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Reduced view of a multidimensional reality

The Northern Ireland peace treaty in Berliner Zeitung – an example of peace journalism?

"The first casualty in war is peace"
(Galtung, 1998).

1. Introduction

Conflicts are complex. A fact that is often either forgotten, as conflicts are reduced to violence (Galtung, 1997), or used to justify an antagonistic approach to conflict resolution.

Antagonistic conflicts, in opposition to constructive ones, however have an innate logic. The conflict constellation represents a threat to the goals, intentions and actions for each of the parties involved. The intention of each side is to defend his or her rights. Their actions are meant to get one’s way, but the opponent experiences them as attack, thus fostering the situation of threat (Kempf, 1998). Through this autonomous process, conflicts tend to become destructive, to enlarge and to escalate. Conflict escalation is mediated by three connected mechanisms: 1. the definition of the conflict as a competitive process, 2. the production and support of a systematic divergence of perspective (Kempf, 1995, 1998) and 3. the social and personal entanglement with one’s own side (Deutsch, 1976).

Along the stages of conflict escalation, cognitive, motivational and emotional bases for cooperation will successively get a negative omen until reaching warfare (Kempf, 1998), where peace is the victim.

There is not just one truth, as each conflict party tends to believe in the justness of their own goals, intentions and actions. They seem to be threatened by the opponent, creating a ‘subjective reality’ (Kempf, 1998) - a ‘subjective truth’. The ‘objective reality’ (the underlying ‘objective truth’) may only be seen from the outside and requires a way to communicate each party’s perspective, as well as their will to adopt it. The division of the ‘Truth’ compromises peace and is thus the first victim of the conflict escalation.

The media may be one possibility to contribute to constructive conflict communication. Thus trying to identify influencing factors will point out the importance of a de-escalation oriented conflict coverage.

"Mass media became instruments of reality construction", states Schmidt (1994). In print media, one of the most important findings on conflict communication has been its escalation oriented reporting style (Kempf, 1999). The media do influence and suffer influences themselves.
1.1 Influences on the media

The Cold War engaged several societies in a state of permanent military awareness. Media and national defense organizations integrated in such a way that the journalistic independence was compromised. This is seen as a consequence of the Cold War culture (Luostarinen & Ottoson, in print) and has far reaching consequences itself. War was a consistent item on the political agenda and could be consumed as a natural part of everyday entertainment.

Von Bonsdorff (1998), in his work on the historical evolution of conflict resolution, stylizes two types of societies, providing presuppositions for international war or peace: ‘the power society’, labeling war as a means of politics, and the ‘consensus society’, regarding war as an international crime.

Kempf (1999) defines war culture as a "competitive environment in which conflicts are dealt within the framework of a win-lose model, according to which any of the conflict parties can achieve their goals only on the expense of their opponents" (for a detailed description see Kempf 1995, 1996b, 1999).

War culture, based on these assumptions, creates a discourse about conflicts, which focuses on maximizing the own chances of winning. It will therefore operate in an escalation oriented manner regarding the conceptualization of the conflict, the evaluation of the opponents' rights and intentions, the evaluation of the opponents' actions and the stimulation of emotional involvement (Kempf, 1998). It is propaganda, based on social psychological conflict processes, using presentation, perception and interpretation mechanisms in order to aim at increasing the personal entanglement and changing the individual's hierarchy of values in favor of the conflict engagement.

Empirical results from analyses of the conflict coverage during the Golf War (Kempf, 1999; Kempf & Reimann, in print) and the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Jaeger, 2000) have shown that the escalation oriented style of reporting is dominant in American and European mainstream media, displaying some variations according to features of the specific conflict and the country, whose media are reporting.

Another aspect of war culture is its impact on the definition of 'what sells'. Galtung (1998) defines the 'ideal' top news as: "something negative, happening to a person in the elite (not ordinary person), in an elite county (not 'unimportant periphery')" - the tragic death of Princess Diana and Dodi Lafayette serves as an archetypal example of his point.

1.2. The media's influence

Communication is always interaction. Yet, in mass media, the communication process is indirect, as the recipient can not reply immediately (Kempf, 1995). Still, selective and intentional information presentation, as well as perception and processing are involved and give rise to various interaction mechanisms.

