Dov Shinar

Epilogue: Peace Journalism – The State of the Art[1]

Kurzfassung: Ziel dieses Artikels ist es, die von der Toda Peace Journalism Group veröffentlichten Artikel (cco, 4/2 2005; 5/2 2006; 6/1, 2007) in einem gemeinsamen Rahmenmodell überblicksartig darzustellen. Hierbei soll es nicht darum gehen die einzelnen Argumente zu wiederholen, sondern vielmehr die interessierte Leserschaft zur Weiterentwicklung der Ideen anzuregen.
Die Kritik an der konventionellen Konfliktberichterstattung in den Medien und die entsprechenden Forderungen an den Friedensjournalismus dienen als übergeordneter inhaltlicher Rahmen. Insbesondere werden die wissenschaftlichen und anwendungsbezogenen Bedingungen des Friedensjournalismus analysiert, Möglichkeiten der Verbesserung und Weiterentwicklung friedensjournalistischer Konzepte dargestellt und eine Strategie zur praktischen Weiterentwicklung angeboten.
Ausgehend von der Prämisse, dass der Friedensjournalismus – in Abgrenzung zur konventionellen Berichterstattung – durch eine verantwortungsvolle und gewissenhafte mediale Darstellung von Konflikten definiert ist, wird dieser in der Schlussfolgerung einer kritischen Evaluation unterzogen und es wird die Notwendigkeit einer Konzeptualisierung des Friedensjournalismus betont.
Auf diese Diskussion folgen konkrete Handlungsvorschläge, wie z.B. weitere Professionalisierung des Friedensjournalismus, Diskussion journalistischer Werte und eine Öffnung für neue Perspektiven innerhalb der Friedensforschung. Neben den Forderungen an den Friedensjournalismus widmen sich der Autor aber auch den aktuellen Problemen in der Umsetzung und Verbreitung friedensjournalistischer Konzepte. In diesem Rahmen erfolgt auch eine Debatte des Objektivitätsproblems und der Versuch alternative Normen zu finden.
Die wissenschaftlichen und pragmatischen Erwägungen werden abschließend in der Forderung nach klarerer Formulierung von Konzepten und klareren Regeln zur Anwendung von Methoden zusammengefasst. Weiterhin wird angeregt durch das Aufzeigen überzeugender Argumente den Friedensjournalismus unter Journalisten populärer und die Öffentlichkeit durch einen entsprechenden Mediendiskurs auf die Werte des PJ aufmerksam zu machen, so wie die Beeinflussung der Berichterstattung durch Interessen der Herausgeber in der Praxis zu durchbrechen.

Abstract: This epilogue aims at integrating the series of articles offered by the Toda Peace Journalism group in *cco* (4/2 2005; 5/2 2006; 6/1, 2007) into a framework designed to orient the reader, without repeating the arguments presented in the articles; to encourage instructors and students to use these materials; and to stimulate thinking on "where do we go next". Coherence is sought through looking at critical analyses of the conventional coverage of war and peace and at the promise and performance of Peace Journalism, analyzing epistemological and professional constraints, presenting ways to improve Peace Journalism concepts and practices, and offering an agenda and some development strategies.
The initial premise that Peace Journalism (PJ) is a mode of responsible and conscientious media representation of conflict, alternative to conventional coverage, develops into a summary of critical evaluations of such coverage, and of the efforts to conceptualize PJ. A discussion of the promises offered by PJ follows suit, including professional improvement, the enhancement of journalistic values, the provision of better public service, and the widening of scholarly and professional horizons. Also PJ performance is analyzed, suggesting some explanations for its lack of popularity and some of its built-in problems, such as in the debate over the tradition of objectivity and other normative alternatives. Epistemological and professional considerations converge in the discussion of needs for clearer formulation and application of concepts, expectations, and procedures, and for an agenda that includes the production of persuasive evidence of PJ value; for overcoming rejection by journalists, for avoiding self-manipulation in field staff-editor relations, and for encouraging the development of a media peace discourse.

---

1.   Introduction

Peace Journalism is a normative mode of responsible and conscientious media coverage of conflict, that aims at contributing to peacemaking, peacekeeping, and changing the attitudes of media owners, advertisers, professionals, and audiences towards war and peace. Such goals are sought through (a) critical evaluations of the current state of conflict coverage and (b) efforts to conceptualize professional values and practices in both theoretical and operational terms.

