

I was reminded of Mander's observations by the book which seems to me to be the classic work on the use of violence by the media. The work in question, *Violence as Communication*, was written by two specialists from the Netherlands, Schmid and de Graaf, and published in 1982. In my view, all the questions we have been asking since the beginning of this conference are clearly asked in this work. The book discusses terrorism and the media, and the thesis of the authors is that terrorism can be understood only in the context of communications. "This type of terrorism, insurgent terrorism, has to be explained in relation to the prevailing information order in the news values that are paramount within this order."

I think that the debate should focus on an ethical consideration of information values. I am not talking here about a code of ethics. I am not talking about codes or standards which often lead to self-censorship, but to ethical thinking. Ethics means thinking about values, being patient with what is good, and distinguishing good from bad. For the moment, I would just like to mention two or three things from this book *Violence as Communication*, which gives us some indication of the complexity of the question which this conference requires us to address. These questions were asked yesterday: some of them dealt with censorship and there was one asked this morning about the impact of media coverage on conflicts. Is there an escalation here, is there a cause-and-effect relationship?

Who is affected? Are the effects positive or negative? Is there an effect on the government? The effects of presenting violence are not solely negative, and thus I would not wish to be Manichean in my presentation; rather I would try to qualify what can be said about such effects. Yesterday, Mr. Turner spoke of the influence of demonstrations in the USSR on President Bush. Such an influence may perhaps be positive.

In this summer's issue of the *Columbia Journalism Review*, Daniel Schorr explained that television played an enormous part in changing President Bush's attitude to the Kurds. The author explained that the initial criticism came from the print media, but they did not cause Bush to change his position. He quoted a comment from one of the President's aides concerning a critical article written by William Safire in *The New York*