

Media Program

Project Activities:

Activity 1: Training of Trainers:

This activity was planned for 18 people from both organizations accompanied by 2 coordinators and a translator. The aim was to examine the objectives and the methods of the two organizations, find ways to combine our experience and create a joint “language” that will promote professional cooperation between the two staffs.

We planned to do it in 2 days of management meetings, and 7 days of training.

In July and in August 2004 we conducted two meetings for members of the management of the SFP and the CCRR. These took place at the CCRR and focused on basic intellectual discussions of the philosophies of the two organizations. In November we conducted a training for the two staffs. This training took place between the 21-24th of November 2004 in Jordan. 9 staff members and free lance trainers from each organization participated, led by 2 coordinators and assisted by 2 translators. In May 2005 we conducted another staff training. We will present the program for the 4 day training and later share with you some of our conclusions and results from the joint training.

The School for Peace
Reconciliation

The Center for Conflict Resolution and

Program for training of trainers

Media Project- sponsored by the European Community

November 2004, Jordan

Aims

To get to know each other, and create a working team

To get to know the organizations, and the project

To create a joint ‘language’ for working with Israelis and Palestinians

Sunday

16:00-17:30 Opening session and getting to know each other

17:45-19:00 group building and acquaintance (through expectations from the other side, and from our selves)

Dinner 19:00

Monday

9:00-10:00 uninational sessions including topics for negotiations

10:00-12:30 Opening of negotiations session: deciding the different topics with uninational, and bi national forums for negotiations

Lunch

14:00-16:00: negotiations continue and the sharing of the “agreements”

16:30-18:00 Panel CCRR and SFP “what we can learn from these sessions, as professionals

Dinner

Tuesday

9:00-10:30 introductions to the two organizations and to the media project

10:45-12:30 Me and the media

Joint activity in Amman and Dinner

Wednesday

9:00- 11:30: important issues when working with Israelis and Palestinians:

(In small think tanks and later in the whole group)

1. How to deal with the complexity of 67/48/Jews in the encounters?
2. What are the aims of the encounters in the eyes of the Palestinians and in the eyes of the Jews?
3. Is there importance to the gender issue in the encounters?
4. What is the best model for working with translation?

12:00-13:00: summery session and good byes.

As you can see, the logic behind this training was to have a chance to create some links between people who will later need to work together, to get the people from the two organizations to get to know each other on a personal basis.

This part included a free, open discussion which the group utilized in order to talk about the checkpoints, about politics, about being refugees, and about the disappointment of the Palestinians from the Israeli Left. The atmosphere was polite, and there was a sense that the Palestinians were testing the Israelis. The group was new to the idea of the Hebrew-Arabic dialogue, as opposed to a dialogue in English, and we investigated what would be the best way to use the translators, and together we tried to learn how to conduct such an encounter. There was a lot of cautiousness in the group out of respect, because we all knew we would have to work together, and because in the previous two meetings between the managements we already had some hard arguments about the differences between the ways that we work. Also all of the Israelis had before met with Palestinians in workshops, and facilitated in such encounters while some of the Palestinians did not. This was hard on those who didn't meet before, and since this is the case in our encounters, that most participants have never met, it was good to be able to deal with this in the training, understand what people go through and feel and create space for these hardships in future programs.

On the political issues we conducted an activity in which we negotiated about some hot issues between Israelis and Palestinians including the refugee problem, the possibility for a one-state solution, ect. This activity was crucial so that people who will work together will know a little bit how each partner in the staff feels about these issues, and not be surprised while working with future participants. This helped to build trust between the trainers and when they will work together it will help them cooperate and deal with what the participants bring to the group, without needing to participate in such a discussion for the first time. The political discussions were also a way to get to know the two organizations because both organizations have a position on political issues. (We don't have any political positions)

On professional issues: We divided this part into three parts; we first gave a lecture about each organization. The two directors, Noah Salameh and Nava Sonnenschein gave these lectures and later we had a long question and answer period. One of the questions that came up had to do with the political views of each organization, with whom each organization works, and with whom each organization will not work. Another question had to do with the effectiveness of each organization's work in both societies; this was especially pointed at the SFP (from the Palestinian participants ????) which has been working for a long time.

After this elementary introduction we conducted a session on the media project: this included preparing ourselves to work with media people, how they are different from other population groups, how we view the media and its role in our societies, how to choose participants who will be of similar background, professionally, when we have media industries which are so different. We also shared our goals as Israelis and

Palestinians and found out that there are differences we need to make clear. For example there were those who wanted to influence Israeli media, but empower Palestinian media, and there were others who had a more similar goal for both sides. This discussion was very effective because it focused on the project.

The last part of our professional discussion had to do with summarizing our joint training. This was the hardest and most conflictual part of the training because together we analysed the dynamics that took place during the 4 days. The Palestinians told the Israelis that the Israelis were not sharing enough, but mostly listening, which can be interpreted as a form of patronizing. The Israeli-Jews on the other hand, thought that listening is a form of giving respect, and space to the other, and were unaware of the effect it had. The Israeli-Jews were in a minority in this training, and so was the use of Hebrew, this fact brought up feelings of abandonment and marginalization, not reflecting the reality that they have the power and that they are the occupiers. The way that was chosen to overcome this in the future, was first of all to be aware of the situation and what it brings up, second to have a strong Jewish staff that can be a role model and a support system for future participants, and to use this situation as a part of the learning process for both the Israeli Jews, and for the Palestinians. The position of the Israeli Arabs in the training was also examined and better understood; their needs, their priorities, and their relations to each of the other groups. This too was essential for future programs since the Israeli group consist of Jews and Arabs.