Results in experimental psychology indicate that reported events mingle with self made experiences through memory construction. This effect is even stronger, when emotions are involved. The combination of facts and fiction becomes 'reality' through
mechanisms of reduction, selection and mainly via further individual processing of the presented information (Früh, 1994; Neuber, 1993). According to Galtung, (1998) this is a question of perception, reception and motivation in a ‘reader-listener-viewer’ psychology framework about the impact of the media. Television produces these effects through pictures and the closeness of the transmitted information to what looks plausible in the eyes of the recipient’s everyday life. Print media, on the other hand, exercise manipulation power through ‘partializing’ reality into seemingly unconnected facts and events. They need to be ‘re-contextualized’, a process left to the interpretation of the recipient and helped by the presentation of the information through identification suggestions, a truth orientation, where the truth is but raw material and a motivation logic, which presents warfare as a wall against destruction and a bridge into a brighter future (Kempf, 1995; Luostarinen & Kempf, 2000).

This form of discourse leads to a growing antagonism between the conflict parties. If societies are involved in intractable conflicts over a long period of time, the distorted view of the conflict consolidates into societal believes. The so produced explanations and framework for the conflict and its interpretation lead to a process, displaying the mechanisms of a self fulfilling prophecy. As they provide a psychological infrastructure, which is, in addition to e.g. appropriate political conditions, needed to cope with burdens of such conflicts, they engage the society members to interpret information ‘correctly’ and to act on behalf of the society (Bar-Tal, 1998).

There is no complete prognostic and explanatory model on the recursive influences from and upon the media (Neuber, 1993; Wolff, 1999). Through the conflict coverage a ‘pseudo objective reality’ is forged by the media. This distorted view becomes reality in itself and affects one’s behavior (Luhmann, 1996), giving rise to the steering function of the media (Rolke & Wolff, 1999). The importance of a responsible way of information transmission is highlighted.

1.3. Peace journalism

We have a well defined picture of what propaganda - escalation oriented conflict coverage - is and how it works. Yet we do not have a clear view, neither of all the de-escalation oriented elements of peace journalism, nor of peace journalism as such. But, the knowledge about escalation oriented conflict coverage enables us to identify what needs to be ‘deconstructed’.

The closer the media gets its own construction of reality to the true objective one, the more familiar the whole community will be with all the subjective and global truths, resulting on a progression towards the de-escalation of the conflict.

Thus, "critical peace journalism" should be "resistant to perspective divergence without being turned into contra-propaganda" and "demands more than to avoid judgments and to report facts only. It requires an intellectual capacity which goes beyond antagonism", according to Kempf (1997). Galtung (1998) summarizes peace journalism as being peace oriented, truth oriented, people oriented and solution oriented. It has as goals to de-polarize and to
de-escalate by means of truthful presentation of all sides, showing attachment to both sides population and victims but as well pointing out deficits and ask difficult questions. The stress is put on the fact that a conflict is often mistaken by violence, oversimplifying the innate complexity of conflicts in general (Galtung, 1997). Peace journalism therefore requires "more work in space, time, political geography and history" (Galtung, 1998).

The dominance of the escalation oriented discourse in contemporary media does not necessarily imply that journalists do not have the capacity of a de-escalation oriented reporting style.

We follow the hypotheses that de-escalation oriented reporting is part of the journalist's repertoire too and that peace on the political agenda allows de-escalation oriented reporting style to emerge. Analyzing the media coverage of peace processes is one approach to define if constructive ways of reporting do exist and how they look like.

As Galtung (1997) stated "reporting about war brings war, reporting about peace maybe brings peace".

2. Method

An exemplary article in the German newspaper "Berliner Zeitung" from the 10/11. of April 1998, consisting of two titles and 8 paragraphs, was chosen for analysis because of its detailed and, at first glance, constructive coverage of the peace treaty negotiations in Northern Ireland (Appendix I).

Based on a psychological model of conflict communication (Kempf, 1996), a qualitative method (Kempf, Reimann & Luostarinen, 1996b) was developed in order to analyze conflict coverage in the media. As the original version of this coding schedule had been designed in the context of the analysis of war propaganda, it was modified during the present project. New aspects, identified during the analysis of the coverage of peace processes, had to be included. (For the present version of the coding schedule see Appendix II).

The article was coded using the present coding schedule, consisting of 6 conflict dimensions, each being operationalized by several aspects, at a time escalation and de-escalation oriented. Based on these codlings, the article was analyzed in two ways.

- First, the structure of the article was described quantitatively by
  1. the frequency of escalation oriented or de-escalation oriented aspects, which were found, both, in general and on the various conflict dimensions included in the coding schedule. As a result, we get a global idea about the text construction.
  2. In order to get a global idea about the flow of argumentation, the distribution of the frequencies along the article was analyzed.