Evaluations of current conflict coverage criticize the following media preferences:

1.   For violence, sensationalism, personalization, patriotism and exclusion-inclusion biases toward certain countries, groups, and persons (Lynch, 2007; Neiger and Zandberg, 2004; Roeh and Ashley, 1986; Shinar, 2003, Shinar, forthcoming; Zandberg and Neiger, 2005);
2.   For simple descriptions rather than analyses of complex conflict origins, causes, and contexts (Lynch, 2007; Roeh & Ashley, 1986);
3.   For fighting parties rather than broader human and other conflict dimensions (McGoldrick and Lynch 2005; Peleg, 2006, 2002);
4.   For coverage of conflict only when manifest violence occurs or is about to occur (Hanitzsch, 2004a, b);
5.   For "sports-like", "us-versus-them" situations that seek visible events and results, damage and victims, winners and losers, rather than longer processes of conflict resolution or transformation (Shinar, 2003; Wolfsfeld, 2004);
6.   For the relatively lower news value of peace-related stories and topics (Shinar, 2003).

Beyond the pioneering work of Johan Galtung in the area (see Galtung, 2000), efforts to conceptualize Peace Journalism appear in the works of the Toda Peace Journalism group members and others, both in and outside the *cco* special issues on Peace Journalism. They focus on:

1.   Exploring backgrounds and contexts of conflict formation, and presenting causes and options on every side so as to portray conflict in realistic terms, transparent to the audience;
2.   Giving voice to the views of all rival parties;
3.   Offering creative ideas for conflict resolution, peacemaking and peacekeeping;
4.   Exposing lies, cover-up attempts and culprits on all sides, and revealing excesses committed by, and suffering inflicted on, people of all parties;
5.   Paying attention to peace stories and post-war developments more than the regular coverage of conflict;
6.   Promoting realistic and cautious attitudes with respect to the success Peace Journalism might have in overcoming resistance and rejection, as well as criticizing excessive enthusiasm on the part of Peace Journalism supporters.

2.   Four Promises of Peace Journalism

The promises of Peace Journalism appear in the *cco* special issues on the topic, particularly in the works of Jake Lynch (2007), Annabel McGoldrick (2006), Robert Hackett (2006), Susan Ross (2006), and Wilhelm Kempf (2005). Although Peace Journalism does not mean necessarily "good news", it is conceived as a fairer way to cover conflict, relative to the usual coverage, and suggests possibilities to improve professional attitudes and performance; strengthen human, moral and ethical values in the media; widen scholarly and professional media horizons; and provide better public service by the media.

2.1 First Promise: Professional Improvement

Peace processes are complicated, take time to unfold and develop, are marked by dull, tedious negotiations, lead to reduced tensions, and happen to a large extent behind closed doors (Wolfsfeld, 2004). By contrast, war is more compatible with media norms, discourse, and economic structures (Shinar, 2003). The supporters of Peace Journalism principles and techniques suggest that it might lead to better reporting and interpreting, away from the ratings culture, towards human and social awareness; that it might change the seemingly inherent contradiction between the nature of peace stories and the professional demands of journalists; and that it might increase the news value of peace.

2.2 Second Promise: Strengthening Human, Moral and Ethical Values in the Media

Scholars, activists, and journalists emphasize the value of Peace Journalism in upholding these professional requirements of journalism, some of which have been eroded by the "ratings culture". Such personalities include Johan Galtung (2000), Majid Tehranian (2002), Edward Herman, Noam Chomsky (Hackett, 2006), Jean Baudrillard (1981, 2001), Ben Bagdikian, Phil Donahue, Robert McChesney, Nicholas Johnson, Naomi Klein, Ralph Nader, and Gore Vidal (U.S. Newswire).

2.3 Third Promise: Contribution to the Public Sphere

Peace Journalism can improve media images, and can increase the contribution of the media to recognized socially important causes, through dealing with inherent dilemmas such as the one between "objective" and other normative frameworks[1]. Schudson (2001, 2003) and Kempf (2006) tackle this issue, the former through a historical analysis of different perceptions of journalistic objectivity in the US and elsewhere, and the latter through a philosophical analysis of media objectivity and the lack thereof. Neiger and Zandberg (2004), and Zandberg and Neiger (2005) offer post-Cold War updated empirical data about modern journalistic reality constructions, which show a preference for nation over profession, and for ethnic rather than civil attitudes.

2.4 Fourth Promise: Widening Scholarly and Professional Media Horizons

Deviating from traditional leading theories and ideologies, such as various shades of functionalism, hard core Marxism, and technological determinism, more recent writings, including the *cco* articles on Peace Journalism, open new frontiers for research, thought, and knowledge on media and society. They lean on the study of objectivity and conflict research (ASPR, 2003, McGoldrick, 2006, Peleg, 2006, 2002); relate to post-Marxistpost-Cold War problems of media structure and democratization (Hackett, 2006, McChesney and Hackett, 2005, Tehranian, 2002); and deal with self- and the "other's" images (Ottosen, 2007), war and peace discourse (Ross, 2006, Keever, 2007, Shinar, 2004, Mandelzis, 2003), and the interdisciplinary linkage of the media with tradition, democracy, peace, and development (Lynch, 2007; Ross, 2006; Hackett and Zhao, 2005; Bratic, 2005, 2006).