We believe that the training was essential to bring out into the open some of the difficulties that we have as two organizations working together, with our histories, with our different experiences, with different realities, with the fact that one is a younger organization (Why are you repeating this?), and of course with the bitter fact that our realities are so different, one being on the occupier side, and the other on the occupied.

The joint training day in May took place in the CCRR and was a continuation of the learning process. This time we had the experience of two joint activities, and the data from our evaluator, of one activity. We heard a report and short analysis from Dr. Rabah Halabi of the SFP Research Center, who evaluated the March media encounter, and discussed the findings. This evaluation we will share with you later, when we describe activity #3. 10 trainers and staff participated in this session.

Changes that were made in this program: there were two changes made, the first was that we split the training and included separate days in Palestine, and a 4-day session in Jordan, this we did for technical reasons as well as out of necessity that came up in the field. The second change was that we invited 2 translators to the training, because we wanted the two people who will later work in the project to get to know everyone, get acquainted with the project and start to learn to work together.

Activity 2- Training of Media Specialists:

This was planned for 20 specialists, 10 from each national group. We planned to have a mixed group of academics and practitioners, from the written media, from radio and from

television. The aim for this training was to help the SFP and the CCRR develop a model for training the participants in this program. We share with you our report and later we will relate to changes that were made in the original program.

Report on Media Project

Between January 27 –31st 2005, we met in Cyprus for the second stage of the project. Each organization invited ten people who have vast experience in the media, to participate in a think tank, and help us in learning about which are the most crucial issues between Israeli and Palestinian journalists. The Israeli group traveled through Ben Gurion airport and arrived in no time. The Palestinian group; however, traveled via Jordan, and had a long and tiresome trip. We mention this not because we think you do not know the facts of life in our area but from our experience, these facts should not be belittled, or neglected; they are the small facts that make up our perspective on life. The group was very supportive and productive and we reached more than what we set out as our goals.

Who was on the team?

The Palestinian group included five men and five women, eight from the West Bank and two from Gaza. The group was very experienced in media coverage of the Palestinian situation and society, and very committed to create free and professional media in Palestine. The team included:

- Two academicians who specialize in educational T.V. and in freedom of speech in the Palestinian media
- Three directors of local private T.V. stations
- Two reporters who work on Palestinian official T.V.
- One journalist from one of the three big papers in Palestine
- Two other journalists, one from a private T.V. station and one from the official Palestinian media bureau (the names will not be reported out of respect for the privacy and security of our participants).

The Israeli group included four women and six men:

- The head of the media department at Natanya college, and who specializes in research on minority representation in the Israeli media, especially women and Arabs.
- A Professor who teaches philosophy at the Open University and law at the Ramat Gan academy of law, and is a member of the Eastern Democratic Rainbow, and a researcher at the Adva center.
- A representative of a daily news program on Radio Tel Aviv and is active in the centers for victims of sexual abuse in Israel.

- The head of the Arab and the Palestinian desk on channel 10, a commercial T.V. channel in Israel, and who teaches a course on the media and the Intifada at the Tel Aviv school for media.
- A journalist in Ma'ariv (one of the two biggest daily Hebrew news papers), who wrote about current events and especially about the Jewish-Palestinian conflict.
- A reporter for channel 2, a commercial T.V. channel in Israel; who has been covering the Palestinian society for 12 years, and lectures about his work in Israeli colleges.
- A former journalist at Haaretz newspaper, and editor of the local radical media website indymedia, and currently works at a public relations agency which gives services to leftist organizations.
- The director of I'lam Center in Nazereth, an Arab NGO which informs the Hebrew media with news from the Arab society in Israel. The center also conducts workshops for Israeli journalists.
- An experienced editor and journalist, his last position was editor of the news division at Haaretz newspaper, he writes about the Palestinians and about the conflict.
- A photographer for local and international newspapers, who lectures about his work in media departments in Israel and abroad.

The program

The program was conducted in Arabic and Hebrew, with translation back and forth, and included the following sessions:

- Acquaintance
- Dialogue in small bi-national groups about the conflict and about media
- Presentations in the plenary of the School for Peace and the Center for Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation
- A lecture in the plenary on: Encounters between Israelis and Palestinians in the years of occupation and Intifada- by SFP and CCRR
- Dialogue in national groups for reflection and introspection
- Presentation in the plenary of Israeli/Palestinian media- the mission was prepared in the national groups.

· Presentation in the plenary of moral dilemmas of the journalists - the mission was prepared in the national groups.

· Presentation in the plenary of four topics-prepared in small bi-national teams. The topics were:

1. Are the media and the journalist independent? The group explored issues such as self-censorship, economic restrictions, security restrictions and social restrictions.
2. The conflict within the journalist: the group explored the clash between national identity, professionalism and the value system of the journalist.
3. Language reflects the conflict: the group prepared a lexicon of terms that journalists on each side of the border use.
4. What are the expectations of journalists from Israel/Palestine from each other? The group explored issues of cooperation and dependency.