- As a next step, the content of the article was analyzed qualitatively by taking a close look at
3. which of the escalation oriented or de-escalation oriented aspects were found. As a result, we will learn about the article’s conceptualization, both of the conflict and the peace treaty.

4. In order to learn about the article’s argumentation logic, finally it was analyzed how these conceptualizations were distributed along the article.

3. Results

Already the modification of the coding schedule can be seen as a methodological result. Some aspects of de-escalation oriented reporting, seeming rather characteristic for conflict resolution and peace processes, could be identified.

3.1 Structural description

The results of the structure description are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Figure 1 presents the total frequency of escalation or de-escalation oriented aspects, both in general and in the various dimensions included in the coding schedule. In Figure 2 the frequency distribution along the article is pointed out.

Figure 1: Total frequency of escalation and de-escalation oriented aspects, both in general and in the conflict dimensions.

Comparing the total frequencies of aspects, it is evident that the escalation oriented aspects are dominating the article.
Looking at the conflict dimensions, escalation oriented aspects are more frequent than de-escalation oriented aspects within the ‘conceptualization of the conflict’ and the connected ‘evaluation of the other party’s rights & intentions’ and ‘evaluation of the other party’s actions’, where the strongest emphasis lies on the first. De-escalation oriented aspects occur as well concerning the ‘conceptualization of the conflict’ and the ‘evaluation of the other party’s actions’, but they are dominating the dimensions ‘emotional involvement’, ‘social identification’ and ‘motivation logic’ (even though with less total frequency).

Figure 2: Distribution of the frequencies along the article.

The article’s discourse starts de-escalation oriented. This reporting style then disappears successively until it reaches zero in the fifth and sixth paragraph. It only reappears at the end.

The escalation oriented line displays an almost opposite shape. Escalation oriented aspects appear primarily in the second paragraph. Their number then rises to peak in the fifth and sixth paragraph before disappearing at the end.

3.2 Content analysis

The results of the content analysis are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 presents which of the escalation or de-escalation oriented aspects were found. In Table 2 the distribution of the conceptualizations of the conflict and the peace treaty along the article is pointed out.
Conflict dimension | 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 all sides (3)

evaluation of the opponent’s rights & intentions | ‘demonisation’ 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 mediating (5)
 | mistrusting the opponent (1) | new perspective for peace possible through empathy (2)

emotional involvement in the conflict | devaluation of positive (emotional) reactions to the prospect of peace (1) | ‘humanization’ / respect for peace promoters (7)

social identification and personal entanglement | definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future (2) | 

motivation logic | 

Table 1: Escalation- and de-escalation oriented aspects in the article (absolute frequencies).

Within the escalation oriented aspects in the coverage of the peace process, the emphasis lies on the denial of common interests (5) and possibilities for cooperation (9). The treaty is presented within a zero-sum- or win-lose orientation. It is described as being no true solution (7) by directly rejecting or indirectly questioning peaceful alternatives and possible conflict resolutions (12). Agreements are interpreted as giving in and antagonism is emphasized (10). This is underlined by mistrusting the opponent (1), ‘demonizing’ his intentions (1) and devaluating positive (emotional) reactions about the peace treaty as ‘blue-eyed’ (1).