2.4.1 Four parameters of the promise

In widening scholarly and professional media horizons, the four parameters of this promise focus on the market, on media structure, on leadership, and on the criticism of Peace Journalism. The relevance of each parameter to Peace Journalism is briefly presented in the discussion.

2.4.1.1 *Is the market the message?* The first parameter of the promise held by Peace Journalism is the question whether the neo-liberal laissez-faire market has become the message, and what it means. The fact that media scholars have been exploring this question in a critical vein is hardly surprising (see McChesney and Hackett, 2005; Hackett and Zhao 2005; Hackett, 2006**;** McGoldrick, 2006). The position displayed by some of the very representatives and symbols of the market is, however, of particular interest. One of them is George Soros, a real estate wizard and currency-trading tycoon-turned-philanthropist, who became a symbol of contemporary capitalism. He was one of the first to ignite a fierce ongoing debate over the apparent contradictions between the post-Cold War unregulated "market fundamentalism" (particularly, but not only in the former USSR and Eastern Europe), and the Open Society concept that he learned from Karl Popper, his teacher at the London School of Economics. In an extremely provocative article published in the Atlantic Monthly (1997), and later expanded into a full volume (2002), Soros argues that while the communist threat disappeared with the Berlin Wall, a new menace looms in unlimited libertarianism. Calling it the "capitalist threat", he fears that the tolerant, democratic, pluralistic, open societies described by Karl Popper are being threatened by the alleged triumph of free-market economics, often accompanied by the belief that governmental intervention is bad and all market- and price-determined outcomes are good. Instead of the emerging solely price-determined decision-making syndrome that is often accompanied by unlawful violence, intimidation, and urban terrorism, Soros longs for reviving rules of conduct and ethical codes anchored in values independent from the market. In full contradiction with the values he has come to represent, Soros sees nothing less than the state as the only viable mechanism for reinstating the autonomy of values from market pressures, and for struggling against the dehumanizing features of contemporary neo-liberal capitalism. In the media world, this process can be understood by the "assault" of the ratings culture that represents particular, usually economic interests, on the alleged autonomy enjoyed previously by universal aesthetic and artistic values.
One does not necessarily have to agree with Soros's demand of State intervention in order to ask the crucial question of whether and which kind of regulation might help ease the problem, in general and in the media alike. Moreover, the humanistic stance of Peace Journalism might strengthen the resistance against the exaggerated adherence of the media to extreme neo-liberal concepts and to overdosed patriotism or war against terrorism (Lynch, 2007).

2.4.1.2 *Is the structure the message?* A second parameter in the promise of Peace Journalism to widen scholarly and professional media horizons is represented by Tehranian (2002), Hackett (2006) and others who argue, "The structure is the message". This approach considers the realities of ownership and state/private interests and interaction with media professional standards and ethics, democratic values, socio economic development, and cultural standards. The structural approach departs from the premises that:

---

1. "Objective" and "normative" are not mutually exclusive. The traditional norm of objectivity, typical of Western mainstream journalism, has been increasingly challenged by alternative norms, such as the commitment to social objectives and social justice, including open and critical journalistic attitudes against crime, drugs, environmental pollution, and war. Such challenges often result from the criticism against corporate, capitalist media structures (see McGoldrick, 2006; Hackett, 2006).

- We live in a largely mediated environment ruled by government media monopolies or commercial media oligopolies that construct our images of the world.
- In the present globalized and globalizing world, media ethics and professionalism must be dealt with not only with regard to journalists as individuals but also in the context of media institutional, national, and international regimes.
- Ethics (related to peace, social justice, democracy, and development) and professionalism need commensurate institutional frameworks and sanctions in order to become effective.
- A pluralism of media content, form, and structures at the local, national, and global levels is necessary to reflect the diversity and complexity of the world.

If these arguments are valid indeed, then scholars such as Hanitzsch (2004a, b), Bläsi (2004), Hackett (2006), and others are right in demanding that Peace Journalism translate its normative concerns, rooted in the discipline of peace research, into a strategy based on a theoretical and practical analysis of news production logics and constraints. Peace Journalism supporters, they argue, need to review the lessons of research on the factors affecting news production. Such a review would help identify barriers, blockages and opportunities for the practice of Peace Journalism, and clarify questions such as: Do media organizations have sufficient autonomy vis-à-vis other institutions, or journalists vis-à-vis media organizations, to put Peace Journalism into practice? Is structural reform a prerequisite for the successful implementation of Peace Journalism? If there is to be such a reform, a number of questions should be asked: Does such a reform entail taking over the media economy, as argued by Enzensberger (1970), or should it follow Baudrillard's logic (1981), that taking over would make the reformists similar to the owners they ousted? Are there other options to develop the ethics of Peace Journalism in accordance with contemporary media realities?

Thus, according to the prevailing critical thinking, since ethics without laws and sanctions are largely pious wishes, the development of ethical codes for peace journalism should be considered necessary but not sufficient.