Thanks to our friends from the Peace Movement in Cyprus, we were able to take a study tour of Nicosia with Prof. Yiannis Papadakis from the University of Cyprus who is a critical anthropologist. After the walk we met top journalists from the Greek and the Turkish sides of the island, and heard from them about their partnerships and about the Anan plan to end the conflict, a plan that was rejected by the Greek Cypriots.

Some thoughts and reflections about the program:

The meeting was very powerful and interesting. The changing political situation affected the meeting, but also gave very immediate significance to our discussions. We were happy that the participants had a joint interest and mission. They are linked through their profession, which crosses borders, somewhat like medical doctors, and indeed they managed to overcome great barriers and pain, and work together with an amazing amount of openness, self-criticism and commitment.

The dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians is always very tense and emotional. There were people on both sides that have never met the “other” for dialogue, and they all shared their anxieties and their excitement from this experience. We recognize that this is part of the necessity for such meetings, particularly because these people are responsible for reporting about the “other.”

Those who have met before, especially from the Palestinian side, reported that they felt hopeless and tired; nevertheless they participated and were very active. Towards the end some mentioned that in other encounters they just waited for the program to end, and this time they wanted the program to continue, because it was relevant and interesting. From our point of view, the difference was that there is a great deal of participation from the group in our program, using their knowledge and experiences as a base, and that we did not sway the discussions only to the “nice” things that people have in common; on the

contrary, we gave them a safe environment to discuss and explore the things they have in conflict.

Indeed some of the issues that they touched on, we feel, are central in the conflict:

- The assumption of the Israelis that the Israeli media is better than the Palestinian media
- There was a critical discussion on the reporting by Palestinian journalists after the battle of Jenin, which included the use of high numbers of casualties.
- There was an analysis of the hidden assumptions behind the Israeli reporting at Camp David, there was a long and critical discussion on the term “generous offer” that the Israeli media used to describe Barak’s offer.

One of the most interesting and openhearted sessions was when the participants shared their moral dilemmas at work. An example of dilemmas from the Palestinian side:

- Can one show a picture of an Israeli soldier at the checkpoint, helping a Palestinian woman cross?
- Can one show pictures of Israeli civilian victims without saying something about the wider context?

From the Israeli side:

- Should one interview a Palestinian fighter before he goes off to explode civilians?
- And another journalist shared his insight that he wrote about a shooting of a Palestinian by an Israeli sniper: “the woman died from a stray bullet,” sharing his difficulty to realize the army is capable of killing civilians on purpose.

As a result of this workshop there has been a beginning of working relations between Israeli and Palestinian media specialists. There are plans for cooperation and collaboration, including the possibility for preparing joint reports.

After hearing the hardships of the Palestinian journalists to move around, two Israeli participants took it upon themselves to form a support system in order to help Palestinian journalists get permits, and press cards, and form a “union” of Israeli journalists that will react when Palestinian journalists are hurt, shot, wounded, not able to move, etc. This is a result of the encounter, and the realization on their part that they can do something rather than standing in silent complicity. The participants have realized that there is a mutual dependency and that there should be solidarity.

This project is sponsored by the European Community

Changes in the program:

The first change that we did was that we did not invite lecturers to join our staff in this program. We saw that the specialists themselves are top people in their field, and to bring a lecturer would be pointless and insulting. Instead, we built a program that invited the specialists to share their knowledge, and we wrote a full protocol of the whole program for future use.

We also originally thought that these specialists will later participate in the program as advisors and lecturers but the model that we developed with their help is much more participatory, with very little “outside” knowledge. The concept that was adopted was to use the knowledge in the groups as a main resource for dialogue and learning. We will now describe the model that was developed, and used at this point twice, in March and in June of 2005 each time, with a group of 30 media people. The specialists helped us develop the model during the workshop, and are since, helping us reach new media people. (We are using them as lecturers and resource people in some of the programs, the July program for teachers)?????, and the program for NGO’s staffs. (the NGO’s program will be included in the next report).

Activity 3-Training for Journalists in Peace Journalism

This activity is planned for 90 participants. We have conducted 2/3 of the program, in two workshops, the first in Jordan between the 17-21st of March 2005 and the second in Jordan as well, between 2-6th of June 2005. We present the program, and later the reports of the March and the June workshops.

Program for Media encounters in Jordan
March & June 2005

Aims:

- To raise the awareness of the participants to the role media plays in our societies.
- To recognize and observe their own work according to their ethics and values.
- To make participants more committed to humanistic values such as equality and peace and to the creation of fair journalism.
- To create links between Israeli and Palestinian journalists

Thursday

Arrival at hotel rooms etc.

