceless • Give name to all evil-doers • Focus on people peacemakers
IV. VICTORY-ORIENTED • Peace = victory + ceasefire • Conceal peace initiative, before victory is achieved • Focus on treaty, institution the controlled society • Leaving for another war, return if the old flares up	**IV. SOLUTION-ORIENTED** • Peace = nonviolence + creativity • Highlight peace initiatives, also to prevent more war • Focus on structure, culture the peaceful society • Aftermath: resolution, reconstruction, reconciliation

Table 5.2

Perceptual distortions during the escalation of conflicts (1)

Escalation step	Cooperation	Perspective divergence	Competition	Struggle	War
Conzeptuali-zation 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, force as the appropriate means of solving conflict, emphasis on military values, transfer from win-lose to lose-lose

Table 5.2

Perceptual distortions during the escalation of conflicts (2)

Escalation step	Cooperation	Perspective divergence	Competition	Struggle	War
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

Table 5.2

Perceptual distortions during the escalation of conflicts (3)

Escalation step	Cooperation	Perspective divergence	Competition	Struggle	War
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 of 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

Table 5.3

War discourse vs. peace discourse (1)

	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 • 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 • 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

Table 5.3

War discourse vs. peace discourse (2)

	War discourse	Peace discourse
Truth orientation	Sees truth simply as raw material and harmonizes the frames of reference • 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 • 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
Motivational 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 • 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 • conceptualization of the conflict • evaluation of the rights, aims and actions of the conflict parties • inducement of emotional involvement in the conflict

Table 5.4

De-escalation-oriented and solution-oriented conflict coverage (1)

	De-escalation-oriented conflict coverage	**Solution-oriented conflict coverage**
Conceptualization of conflict	Exploration of the conflict formation with a win-win orientation; questioning violence as a means of resolving conflict and questioning military values	Peace orientation (peace = nonviolence + creativity; proactive (prevention before violence occurs); people oriented (focus on the civilian society)
Evaluation of rights and aims	Respect for the rights of the opponent and undistorted representation of his aims; realistic and self-critical evaluation of one's own rights and aims; fair reporting of peace initiatives and attempts at mediation	Focus on common rights, aims, and interests and on the benefits all sides can get from ending war/violence; gives the anti war opposition a say; focuses on peace initiatives, signals of readiness for peace and mediation attempts

Table 5.4

De-escalation-oriented and solution-oriented conflict coverage (2)

	De-escalation-oriented conflict coverage	**Solution-oriented conflict coverage**
Evaluation of actions	Realistic and self-critical evaluation of one's own actions and undistorted evaluation of opponent's actions; critical distance from the bellicose on all sides	Focuses on the sufferings of all sides, focuses on the invisible effects of war: trauma and loss of reputation, structural and cultural damage; humanizes all sides and identifies all who act unjustly; focus on reconciliation perspectives
Emotional involvement	Recognition of the threat to the opponent and reduction of one's own feelings of threat	Recognition of the price of war, even in the case of victory and transformation of outrage at the enemy into indignation at war
Identification offers	Neutral und distanced	Universal

Table 6.1

Conceptualization of the (conflict-) situation

	Escalation-oriented aspects:		De-escalation-oriented aspects:
E 1	Polarization (or respectively support of war) & confrontationist (or respectively military) logic	D 1	Query of polarization (or respectively warfare) & confrontationist (or respectively military) logic
E 1.1	Zero-sum or at least win-lose orientation (construction of conflict as a competitive process); conflict resolution is regarded as impossible; agreements are interpreted as "giving in"; compromise is devalorized	D 1.1	Win-win orientation (or at least questioning win-lose) and/ or presentation of structures for possible cooperation (construction of the conflict as a cooperative process)
E 1.2	Emphasis on military values	D 1.2	Cooperative values and/or questioning militarism and military values
E 1.3	Designation of (military) force as an appropriate means of conflict resolution and/or downgrading of doubt in its appropriateness	D 1.3	Emphasis on negative effects of (military) force and/or questioning its appropriateness
E 1.4	Refutation, questioning or downgrading peaceful alternatives; focus on violence reduces the perspective of peace and/or obstacles to peace are emphasized or portrayed as overwhelming	D 1.4	Perspectives on, demands for and/or agreement with peaceful alternatives
E 1.5	Emphasis on antagonism	D 1.5	Emphasis on openness to all sides or at least abandonment of dividing the protagonists into two camps

Table 6.2

Evaluation of the war parties' rights and intentions

Escalation-oriented aspects:		De-escalation-oriented aspects:	
E 2	Antagonism	D 2	Balance
E 2.1	Demonization of the opponent, denial of his rights and/or demonization of his intentions	D 2.1	Respecting the opponent's rights and/or unbiased description of his intentions
E 2.2	Idealization of one's own rights and intentions	D 2.2	Realistic and self-critical evaluation of one's own rights and intentions
E 2.3	Denial of common interests or emphasis on incompatibility of interests, culture etc.	D 2.3	Emphasis on common interests and/or description of the (concrete) benefits that both sides could gain from ending the war