Also structural pluralism in media ownership and control is an indispensable condition for democratic media checks and balances. In our mediated world, most of the stories are told and most realities construed by media sources. If media sources are dominated by a single structure, public knowledge of vital issues will portray undue homogeneity of opinion and reduce democratic reflexivity and resiliency. Responsible journalism cannot survive in such an environment. Consequently, there is a need to redress the balance in media structures with increased support for public and community media, to be achieved by contributions made by commercial media systems.

In addition to its general effectiveness, this reasoning would make a considerable contribution to the development of Peace Journalism.

2.4.1.3 *Is the leader the message?* The third parameter in the promise of Peace Journalism to widen scholarly and professional media horizons appears in cases where national, political or religious leaders occupy center-stage in relation to war and peace. Examples include the critics of George W. Bush (U.S. Newswire, 2003); Peleg's work on the words that killed Yitzhak Rabin (2002, 2003); studies on Yasser Arafat, such as Mandelzis's (2003) and Rubinstein's (1995); and Kurnitzky's work on leadership in North Korea (2006).

Thus, Peace Journalism might attenuate tendencies to personalize conflict in the media and elsewhere, so as to broaden the scope of journalistic coverage towards human dimensions and prices to be paid for war.

2.4.1.4 *The message of criticism.* The fourth parameter is the contribution made by evaluations and critiques to the conceptual development of Peace Journalism. Two types of criticism are relevant in this context: the first does not accept the very idea of normative journalism beyond the norms of objectivity and neutrality (Loyn, 2003; Spicer, 2006). This can encourage Peace Journalism scholars and practitioners to react and to invest in efforts to make their case that additional normative frameworks, such as Peace Journalism, exist and can be analyzed as legitimate alternative frames of reference for journalistic coverage. The second type of criticism does not reject Peace Journalism entirely, but claims that journalists should not replace generals and politicians in peacemaking processes, and views professional constraints as killers of the very possibility of putting Peace Journalism to work. This type of criticism can fuel constructive exchanges on the nature of the concept and on the conditions for its application (Hanitzsch, 2004a, 20004b; Hackett, 2006).

3. The Performance of Peace Journalism

Although different in principles and arguments, Peace Journalism belongs to a list of titles that refer to advocacy models of reporting -- such as "journalism of attachment" (Bell, 1997), "victim journalism" (Hume, 1997), "justice journalism" (Messman, 2001), and "engaged journalism" (Lynch, 2003)[1] – and that enjoy low degrees of popularity among professionals and audiences. Two types of reasons can help to explain some of the mixed feelings and the lack of popularity attached to the "peace journalism" construct. The first type includes professional reasons that refer, first, to the principle of media objectivity, and second, to the function of war as a source of media inspiration and exploitation of audience feelings: "War

---

1. These concepts differ, sometimes dramatically, from each other. But all of them, including Peace Journalism, share low levels of popularity in the mainstream media.

provides visuals and images of action. It is associated with heroism and conflict, focuses on the emotional rather than on the rational, and satisfies news-value demands: the present, the unusual, the dramatic, simplicity, action, personalization, and results. This preference is magnified in the vivid colors, clear-cut polarities, unexpected features, and primordial sentiments typical of cultural conflict, and in its variety of images and voices exceeds that of plain conventional war…" (Shinar, 2003, 5-6).

The second type includes historical reasons, such as the political discourse inherited from the Cold War and developed in later armed conflicts, particularly since the 1990s, which have led the media usually to adopt the governmental rhetoric of power and violence as their "official discourse". In the Western world, "peace talk" was tagged Communist in the 1950s and 1960s, and "challenger discourse" until the late 1980s, with low popularity and entry into the general audience media (Shinar, 2003). The patriotic stance of media celebrities in the Iraq war[1] follows previous demonstrations of loyalty to ruling powers, as shown in the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon (Roeh and Ashley, 1986), the first Gulf War, and the wars in former Yugoslavia and Afghanistan (Shinar, forthcoming).

Both types of reasons have helped to criticize Peace Journalism so as to fuel the debate that goes far beyond the orthodox norm of objectivity and "deviations" thereof. In their studies on the dilemma of universalistic professionalism versus particularistic allegiances, Neiger and Zandberg (2004), and Zandberg and Neiger (2005) develop empirically the argument offered by Baudrillard that structural limitations of style and discourse make capitalist mass media unidirectional, intransitive, "speech without response", rather than "a reciprocal space of speech and response" (1981, 164-184).

In another strand of criticism of the lack of discrimination between reality and fantasy on the part of media professionals and audiences, Baudrillard criticizes media coverage of the Gulf War using the ironic argument that there is no way to ascertain whether the Gulf War happened on the ground or just in media reality constructions (2001). Peace Journalism research offers some comfort, at least in what concerns audience discrimination, as demonstrated by Kempf's (2005) more optimistic experimental findings about a certain measure of acceptance towards conflict de-escalation discourse on the part of German readers.