17:00-18:00 Opening session: circle of introductions

18:00 Dinner in hotel

19:15-20:30 dialogue in two small groups

Friday

9:00- 10:15 CCRR and SFP introductions

10:30-11:30 dialogue in the small groups continues

11:45-12:45 dialogue in two small groups continues

13:00 Lunch

15:00-16:30 uninational preparation of presentation of media

17:00-18:00 first presentation of media in plenary

Dinner in the city

Saturday

9:00-10:00 second presentation of media in plenary

10:15-11:30 discussion in the small groups

11:45-14:00 uninational: moral dilemmas from work

Lunch

Free time (Dinner in hotel)

Sunday

9:00-10:30 Presentation of Dilemmas in the plenary

10:45-12:00 discussions in the small groups

Lunch

14:00-16:00 work in 5 small teams: practical journalist missions

16:15-17:30 presentation of journalist missions in the plenary

17:45-19:30 closing circle (including evaluation questionnaires)

Dinner

Monday

Breakfast and goodbye.

Media and the Conflict

An Encounter between Israelis and Palestinians from the Field of Media

On the Jordanian shore of the Dead Sea, the Movenpick Hotel wonderfully blends into the rugged desert surrounding like an oasis. It was there that the School for Peace and The Center for Reconciliation and Conflict Resolution in Bethlehem conducted a joint workshop for Israeli and Palestinian professionals in media. Thirteen Palestinians from the Palestinian Authority and 14 Israeli citizens took part. There were 3 Palestinians and 11 Jews in the Israeli group. The workshop was funded by the European Union and it took place from March 17th to March 21st, 2005. The aim of the dialogue was to enable participants to examine the role of the media in the Palestinian–Israeli conflict. Most of the participants were journalists; however, there were also a number of photographers and people who worked on documentary films.

The Israeli group arrived late on Thursday, the first day, making it impossible to conduct formal meetings according to the program. However, the participants quickly and easily took the initiative to get acquainted, and they stayed up talking until late in the evening. From Friday morning until Sunday evening they took part in an intensive series of discussion sessions. They parted at noon on Monday after a summary session.

During the course of the workshop we held discussions in four different forums: The full group together, two small mixed groups, two uninational groups (one Palestinian and one Jewish), and towards the end of the program the participants divided into four mixed groups, each of the four tackling a particular task. One group wrote an article together. One group formulated a letter to the Israeli authorities protesting their decision to prevent a Palestinian journalist from participating in the workshop. One group examined expectations that Jewish and Palestinian journalists had from each other. One group examined ideologically – charged concepts commonly used in the Israeli and Palestinian press and they prepared a glossary of terms.

Among other activities, we requested from the Israeli and the Palestinian participants to describe their media to each other. We also asked them to address moral dilemmas that they have had to confront in their daily work. Most of the participants took an active part in all stages of the program. The dialogue was open, effective, and fascinating. Though we initiated activities, our job as facilitators in this workshop was primarily to observe and allow the discussion to continue.

Questions of neutrality, objectivity and the essence of professional journalism made up a major theme of the discussions. But the subtext of that discussion was an ongoing competition over which side was more humane, or which side was morally superior. While they may not have been aware of it, each side tried to score more points. From the moment of arrival, the Palestinian group worked hard to give the Israeli group a first hand account of their inhumane conditions under occupation. On the other hand, the Israelis were not accustomed to having someone else set the agenda. They grow up in a society that dehumanizes the Palestinian side. Any society determined to occupy another's land has little choice but to dehumanize the other. Dehumanization is necessary in order to

justify the oppression and humiliation that are inherent to occupation. The reaction of the Jews in this case was common to most encounter workshops that we are familiar with. But as journalists, these participants in particular are accustomed to being the ones who draw the image of the Palestinian for public consumption. They are the ones who analyze the political situation and who offer advice. The Israeli journalists in this workshop seemed to be shocked by their encounter with a Palestinian group that was self-confident, knowledgeable, professional, dynamic and articulate. The Palestinians exposed to the Israelis a reality with which they were not familiar. The Palestinians were also very candid, even courageous, in sharing with the Israelis dilemmas that they, as professionals, confront working in the media while living under occupation. They allowed themselves to be critical of the Palestinian society.

After recovering from the initial surprise, the Israeli journalists regrouped and found themselves divided between those who were more pro-Palestinian and those who took upon themselves the role of gatekeepers of the status quo. But soon the Palestinians and the Israelis alike let down their guards and met eye to eye.

After such an experience, it is hard to imagine the participants returning to the same patterns of work to which they were previously accustomed. The encounter was a revelation not only to the Israelis, but also to the Palestinians, many of whom were speaking to unarmed Israelis for the first time in their lives. However, while the changes that we identify may be significant, we do not delude ourselves into believing that a single three - day meeting can put an end to deep-rooted perceptions that develop over years and that lie at the base of our identity and our self-image. We have seen that the encounter framework such as this can raise awareness of perceptions and problematize them. Though it is a significant step, we must remember that it is still only a step. It is the beginning of a process in which workshop participants begin to identify ways in which their perceptions and assumptions color their understanding of political and social processes.

We illustrate our point with an example of one of the issues that came up towards the end of the workshop. It started when the most radical, even anarchist, Jewish participant in the group expressed his disappointment with a Palestinian participant who had said that he – the Palestinian – would not publish photographs of the Muqata'a (the headquarters where the Palestinian leadership sits) if they included images of Palestinians who were wanted by the Israelis. The Palestinian participant brought this up after expressing his criticism of attitudes towards Palestinian journalists within Palestinian society. He had told the story of a Palestinian journalist who once printed a photograph of the Muqata'a that exposed the presence of Palestinians who were sought by the IDF. This was particularly embarrassing at the time because President Arafat had denied that there were any Palestinians using the Muqata'a as a refuge. As a result, the Palestinian journalist was attacked and badly beaten by other Palestinians. Many Palestinian journalists, including journalists who opposed the choice to print the picture, then gathered to demonstrate against Palestinian violence directed at journalists.