Summarizing the de-escalation oriented aspects in the article, the peace treaty is described as a structure for further cooperation (10), a bridge into a brighter future (2) and a new perspective, through which reconciliation may become more possible (2). The emphasize is hereby lying on a win - win orientation and cooperative behavior. Concessions on both sides and joint efforts result in an agreement (5). In addition all sides are mentioned (3). The prime ministers on both sides are portrayed as relieved and their personal efforts are honored (7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph / Content</th>
<th>Escalation oriented aspects</th>
<th>De-escalation oriented aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>• description of cooperative behavior...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title 2</td>
<td>• peaceful alternatives rejected or questioned</td>
<td>• win-win orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph I:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • description of cooperative behavior and interpretation of a 3. party’s role as mediating • new perspective possible through empathy • definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation of the treaty</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • description of cooperative behavior and interpretation of a 3. party’s role as mediating • new perspective possible through empathy • definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title 3</td>
<td>• emphasis on antagonism</td>
<td>• definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph II:</td>
<td>• zero-sum- / win-lose orientation • refutation of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism</td>
<td>• definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of the treaty</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph III:</td>
<td>• refutation of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism</td>
<td>• win-win orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments about the treaty from both sides politicians ‚Personalization‘</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph IV:</td>
<td>• refutation of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism</td>
<td>• win-win orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments about the treaty from both sides politicians ‚Personalization‘</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph V:</td>
<td>• refutation of peaceful alternatives • denial of possibilities for cooperation • emphasis on antagonism • denial of common interests</td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background treaty ‚Personalization‘</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paragraph VI:</td>
<td>• emphasis on antagonism • denial of common interests • zero-sum- / win-lose orientation • ‚denomination‘ of the opponent’s intentions</td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background conflict ‚Personalization‘</td>
<td></td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title4</td>
<td>• mistrusting the opponent...</td>
<td>• win-win orientation • emphasis on all sides • new perspective possible through empathy • humanization / respect for peace promoters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paragraph / Content | Escalation oriented aspects | De-escalation oriented aspects
--- | --- | ---
**paragraph VII:**
statements about the conflict ‘Personalization’
- emphasis on antagonism
- denial of common interests
- zero-sum- / win-lose orientation
- refutation of peaceful alternatives
- denial of possibilities for cooperation
- win-win orientation

**paragraph VIII:**
statements about the treaty ‘Personalization’
- win-win orientation
- emphasis on all sides
- definition of peace as a bridge into a brighter future

Table 2: distribution of the conceptualization along the article.

The first title emphasizes a solution to the long lasting conflict in Northern Ireland: the peace treaty. The second title highlights a win-win orientation, counterbalanced by a refutation of peaceful alternatives.

In the first paragraph, the peace treaty is introduced as a result of the negotiations. The discourse is clearly win - win orientated, highlighting cooperative behavior. The third title is stressing the antagonism between the conflict parties. In the following second paragraph the treaty itself and its ratification are described. In here the success of having a peace treaty is counterbalanced by it’s exclusive attribution to the politicians and it’s description as an artificial construct.

In the third and fourth paragraph, politicians from both sides are commenting the treaty. ‘Personalization’ (using other persons words without directly citing) as a style aspect is introduced and will be dominating the remaining four paragraphs. Through the third paragraph, positive emotional feelings towards the peace treaty are devaluated and antagonism is prominent. The fourth paragraph then relativates win - win orientation with refutation of peaceful alternatives.

The fifth paragraph describes the background of the peace treaty. The escalation oriented aspects increase significantly, pointing out no common interests and possibilities for cooperation.

The sixth paragraph then provides background information about the conflict. The concentration of escalation oriented aspects peaks here, stressing the incompatibilities between the conflict parties and the hopeless state of the underlying conflict through emphasis on antagonism.

The fourth title says that ‘the mistrust between the conflict parties remains’, consolidating the desperate picture. In the seventh paragraph statements about the conflict are given from both side’s politicians and academics. Escalation oriented aspects decline and a de-escalation orientation comes up again.

In the eighth paragraph an involved politician comments the treaty through a clear win - win orientation.
4. Discussion

From the structural description it becomes visible that escalation oriented aspects exceed de-escalation oriented ones in frequency and concentration concerning the conceptualization of the conflict. De-escalation oriented aspects are more prominent in emotional and motivational conflict dimensions. The beginning and the end of the article are purely de-escalation oriented, the middle on the other hand is entirely dominated by escalation oriented aspects.

Summarizing the results of the qualitative analyses, we may admit that a possibility for conflict resolution is presented and cooperative behavior is highlighted in the article. But, the way both, the conflict and peace treaty are conceptualized throughout the article shows incompatibilities between the conflict parties to be overwhelming and the treaty to be an artificial and political construct. No indignation of the conflict parties against each other is underlined, but rather an indignation against the peace treaty itself becomes visible.

The construction of the article positions positive aspects in a ‘reader like’ manner, as, (in reference to ‘primacy and recency effects’ in experimental psychology) the beginning and the end are read the most consciously. The undertone of the article is clearly positive as well. But the high concentration of escalation oriented aspects in the middle part and the many ambivalent interpretations, in which escalation oriented elements counterbalance and overtake de-escalation oriented ones, can not be neglected.