Such instances of controversy typify the development of philosophical, conceptual, professional and practical aspects of Peace Journalism, emphasizing the need for clearer formulations and applications of concepts, expectations, and procedures.

3.1 Epistemology: The need for clearer formulations of philosophical and conceptual premises.

The conceptual development of Peace Journalism offers an interesting insight into this need. A variety of formulations indicate an increasing volume of activity and dispute on its evaluation, conceptualization and critique. According to Galtung (2000), War Journalism is "propaganda-orientated", whereas Peace Journalism is "truth-orientated". This concept is of course problematic, and should be addressed. Thus, in a critique of Galtung's adherence to absolute truth, Keith Spicer (2006) demands no more than responsible journalism. Michael Schudson describes the post-World War I definition of objectivity as a method designed for a world where "even facts could not be trusted" (1978, 122); and recognizes that "at the very moment that journalists claimed 'objectivity' as their ideal, they also recognized its limits" (2001, 164). Even Galtung's loyal disciples Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick (2005) are cautious in dealing with the word "truth". They claim that reports of conflict can be assessed for their accuracy against overlapping evidence in journalism and other fields, as featured by peer review and critical self-analysis techniques. This view too has been challenged. Wilhelm Kempf, for example, is critical of both Galtung's absolutism and his relativist critics. The final conclusion of his elaborated philosophical analysis is, like Roeh's and Ashley's (1986), that "there is no methodological reason why subjective realities -- and particularly the one version of reality which is constructed in war reporting -- cannot be criticized as misrepresenting reality and/or as biased toward promoting conflict escalation" (Kempf, 2006, 6).

Thus controversy goes on. Criticizing his colleague Jake Lynch's adherence to Peace Journalism (2003), David Loyn accuses its philosophy of compromising the integrity of journalists and blurring their role as neutral, objective disseminators of facts. The fierce argument posed by Bell (1997) and Glasser (1992) about the inherent lack of media objectivity leaves the ground wide open for an ongoing and unresolved healthy debate. On another line of criticism, Thomas Hanitzsch (2004a, b) struggles with the contradictions between Peace Journalism and professional norms, such as, first, its alleged failure to take into account the actual dynamics of news production, professional values, and organizational imperatives, and second, the contradiction between the normative premises of Peace Journalism with some prevailing mass communication theories. The conflict & communication online special issues on Peace Journalism make substantial contributions to the clarification of these issues. Examples include Peleg's conceptual argument on the importance of conflict theory for a better understanding

---

1. For example, Dan Rather's statement on CNN (Larry King Live, April 14, 2003): "Look, I'm an American. I never tried to kid anybody that I'm some internationalist or something. And when my country is at war, I want my country to win, whatever the definition of 'win' may be. Now, I can't and don't argue that that is coverage without a prejudice. About that I am prejudiced."

and application of Peace Journalism (2006); Hackett's (2006) exploration of the importance of structural reform and media democratization as pre-conditions for the conceptual and practical refinement of Peace Journalism; and Ross's (2006) analytical bibliographical survey. Together with additional works (Tehranian, 2002; Bläsi, 2004), such works demonstrate the volume of academic and practical concern with these topics. This concern is made very visible in the upcoming issue of *conflict & communication online*, dedicated to the Peace Journalism controversy.

3.2 Profession: The need for a clearer formulation of expectations

In addition to its epistemological dimension, the debate on objectivity vis-à-vis other normative requirements of journalism features several professional dimensions. First, one could consider findings on the roles of the media in contemporary international relations beyond their traditional roles of impartial observers-reporters (Shinar, 2003, 2004) or active participants in general. Unlike these relatively clear, albeit naïve professional expectations, the newer roles of the media as catalysts, mediators and messengers (Shinar, 2003) have never been clearly translated into specific expectations or norms. Thus there is a need to clarify in better terms questions such as what should be the involvement of the media and media professionals in the mechanics of peacemaking or peacekeeping (Hanitzsch, 2004a, b). Empirical case studies and instructional modules, such as the ones offered by Lynch (2007), Mandelzis (2007), and Ottosen (2007) in the *cco* series, might provide good grounds for experimenting with such clearer formulations of expectations.