After the demonstration President Arafat asked forgiveness from the journalist who was beaten, and there was reconciliation - "sulha".

In the workshop, the Israeli participants raised the flag of the journalist's professional integrity. "You are a journalist before you are an Israeli or a Palestinian, and in the Israeli society there would be no doubt that the journalist should jump on a scoop like that and print the picture."

One of the Palestinian participants said, "Let's say the IDF had received intelligence about a Palestinian on his way to blow himself up in a crowded place in Israel, and a word reached you about where the Israeli soldiers were waiting for him in ambush. Would you jump on the scoop and expose the location of the soldiers?" The Israeli journalists were taken off guard. They tried to avoid the question by saying that they would be prevented by censorship to report military secrets, but they understood that that was beside the point. One of the Israelis asked the Palestinians to let him sleep on it and that he would respond the next day. The response never came.

Both sides, the Israeli even more than the Palestinian side, left the workshop after having shaken the foundations of the basic beliefs and conceptions regarding themselves and regarding the other. The workshop ended as the participants began to reexamine their roles in the conflict as Jewish and Palestinian journalists. We regard this reexamination as a significant measure of the workshop's success.

An Encounter between Israeli and Palestinian Media Professionals

Jordan, June 2005

This is the third encounter that we are conducting together with the Center for Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation, as part of a program about the media and the conflict. In this encounter there were 14 Israelis, including representatives from the media in the Arabic language and in the Russian language, in Israel. In the Palestinian group there were 15 participants including representatives from private television stations, representatives from Palestinians working in foreign and Arab media and from newspapers. The encounter took place in Amman, between 2-6th of June.

The program gave an opportunity to get to know each other, and to discuss the political situation. In this part most of the discussions were about life under the occupation, and about the consequences of the occupation on the Palestinian society. After that, we continued with discussions on professional topics. This included a presentation of the Israeli Media by the Israeli group, and a presentation of the Palestinian media by the Palestinian group. In another session, we asked the groups to share ethical and professional dilemmas from their work as journalists and we concluded the workshop with a practical activity, when the participants created joint missions, among them writing an article together, and creating a dictionary of terms about the conflict, that journalists on each side of the border use.

This is the third workshop we are holding for journalists, and we can start to see some processes that repeat themselves. We believe that these encounters can teach us about our reality, and some of the findings we will share with you now, might be relevant for understanding the Israeli-Palestinian relations these days.

We will share with you some anecdotes from the workshop, the first has to do with the different ways the Palestinians and the Israelis present themselves in the opening session: The Israelis present themselves as human beings, in the universal or international sense, and as professionals, it is hard to place them as a side in this conflict, or as people of the Middle-East. On the other hand, among the Palestinians, there are those who present themselves as refugees, or as ex-prisoners; they stress their national identity. On second thought, the Israelis also stress their national identity, this is an identity which hides national elements, and stresses “Tel Aviv” elements, or universal elements. These differences are evident in the opening sessions, it is easier to understand the Palestinians who are in a state of national struggle for independence, and they are a part of a mobilized society, a society which believes in its rights. The Israelis are harder to understand, they hide the more nationalist elements of their identity. Maybe they are uncomfortable to display them in front of the Palestinians, or maybe State institutions like the government and the army, do that work for them, and they can be free to just be “human beings”. It is important to mention that in the context of the encounter, a universal person, who is not involved in the national, or the patriotic, is considered by most Israeli participants as a higher being.

We will continue and share another example from the workshop. On the second day, the groups are asked to present the media of their country, to the other side. In this June workshop, the two groups took the activity very seriously and prepared detailed presentations, which were very different from each other. The Palestinians, like in the previous two workshops, prepared a thorough historical lecture about Journalism in Palestine. It is no coincidence that they stress the historical aspect, this could be a means to emphasize their long and historical existence in our area, it is an answer to the seldom heard argument, ‘who was here first’. The Israelis in the last workshop chose to present their media using the parameter of exposure to the public, therefore they began by describing the medium of television. In a previous workshop the Israeli group chose a different parameter, they described how the media deals with the conflict. None of the Israeli groups stressed the historical aspect. It is also interesting what they chose to omit: two out of the three Israeli groups did not include, in their presentation, the Arabic-speaking media in Israel, two out of the three did not mention the fact that the Israeli media is owned by a very small number of wealthy families. In the last workshop there was a focus on the “Tel Aviv” culture, and its effect on the media, as part of their attempt to describe the culture of escapism that is prevailing in Israel. Two of the three groups mentioned in depth, the issue of censorship and the relations the media has with the Israeli Army Spokesperson Unit. One of these groups was very critical when talking about this Unit. It is possible to say that the presentations are effected by the specific members of each group, but since we have three groups to compare, we can learn something that is more general about the way Israelis and Palestinians chose to present the media in front of the other. We will conclude this example with a quotation that can

teach us a lot about the Israeli state of mind. It was the opening sentence of the Israeli presentation in one of the workshops: “The Israeli media is developed, Western and influenced from things that happen in the world, it does not take much interest in the news and it takes more interest in sports and lifestyle”