We thus conclude that if peace is part of the political agenda, de-escalation oriented may emerge and in principle journalists do have the capacity to meet it’s requirements. But the way, they seem to support peace processes are inappropriate to the aim of constructive conflict resolution. Important information is not mentioned: The actual issues of the conflict remain invisible, civil society is ignored and the achievement of peacemakers is downgraded, limiting a solution oriented discourse to arise. Thus even if the individual and environmental presuppositions are fulfilled (if both, journalists do have the capacity of de-escalation oriented conflict coverage and peace is part of the political agenda), there are some factors, which still put limits on a de-escalation oriented style of reporting: (a) One of the factors is that journalists themselves are entangled in the same inner conflicts and ‘societal believes’ as the rest of the society. (b) The other factor is the ongoing dominance of war culture in everyday life, which promotes an escalation oriented conceptualization of conflicts.

As a bottom line of this study we can thus state that reality is still incompletely portrayed. Yet the reporting compromises a fundamental characteristic of escalation oriented discourse - the indignation of the conflict parties against each other.

The article thus demonstrates an attempt at constructive coverage of the Northern Ireland conflict.

Peace journalism should change from the traditional reactive journalism to a proactive, aiming to help for a peaceful transformation of conflicts, but as well to prevent them (Kempf, 1998). Mechanisms to achieve this goal would include the changing of the definition of peace, of its ‘market value’ and the journalists understanding of their role and pressures. Reprimanding journalists does not help
Instead, journalists should be taught conflict analysis, critical distance and perspective take over (Kempf, 1998).

References


APPENDIX I


DIE NORDIRISCHE MAUER WANKT; DOCH SIE FÄLLT NOCH NICHT
(Berliner Zeitung, 11. / 12. April 1998)


KEIN HANDSCHLAG


PARAGRAPH VI: In Nordirland treffen nicht nur Protestanten und Katholiken aufeinander, die in ihren Religionen und Vorurteilen verwoben und in ihrer Kultur - auch der politischen - grundverschieden sind. Hier begegnen sich vor allem Briten und Iren: Für die Unionisten ist der feste Bestand der Verbindung zum britischen Mutterland ein Teil der Identität, für die Nationalisten ist Fortschritt nur möglich, wenn
die "britische Besatzung" ein Ende hat und Ulster "wieder" zur Republik Irland gehörte. Beide Träume, so Duncan Morrow, sind aber nicht realisierbar. Ein rein britisches Ulster wäre nur auf undemokratische Weise durchsetzbar, was überhaupt nicht im Interesse Londons liegt. Die Vereinigung der Insel aber liegt Dublin ebenso fern, und sie wäre auch nur durchsetzbar unter Verlust der eben auch protestantisch gefärbten Identität Nordirlands. "Man kann Rührei nicht entrühren", sagt Duncan Morrow, "Das Irland Sinn-Feins ist eine Wüste," das Ulster der Unionisten "ein Serbien".