3.3 Practical shortcomings

A number of practical difficulties can be derived from the discussion on promise and performance:

- *Difficulty in reconciling apparent contradictions of Peace Journalism with roles, expectations from and definitions of journalism and journalists* as community and/or industry, and as loyal citizens and/or professionals (Hackett, 2006; Neiger and Zandberg, 2004; Shinar, 2000, 2003, 2004; Tehranian, 2002; Wolfsfeld, 1997, 2003, 2004; Zandberg and Neiger, 2005);
- *Difficulty in producing persuasive evidence of Peace Journalism importance, news value, and feasibility*. Significant efforts in this area have emerged only in recent years in the form of research efforts and media monitoring projects; courses taught in universities and professional institutions; publication of scholarly books, chapters, articles, teaching manuals, and trade oriented materials; meetings of interested scholars and professionals in prestigious conferences and appearances in journalists' forums; working groups in national and international organizations; and effective workshops. We have yet to wait for these seeds to mature into robust outcomes.
- *Rejection by journalists and the difficulty of Peace Journalism to achieve popularity*, as demonstrated in the debate between David Loyn and other scholars and professionals (Open Democracy, 2003).
- *Difficulty in avoiding self-manipulation in the relations between field staff and their editors*. Shinar & Stoiciu (1992) showed, on the basis of their findings on the Romanian revolution and the Gulf War, that the absence of well-defined operative policies might increase manipulation, and enhance "self-manipulation" – the priority given by international news editors (more than their field reporters) to incoming war items that fit their own state of mind, psychological pre-dispositions and news-value expectations, rather than to accept evidence from the field. This has been a major constraint on Peace Journalism.
- *Difficulty in developing a peace discourse in the media*. Even when there is a peace process, the media are constrained by structure and culture, and by the lack of a media peace discourse, as shown by Kempf (ASPR, 2003), Keever (2007), Mandelzis (2007), and Peleg (2003). Shinar (2000, 2004) found that rather than trying to develop a peace discourse, the media opt for three major alternative strategies. Framing peace in the discourse of war is the most frequent strategy. In the coverage of peace the media resort to a terminology of violence, utilizing symbolic clichés, direct quotations of leaders' military discourse, and signed copy and editorials. Trivialization is a second strategy, which in the absence of a peace discourse that satisfies dominant news-value demands, offers trivial information and upgrades celebrities and media personalities to become news. Finally, ritualization is the production of peacemaking media events, negotiations and ceremonies, whose ritual elements are willingly adopted by the media, as they carry enhanced news value (Katz and Dayan, 1985; Dayan and Katz, 1992).

4. Conclusion: An Agenda and Four Principles of Strategy to Improve the Performance of Peace Journalism

The following agenda can be condensed from this epilogue:

1. *Beware of pitfalls*, including two types at least: conservative traps, such as excessive loyalty to governments and establishments (Hackett, 2006), and critical traps, such as "guruism" and excessive loyalty to monopolistic "causes", absolute truths, one-sided concepts of justice, etc. (Spicer, 2006, Kempf, 2006).

2. *Study and disseminate newer research findings*, such as: studies on de-escalation techniques; media detachment,

transparency, reflexivity, and self-criticism; structural, economic, professional, and normative constraints in the media; and the development of a media peace discourse.

3. *Use relevant questions and variables*. They might include the dimensions offered by Bläsi (2004) and Hanitzsch (2004a, b).

   The former refer to the interaction of six factors: (1) structural aspects of the media, (2) conflict situation on-site, (3) personal features of the individual journalist, (4) the political climate, (5) lobbies, (6) the audience.

   Hanitzsch's analytical framework refers to three dimensions:

   (1) *Micro-level analyses* deal with journalists as *individuals* with particular reference to the characteristics and professional views of war journalists. How do journalists see their role in modern society and how do they define their communication goals? How do they deal with the structural constraints under which they have to operate? What is the impact of individual characteristics such as gender, age, education, class, ethnic and religious affiliation, etc. on war and peace coverage? To what extent does the situational context, such as territorial circumstances or limitations imposed by military and civilian authorities prevent or even deter reporters from applying peace journalism strategies to their daily work?

   (2) *Meso-level analyses* that refer to journalism as a process of *organized* news production might ask how the structures of editorial work and quality control influence the news. To what extent do textual constraints pre-structure news reporting? How do rhetorical and narrative forms used by the media facilitate certain frames of viewing a set of events? To what extent does the availability of resources (staff, time, budget, etc.) restrict crisis and war journalism**?**

   (3) *Macro-level analyses* deal with social functions of journalism and its interrelation with the environment. What is the interplay between journalism and other social systems? How do economic imperatives of media companies within which commercial journalism usually operates interfere with daily news making? How independent are war and peace journalism from various interests within the political system? To what extent do expectations of the audience affect the coverage of war and peace? To what extent are these expectations and their anticipation by journalists compatible with peace journalism?

4. *Encourage the development of a media peace discourse.*
   The invention, development, and marketing of a media peace discourse should form part of the research and development agenda on Peace Journalism. Together with work conducted on the deconstruction of war discourse and the construction of peace discourse, frameworks and variables can be borrowed from research on other topics and used for additional conceptual leverage of Peace Journalism (Keever, 2007; Bratic 2005, 2006; Kempf, 2005; Shinar, 2004; ASPR, 2003; Peleg, 2003).