The third example was taken from a very difficult mission in the workshop. The participants were asked to present dilemmas from their professional work as journalists. Each national group sat separately, shared dilemmas and chose what they wanted to present in the plenary. Again we can see a pattern that the Israelis used. The Israelis shared their dilemmas as journalist, but those were usually universal dilemmas, that journalists every where share, such as the classic dilemma whether to continue filming an atrocity, or stopping and giving the victim a hand. The Israelis also shared dilemmas, which leave them looking good, liberal and pro-Palestinian. One of the stories in this category had to do with the dilemma whether to tell the Israeli viewers that the Palestinian fighters have not put down their weapons, as they promised Abu-Mazen and that they are still functioning as militias, while telling the public otherwise. Reporting this would expose the Palestinians and send a message that they don't want to send the Israelis, not reporting this is showing loyalty to the Palestinians. In none of the workshops did the Israelis tell about their loyalty to the Israeli Army, they did not describe how blind they can be to the fact that they write and report from a Zionist and patriotic point of view. Only in the first workshop, towards the end of the encounter, did one of the journalists share such a dilemma. It happened after a Palestinian pushed the Israelis to a corner, showing them how the Israeli media miss-reported about Camp David, put all the blame for the failure of the talks on Arafat, and called Barak's offer a generous one. In a moment of true soul searching, the Israeli journalist described how he visited Jenin Camp and wrote a report about a Palestinian woman who was shot while standing on the roof of her house. The report was in the newspaper the next day, and the journalist received a call from a Palestinian friend who helped him get the story. The Palestinian friend thanked him for the good report, and asked why he reported that the woman was shot by a stray bullet. The Israeli told us that until that phone call he had not even noticed that he used this term “stray bullet” and that he did not have any way of knowing which kind of bullet it was. It seems that, unconsciously, it was hard for him to imagine, that the Israeli Army can have impure intentions.

We saw two patterns, when the Palestinians shared with their dilemmas: they used the “stage” in order to tell about horrible and tragic events that they experienced, including loss of close relatives and friends during the Army envisions. They told these stories to their last details, as if they are post-traumatic. The second pattern we noticed was that they talked about the tension that they have between their loyalty to the national struggle, and their professional role as journalists. They were very open in front of the Israelis, and did not hesitate to tell of cases when they chose to be ‘less professional and more Palestinian’. This openness took the Israelis by surprise.

It is always good to go back to the words of Paul Sartre, in his preface to the book “Wretched is the earth” by Franz Fanon. Sartre writes to the French: “Fanon explains you to his brothers and shows them the mechanism by which we are estranged from

ourselves, take advantage of this, and get to know yourselves seen in the light of truth, objectively. Our victims know us by their scars and by their chains, and it is this that makes their evidence irrefutable". An encounter, and a dialogue with the other, is one of the best ways to help us, Israelis, with this task.

Changes that were made in the program: As we reported above, the first change was that we did not include media specialists in the staff. The second change was the change in the length of the program from 7 days to 5 days together, and 2 uni national days, for preparation and summery.

2. What problems have arisen and how have these been addressed?

1. We saw it is very difficult to get journalists to participate in a weeklong program; therefore we changed the program to a "long weekend" program, which is easier to sell.
2. Freedom of movement is a big issue for our work; it is very bad that the Palestinian partners have to depend on the IDF for permissions. We also suffered twice, when the Israeli security forces didn't let some one from the Palestinian side pass into Jordan, it happened in the staff training, and in the first journalist's encounter.
3. It is difficult to interest top Israeli media people in the program?????, the "celebrities" are not responding to our invitations. Where on the Palestinian side the groups are more varied.
4. Journalists are hard to commit, there is a difficulty in building a stable group in advance, since they cancel at last minute due to urgent work that they are called to, this is again more symptomatic of the Israeli side.
5. We planned to get assistance from the Ben Or agency in Tel Aviv, who promised us assistance in recruiting participants, we found that this was not happening and we did all the work ourselves.
6. We feared that journalists and media people would not respect the atmosphere in the workshops, as a closed forum for individual learning, and report from the workshops, violating the privacy and safety of the participants. We solved this problem by constantly talking about it, in the invitations to the activities, in the preparatory meetings, and in the opening sessions of the workshops. We found ourselves even telling people to stop writing while the sessions were going on, and to ask permission before taking photographs. This has, until now proven to work.

3. Please list all materials and publications produced during the project to date.

The School for Peace published until this date the journal “Pitchon Peh” (Hebrew for Giving a Voice)- this is a journal in Hebrew. The journal includes edited lectures and articles about identity and politics. The journal includes the following chapters:

1. Viki Shiran: When you see wrongdoing, first of all yell no!
2. Ilan Pappé: The visible and the invisible in the Israeli –Arab conflict
3. Mouhammad Amara: Language, Identity and conflictual reality
4. Rafiq Halabi: The Israeli Media functions under self censorship
5. Michal Zak: Between Africa and Europe
6. Rabah Halabi: Racism and the Arab-Jewish conflict

CCRR- The Tree of Hope Magazine- A Report about the Media Program

The Center for Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation published?????????