Table 6.3

Evaluation of the war parties' actions

Escalation-oriented aspects:		De-escalation-oriented aspects:	
E 3	Confrontation	D 3	Cooperation
E 3.1	Justification of one's own side's actions and underlining of one's own rightness --------------------- demonstration of uniformity and /or downgrading differences within one's own party	D 3.1	Self-critical evaluation of one's own side's actions --------------------- focus on plurality of behavioral options within one's own party
E 3.2	Condemnation of the opponent's actions --------------------- disregarding plurality on "their" side	D 3.2	Less confrontationist or unbiased evaluation of the opponent's actions --------------------- focus on plurality of "their" behavioral options
E 3.3	Antagonistic behavior is emphasized, possibilities for cooperation or common gain from ending the war are denied, cooperation between conflict parties is not taken serious and/or --------------------- the role of third parties is interpreted more as exerting (moral, economic or military) pressure (win-lose) than as mediating (win-win)	D 3.3	Supporting) description of cooperative behavior, of possibilities for cooperation or common gain from ending the war and/or --------------------- the role of third parties is interpreted as mediating (win-win) rather than exerting (moral, economic or military) pressure (win-lose)

Table 6.4

Emotional involvement in the conflict

Escalation-oriented aspects:		De-escalation-oriented aspects:	
E 4	Destructive emotions	D 4	Constructive emotions
E 4.1	A focus on "their" viciousness and dangerousness & accentuation of "our" strength create a balance between threat and confidence which promotes willingness to engage in struggle (or war)	D 4.1	Unbiased assessment of "their" intentions & behavior and emphasis on the price of victory deconstruct threat and confidence and promote "our" willingness for peace
E 4.2	Mistrust of the opponent and/or neu-tral third parties who try to mediate in the conflict is encouraged (eg. by depicting the party as untrustworthy, prone to violating treaties, etc.)	D 4.2	Respect for "their" rights and unbiased assessment of "their" behavior reduce mistrust
E 4.3	A focus on "their" atrocities and "our" justness transforms outrage at war into outrage at the enemy	D 4.3	Empathy with both sides victims, emphasis on both sides casualties and unbiased evaluation of both sides behavior redirects outrage at the war
E 4.4	Interpunktuation of the conflict, demonization of "their" intentions and/or justification of "our" behavior jeopardize empathy with "their" situation: if they behave well, they have nothing to fear	D 4.4	Empathy for "their" situation opens up a new perspective: if we can find a solution (together) that takes all sides' needs into account, reconciliation will become possible
E 4.5	Denial of possibilities for cooperation and/or blaming the opponent for the failure of cooperation jeopardizes rebuilding of trust	D 4.5	Emphasis on cooperative experiences (also in the past) rebuilds trust

Table 6.5

Social identification and personal entanglement (Distance / dehumanization vs. social identification)

Escalation-oriented aspects:		De-escalation-oriented aspects:	
E 5	Confrontationist social commitment	D 5	Cooperative social commitment
E 5.1	Humanizes "our" political or military leaders an/or dehumanizes "their" leaders	D 5.1	Refrains from identification with escalation-oriented political or military leaders on all sides
E 5.2	Humanizes "our" soldiers and/or dehumanizes "their" soldiers	D 5.2	Refrains from identification with military personnel on all sides
E 5.3	Humanizes "our" victims and/or ignores or dehumanizes "their" victims	D 5.3	Humanizes or at least respects victims of the war on all sides
E 5.4	Humanizes "our" civil population for its loyalty and sacrifice and/or ignores or dehumanizes "their" civil population for its nationalism etc	D 5.4	Humanizes or at least respects members of civil society and/or refrains from identification with supporters of the war on all sides
E 5.5	Humanizes "their" anti-war opposition and/or ignores or dehumanizes "our" anti-war opposition	D 5.5	Humanizes or at least respects those who strive for a peaceful conflict resolution on all sides
E 5.6	Devalorizes positive (emotional) reactions to the prospect of peace	D 5.6	Emphasizes positive (emotional) reactions to the prospect of peace

Table 6.6

Motivational logic

Escalation-oriented aspects:		De-escalation-oriented aspects:	
E 6	Motivation for war	D 6	Motivation for peace
E 6.1	War as a bulwark against destruction and/or peace as a risk	D 6.1	Peace as an alternative to destruction and/or war as a risk
E 6.2	War as a bridge to a brighter future and/or peace as a risk	D 6.2	Peace as a bridge to a brighter future and/or war as a risk

Table 6.7

Manipulative propaganda techniques

Harmonization of referential levels	
1	Repetition of the same content on different referential levels
2	Circularity of the "proof"

Double-bind communication	
1	Inherent contradictions
2	Emotional involvement with both contradictory messages

Two-sided messages	
1	Anticipation of criticism
2	Rejection of the anticipated information