5. *Four Principles of Strategy.*
   At least four principles of strategy emerge from the preceding discussion:

   4.5.1 Adapt media values and practices to current realities, in which the newly acquired stronger status of the media in international relations (Shinar, 2003) can be used to overcome the media's negative peace-related attitudes and peace-coverage techniques inherited from the past;

   4.5.2 Increase the news value of peace coverage in the contest between media frames, rather than conducting missionary attempts to change war-oriented media structures and professional codes of conduct;

   4.5.3 Devise well-defined professional policies, whose proper execution and training might reduce media self-manipulation and external pressures;

   4.5.4 Create and "market" a media peace discourse that satisfies news values, based on the appropriate application of existing findings, and on innovative research.

References

ASPR, Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ed.), 2003. Constructive Conflict Coverage. A Social Psychological Approach. Berlin: verlag irena regener.

Baudrillard, J., 2001. "The Gulf War Did Not Take Place" In M. Poster (ed.) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 231-253.

Baudrillard, J., 1981. "Requiem for the Media" In Baudrillard, J., *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, Trans. Charles Levine, St. Louis, Mo.: Telos Press, 164-184.

Bell, M., 1997. "TV News: how far should we go?". *British Journalism Review* 8(1), 7–16.

Bläsi, B., 2004. "Peace Journalism and the News Production Process", *conflict & communication online*, 3 (1 & 2).

Bratic, V., 2006. *Examining peace-oriented media in areas of violent conflict*, paper presented at the IPRA (International Peace research Association) Conference, Calgary, July 1.

Bratic, V., 2005, "Media effects during violent conflict: Evaluating media contributions to peace building", *conflict & communication online*, 4 (2)

Dayan, D. and E. Katz, 1992. *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Enzensberger, H.M., 1970, "Constituents of a Theory of the Media", *New Left Review*, I/64, November-December, 13-36.

Galtung, J., 2000."The Task of Peace Journalism"*, Ethical Perspectives,* 7.
        http://www.ethics.be/ethics/viewpic.php?LAN=E&TABLE=EP&ID=141

Glasser, T. L., 1992. "Objectivity and News Bias", in: Elliot D. Cohen (Ed.), *Philosophical Issues in Journalism*, New York: Oxford University Press, 76–83.

Hackett, R. A., 2006. "Is peace journalism possible? Three frameworks for assessing structure and agency in news media". *conflict & communication online* 5 (2).

Hackett, R. and Y. Zhao (eds.) 2005. *Democratizing Global Media: One World, Many Struggles,* Boulder CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hanitzsch, T., 2004a. "Journalists as Peacekeeping Force? Peace journalism and mass communication theory", *Journalism Studies*, 5 (4), 483–495.

Hanitzsch, T., 2004b. "The peace journalism problem: Failure of news people -- or failure on analysis?" in T. Hanitzsch, M. Loeffelholz & R. Mustamu (eds.), *Agents of Peace: Public communication and conflict resolution in an Asian setting.* Jakarta: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 185-209.

Hume, M., 1997. *Whose War is it Anyway? The Dangers of the Journalism of Attachment.* LM Special, InformInc.

Katz, E., and Dayan, D., 1985. "Media Events: On the Experience of 'Not Being There'", *Religion*, 15 (3), 305-314.

Keever, B., 2007. "De-escalating the language of killing – an instructional module". *conflict & communication online,* 6 (1).

Kempf, W., 2006. "Social constructivism and its implications for cultural studies", *conflict & communication online*, 5 (1).

Kempf, W., 2005. "Two experiments focusing on de-escalation oriented coverage of post-war conflicts*", conflict & communication online*, 4 (2).

Kempf, W., 2003. "Constructive conflict coverage - A social-psychological research and development program", *conflict & communication online*, 2 (2).

Kurnitzky, H., 2006. *Collima Korea: A Visit in the Year 23*. New York: Lulu, http://www.lulu.com/content/506235

Loyn, D., 2003. "Witnessing the Truth", openDemocracy.net, 20 February, http://www.opendemocracy.net/articles/

Lynch, J., 2007. "A course in peace journalism". *conflict & communication online,* 6 (1).

Lynch, J., 2003. "Journalists need to think: a reply to David Loyn" in *Open Democracy Journalism & War Debate,* www.opendemocracy.net/media-journalismwar/article_1037.jsp

Lynch, J. and A. McGoldrick, 2005. *Peace Journalism*, Hawthorn Press, Stroud, UK.

Mandelzis, L., 2007. "Representations of Peace in News Discourse: Viewpoint and Opportunity for Peace Journalism", *conflict & communication online,* 6 (1).

Mandelzis, L., 2003. "The changing image of the enemy in the news discourse of Israeli newspapers, 1993-1994", *conflict & communication online*, 2 (1).