July 24-28 2005 we will conduct the Teachers training for 30 educators, teachers and principals on the topic of how to use media as a means to educate for critical thinking.

In October 2005 we will begin our academic course. It is a course on peace journalism. The Israeli course will take place at the Natanya college, and the Palestinian course will take place at November??????

In November we may conduct the training for NGO representatives, which will focus on two things: what an organization for social change wants to publish in the media and how to reach the media with that message.

In November we will also conduct the third and last encounter for journalists

In December we may conduct an encounter for the two academic courses, and a conference for all graduates of the project.

In addition we may publish a report of our experience on working in across the border programs, and the products from the media projects.

C. Impact and Evaluation

1>The assessment of the results so far includes our account of the program and how it has been conducted, and the evaluation from the SFP research center in cooperation with CCRR, an evaluation which includes questionnaires from the two journalists encounters, and analysis of interviews with participants.?????????

The SFP and the CCRR summarize the project to this date in a positive way, all the goals that were put in the proposal were reached, and we have managed to go forth with the program as planned. In addition to the activities, which many times go forth with out a common language, we had a goal which was probably the most basic and hard to reach, this is the goal to create such a common language for cooperation between the two organizations. We are happy to report that this was created, and we will here share with you what we accomplished, both on the organizational level and the professional level:

1. The SFP and the CCRR have decided to divide the grant into two, and each organization is responsible for the management of the finances and the monitoring of the budget. Due to the fact that the SFP is the main partner, the SFP is responsible for ??this is as far as we know, the first and only joint Israeli-Palestinian project which is run like that.

2. Staff meetings and management meetings are conducted in the CCRR offices and in the SFP offices. This is no small matter, and we maintain this policy in order to keep the balance, when possible.

3. The encounter projects are conducted in a third country, this helps because the distance gives the participants and the staff some peace of mind, it is safer than in Israel or Palestine, it is isolated, which is important with journalists and it keeps the balance, since we are all guests.

4. The coordinators, and facilitators and translators come from both organizations. The joint representation is important not only on the symbolic level but also on the practical level and of course the input of staff members from both sides and from both organizations, makes the program richer.

5. We built a new model for encounters which takes into consideration the experience of the two organizations and the needs of the participants. The model includes the following points:

- a. We see the encounter as a possible micro-cosmos, which means that it is possible through this kind of activity to learn about the relations between Israelis and Palestinians. In order for such a learning process to take place it is necessary to give maximum freedom for natural group dynamics to take place. So for that reason we allow any topic for discussion to come up, we also allow free participation, as opposed to giving turns for speakers, we also allow conflicts to come up, and do not play them down. When we see significant behaviours in the encounter, that we can attribute to the relations between the groups (not to individual characteristics), we contribute our analysis and tie it to the macro relations. So for example, when the Israelis didn't take an activity or mission seriously, we pointed that out as a possible behaviour that is typical of a group that feels superior, and over confident. When the Palestinians, during an activity about the media, stressed the history of Palestinian journalism in Palestine, we pointed out that the group used this fact to stress their rights as natives of this land, as opposed to the Jews, and as part of the political discussion.

b. We conduct the encounters in Hebrew and Arabic with translation, and not in English. This model for dialogue helps stress the fact that there are two identity groups in the meeting, and it coincides with our belief that the encounter is between two national groups and not between individuals (inter-group vs. interpersonal). This model also helps participants express themselves better, and it encourages people from all socio-economic groups to participate, and not only the elite who are usually more fluent in English. The difficulty in using this model is that it is very time consuming, and less spontaneous, but we believe the advantages are by far greater.

c. We work in a model of co facilitation with a Palestinian staff member and an Israeli staff member in all encounter forums. To this we add a translator, as a third staff member, who in our case is always a Palestinian from Israel. This model of intervention is essential as we described above, but it also requires a lot of work for the staff to learn to cooperate. We decided to make sure that the staff members work at least twice together, and we don't change facilitators and translators in every workshop, we also decided that it is crucial to meet for preparation, and have a summery meeting at the end of each workshop. Of course during the workshops the coordinators support the staff and help them with dilemmas that arise in the "here and now". There are other possible models for intervention, such as third group intervention, or one facilitator in a mixed group, either Israeli or Palestinian, but we chose the co-facilitation model, since we believe it give maximum support to the participants.

d. The model includes four different forums for meetings: uninational groups, small bi national groups, plenary meetings, and mixed working groups. The plenary is a forum that the Palestinians prefer, and it is the closest to reality out side. The small bi national groups are preferred by the Israelis and it gives a chance for more interactive dialogue, the working groups give a chance to experience joint, practical collaboration on a specific mission and the uninational forums stress the conflict between the two groups, and gives a chance for deeper reflection and self criticism.

2> We also wrote in the proposal that we will measure what the media people reported on, and how much coverage is affected by the workshops. We think this was not a very realistic means for evaluation, and it is very hard to measure how an experience, as profound as can be, influences the way people work. We can share with you a number of reports and articles that we know were written as a direct result of the program.