**TIEFES MIßTRAUEN BLEIBT**


APPENDIX II

Checklist for escalation and de-escalation oriented conflict coverage

by Wilhelm Kempf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escalating aspects:</th>
<th>Deescalating aspects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Conceptualization of the conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Support of war &amp; military logic</td>
<td>D1 Query of war &amp; military logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.1 Zero-sum or at least win-lose orientation (construction of the conflict as a competitive process); conflict resolution is regarded as impossible; agreements are interpreted as &quot;giving in&quot;; compromise is devaluated</td>
<td>D1.1 Win-win orientation (or at least query of win-lose) and/or presentation of structures for possible cooperation (construction of the conflict as a cooperative process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.2 Emphasis on military values</td>
<td>D1.2 Cooperative values and/or query of militarism and military values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.3 Designation of (military) force as an appropriate means to conflict resolution</td>
<td>D1.3 Emphasis on negative effects of force and/or query of its appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.4 Refutation or query of peaceful alternatives; focus on violence reduces the prospective of peace and/or obstacles to peace are emphasized or portrayed as overwhelming</td>
<td>D1.4 Demands for peaceful alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1.5 Emphasis on antagonism</td>
<td>D1.5 Emphasis on all-sidedness or at least abandonment of splitting the protagonists into two camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Evaluation of the war parties' rights and intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Antagonism</td>
<td>D2 Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2.1 demonisation of the enemy, denial of his rights and/or demonisation of his intentions</td>
<td>D2.1 Respecting of rights of the enemy and/or unbiased description of his intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2.2 Idealization of own rights and intentions</td>
<td>D2.2 Realistic and self-critical evaluation of own rights and intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2.3 Denial of common interests or emphasis on incompatibility of interests, culture etc.</td>
<td>D2.3 Emphasis on common interests and/or description of the (concrete) benefit that both sides could gain from ending the war</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From Kempf & Gutiérrez Villalobos (in print).
### 3. Evaluation of the war parties' actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confrontation</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E3.1</td>
<td>Justification of own side's actions and underlining of own correctness</td>
<td>D3.1 Critical evaluation of own side's actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3.2</td>
<td>Condemnation of actions of the enemy</td>
<td>D3.2 Unbiased evaluation of the other side's actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3.3</td>
<td>Antagonistic behavior is emphasized, possibilities for cooperation are denied, cooperation between conflict parties is not taken serious and/or the role of third parties is interpreted rather as executing (moral, economic or military) pressure (win-lose) than as mediating (win-win)</td>
<td>D3.3 Description of cooperative behavior and/or the role of third parties is interpreted as mediating (win-win) rather than executing (moral, economic or military) pressure (win-lose)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Emotional involvement in the conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Destructive emotions</th>
<th>Constructive emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4.1</td>
<td>Focus on &quot;their&quot; viciousness and dangerousness &amp; accentuation of &quot;our&quot; strength create a balance between threat and confidence which promotes willingness for war</td>
<td>D4.1 Unbiased assessment of &quot;their&quot; intentions &amp; behavior and emphasis on the price of victory deconstruct threat and confidence and promote &quot;our&quot; willingness for peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.2</td>
<td>The enemy and/or neutral third parties who try to mediate in the conflict are mistrusted</td>
<td>D4.2 Respect for &quot;their&quot; rights and unbiased assessment of &quot;their&quot; behavior reduce mistrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.3</td>
<td>Focus on &quot;their&quot; atrocities&quot; and &quot;our&quot; correctness converts indignation with the war into indignation with the enemy</td>
<td>D4.3 Empathy with both sides victims, emphasis on both sides causalities and unbiased evaluation of both sides behavior redirects the indignation against the war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.4</td>
<td>demonisation of &quot;their&quot; intentions and justification of &quot;our&quot; behavior jeopardize empathy with &quot;their&quot; situation: if they behave well, they have nothing to fear</td>
<td>D4.4 Empathy for &quot;their&quot; situation opens a new perspective: if we can find a solution (together) that takes all sides’ needs into account, reconciliation will become possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4.5</td>
<td>Denial of possibilities for cooperation avoids rebuilding of trust</td>
<td>D4.5 Emphasis on cooperative experiences (also from the past) rebuilds trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Social identification and personal entanglement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E5</th>
<th>Confrontative social commitment</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>Cooperative social commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E5.1</td>
<td>humanizes &quot;our&quot; political or military leaders &amp;</td>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>keeps aloof from identification with escalation-oriented political or military leaders on any side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dehumanizes &quot;their&quot; leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5.2</td>
<td>humanizes &quot;our&quot; soldiers &amp;</td>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>keeps aloof from identification with military personnel on any side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dehumanizes &quot;their soldiers&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5.3</td>
<td>humanizes &quot;our&quot; victims &amp;</td>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>humanizes or at least respects victims of the war on any side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disregards or dehumanizes &quot;their&quot; victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5.4</td>
<td>humanizes &quot;our&quot; civil population for its loyalty and sacrifice &amp;</td>
<td>D5.4</td>
<td>humanizes or at least respects members of the civil society &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disregards or dehumanizes &quot;their&quot; civil population for its nationalism etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>keeps aloof from identification with supporters of the war on any side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5.5</td>
<td>humanizes &quot;their&quot; anti-war opposition &amp;</td>
<td>D5.5</td>
<td>humanizes or at least respects those who strive for a peaceful conflict resolution on any side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disregards or dehumanizes &quot;our&quot; anti-war opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5.6</td>
<td>devaluates positive (emotional) reactions to the prospective of peace</td>
<td>D5.6</td>
<td>emphasizes positive (emotional) reactions to the prospective of peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Motivation logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E6</th>
<th>Motivation for war</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>Motivation for peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E6.1</td>
<td>War as a wall against destruction</td>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>Peace as an alternative to destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6.2</td>
<td>War as a bridge into a brighter future</td>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>Peace as a bridge into a brighter future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manipulative propaganda techniques

**Two-sided messages**

1. Anticipation of criticism
2. Rejection of the anticipated information

**Double bind communication**

1. Inherent contradictions
2. Emotional involvement with both contradictory messages