McChesney, R., and R. Hackett, 2005. "Beyond Wiggle Room: American Corporate Media's Democratic Deficit, Its Global Implications, and Prospects for Reform". In R. Hackett, R. and Y. Zhao (eds.) *Democratizing Global Media: One World, Many Struggles,* Boulder CO: Rowman and Littlefield, 225-244.

McGoldrick, A., 2006, "War journalism and 'objectivity'", *conflict & communication online* 5 (2).

Messman, T., 2001. "Justice Journalism: Journalist as Agent of Social Change", *Media File*, 20 (4), autumn.
        http://www.media-alliance.org/mediafile/20-4/justice.html

Neiger, M. and E. Zandberg, 2004. "Days of Awe: The Praxis of News Coverage of Violent Conflict". *The European Journal of Mass Communication (Communications)*, 29, 429-446.

Open Democracy Journalism & War Debate, www.opendemocracy.net/media-journalismwar.jsp

Ottosen, R., 2007. Emphasizing Images in Peace Journalism: A Case Study from Norway's Biggest Newspaper. *conflict and communication*

online, 6 (1).

Peleg. S., 2006. "Peace Journalism Through the Lense of Conflict Theory: Analysis and Practice", *conflict & communication online* 5 (2).

Peleg, S., 2003. *If Words Could Kill: the Failure of the Israeli Political Discourse.* Jerusalem: Academon Books (Hebrew).

Peleg, S., 2002. *Zealotry and Vengeance: Quest of a Religious Identity Group*. Lanham MD: Lexington Books.

Roeh, I. and S. Ashley, 1986. "Criticizing Press Coverage in the Lebanon War: Toward a Paradigm of News as Storytelling", *Communication Yearbook*, Newbury Park: Sage, 117-141.

Ross, S. D., 2006. "(De) Constructing Conflict: A Focused Review of War and Peace Journalism", *conflict & communication online* 5 (2)

Rubinstein, D., (1995). *The Mystery of Arafat*. South Royalton, Vt.: Steerforth Press.

Schudson, M., 2003. *The Sociology of News*, New York: W. W. Norton.

Schudson, M., 2001. "The objectivity norm in American journalism", *Journalism*, 2 (2), August, 149-170.

Schudson, M., 1978. *Discovering the News: A social history of American newspapers*. New York: Basic Books.

Shinar, D., forthcoming in 2007, "Media Stories of War and Peace: Yitzhak Roeh's work as a springboard", *Book in Honor of Yitzhak Roeh*, Jerusalem: Magnes (Hebrew).

Shinar, D., 2004. "Media peace discourse: Constraints, concepts and building blocks", *conflict & communication online*, 3 (1 & 2).

Shinar, D., 2003. "Peace Process in Cultural Conflict: The Role of the Media", *conflict & communication online*, 2 (1).

Shinar, D., 2000. "Media Diplomacy and 'Peace Talk': The Middle East and Northern Ireland", *Gazette*, 62, 2, April, 83-97.

Shinar, D. and G. Stoiciu, 1992. "Media Representations of Socio-Political Conflict: The Romanian Revolution and the Gulf War", *Gazette*, 50, 1992, 243-257.

Soros, G., 2002. *Soros on Globalization*, New York: Public Affairs.

Soros, G., 1997. "The Capitalist Threat"*, The Atlantic Monthly,* 279 (2), February, 45-58.

Spicer, K., 2006, Lecture at the Keshev-Miftah Seminar, Antalya, Turkey, May 22.

Tehranian, M., 2002. "Peace Journalism: Negotiating Global Media Ethics" , *Harvard Journal of Press/Politics,* 7 (2), April, 58-83**.**

U.S. Newswire. 2003. *Prominent Journalists and Citizens Criticize Media Coverage of Iraq Disarmament and War Preparations*, March 4. http://www.usnewswire.com;

Wolfsfeld, G., 2004. Media and the Path to Peace. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfsfeld, G., 2003. *Media and Peace.* Cambridge U.K., Cambridge University Press.

Wolfsfeld, G. 1997. "Promoting Peace Through the News Media: some initial lessons from the Oslo peace process", *International Journal of Press/Politics* 2(4), pp. 52–70.

Zandberg, E. and M. Neiger, 2005. "Between the Nation and the Profession: Journalists as members of contradicting communities". *Media, Culture & Society*, 27(1), 131-141.

On the author: Dov Shinar, Ph.D., Professor, School of Communication, and Head, Research Center on War and Peace Coverage, Netanya Academic College, Israel; Principal Investigator, Peace Journalism Group of the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research; Professor Emeritus, Concordia University, Montreal, and Ben Gurion University, Israel. Fields of interest include international communications; media in war and peace; socio-cultural dimensions of communication technologies; media and development, emphasizing collective identities, institutional change, media education, and minority/community media.

Address: School of Communication, Netanya Academic College, 1, University Street, Kiryat Yitzhak Rabin, Netanya 42365, Israel
eMail: shinard@barak.net.il