Suliman A-Shafhe made a report on the Israeli channel 2 news about the different terminology used on both sides of the conflict

The radio station in the Russian language, in Israel, reported on a big SFP conference about peace education.

Gal Berger wrote an article in Makor Rishon, a rightwing Hebrew weekly, about his experience in the June encounter.

Wallah news website publishes articles from the desk of the SFP research center, as a result of the encounter of the editor with the SFP in the March encounter.

Huda Kadoomi from the Palestinian Nationalist T.V. interviewed Noah Salameh –CCR director- about the young political program run by CCR

3> The project is run equally by the two partners. Some of the work is divided so that each partner is responsible for the missions in it's society, some of the work is done by one partner for the benefit of the whole project. We will give examples:

Joint responsibility: planning the budget, planning the educational program, training the staff, and running the joint programs. Each partner is responsible for all the advertising and recruiting of it's national group, so that the SFP is responsible for the Israeli groups and the CCR for the Palestinian groups. We found ourselves sharing in information of course, but also asking for approval, in special cases, for example the SFP had a candidate for one of the workshops for media people who is a soldier, in service at the IDF spokespersons unit. The SFP staff decided to consult with the CCR staff whether to include a soldier in the program and not take a decision on this matter alone.

One partner takes responsibility: in the joint programs we rotate in the administrative planning, so that in each workshop when we need travelling and hotel arrangements, we take turns and use our own travel agent. This way we share the burden and the work load, and we split the economic benefits between the two countries.

One partner gives services for the whole project: the SFP has a research center, we use this expertise for the benefit of the whole project and the evaluation for the project is done by the staff of this center.

The CCR has a DED German peace worker, employed at the center, he has the capabilities to write proposals, and reports, and does so for the benefit of the whole project.

Both done after consultation and cooperation.

Each partner has sole responsibility: in the unational projects and missions we work separately.

Responsibility by main partner: The financial reports

The SFP and the CCR have decided to divide the grant into two, and each organization is responsible for the management of the finances and the monitoring of the budget. This is as far as we know the first and only joint Israeli-Palestinian project which is run like that:

1. Staff meetings and management meetings are conducted in the CCRR offices and in the SFP offices. This is no small matter, and we maintain this policy in order to keep the balance, when possible.

2. The encounter projects are conducted in a third country, this helps because the distance gives the participants and the staff some peace of mind, it is safer than in Israel or Palestine, it is isolated, which is important with journalists and it keeps the balance, since we are all guests.

3. The coordinators, and facilitators and translators come from both organizations. The joint representation is important not only on the symbolic level but also on the practical level and of course the input of staff members from both sides and from both organizations, makes the program richer.

4. We built a new model for encounters which takes into consideration the experience of the two organizations and the needs of the participants. The model includes the following points:

a. We see the encounter as a possible micro-cosmos, which means that it is possible through this kind of activity to learn about the relations between Israelis and Palestinians. In order for such a learning process to take place it is necessary to give maximum freedom for natural group dynamics to take place. So for that reason we allow any topic for discussion to come up, we also allow free participation, as opposed to giving turns for speakers, we also allow conflicts to come up, and do not play them down. When we see significant behaviours in the encounter, that we can attribute to the relations between the groups (not to individual characteristics), we contribute our analysis and tie it to the macro relations. So for example, when the Israelis didn't take an activity or mission seriously, we pointed that out as a possible behaviour that is typical of a group that feels superior, and over confident. When the Palestinians, during an activity about the media, stressed the history of Palestinian journalism in Palestine, we pointed out that the group used this fact to stress their rights as natives of this land, as opposed to the Jews, and as part of the political discussion.

b. We conduct the encounters in Hebrew and Arabic with translation, and not in English. This model for dialogue helps stress the fact that there are two identity groups in the meeting, and it coincides with our belief that the encounter is between two national groups and not between individuals (inter-group vs. interpersonal). This model also helps participants express themselves better, and it encourages people from all socio-economic groups to participate, and not only the elite who are usually more fluent in English. The difficulty in using this model is that it is very time consuming, and less spontaneous, but we believe the advantages are by far greater.

c. We work in a model of co facilitation with a Palestinian staff member and an Israeli staff member in all encounter forums. To this we add a translator, as a third staff member, who in our case is always a Palestinian from Israel. This model of intervention is essential as we described above, but it also requires a lot of work for the staff to learn

to cooperate. We decided to make sure that the staff members work at least twice together, and we don't change facilitators and translators in every workshop, we also decided that it is crucial to meet for preparation, and have a summery meeting at the end of each workshop. Of course during the workshops the coordinators support the staff and help them with dilemmas that arise in the "here and now". There are other possible models for intervention, such as third group intervention, or one facilitator in a mixed group, either Israeli or Palestinian, but we chose the co-facilitation model, since we believe it give maximum support to the participants.

d. The model includes four different forums for meetings: uninational groups, small bi national groups, plenary meetings, and mixed working groups. The plenary is a forum that the Palestinians prefer, and it is the closest to reality out side. The small bi national groups are preferred by the Israelis and it gives a chance for more interactive dialogue, the working groups give a chance to experience joint, practical collaboration on a specific mission and the uninational forums stress the conflict between the two groups, and give a chance for deeper reflection and self criticism.

