How to influence and improve peace negotiations and conflict resolutions by communication: A comparative analysis of nonviolent communication and strategic communication, applied to one case study.
Abstract

This thesis approaches the topic of communication strategies that can influence and improve peace negotiations and conflict resolutions. The aim of this thesis is to highlight ways in which the use of communication can possibly pave the way towards a world with less conflicts by researching two communication approaches called nonviolent communication and strategic communication. To achieve a greater understanding of the two communication models, they will be applied to the case study of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Consequently, this thesis will also include a comparative analysis which will highlight differences and similarities between the two approaches where, as a result, the core of communication will be discussed.

Overall, this thesis will highlight the importance of communication. Communication is a topic that affects all areas of life, the area of religion included. This thesis argues that both nonviolent communication and strategic communication are essential approaches in realising what the core of communication entails. To conclude, this thesis states that both of the two chosen communication models are useful, and can possibly pave the way towards a world with less conflicts, but in different ways. This thesis demonstrates that communication can build bridges, make connections, and restore faith in humanity.
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Introduction

One might wonder why the matter of communication so often has been taken for granted, as if it did not require further understanding. Communication, to communicate – is an act that often one believes one knows how to master, since after all speech is the most human activity of them all(Hanson Lasater & Lasater,2009,p.2). However, this thesis argues that communication is a rather complex process that needs further attention. How one communicates leaves more of an impact than one might believe it does. It has been suggested that when one speaks, one makes an impact and in some way changes the world(Hanson Lasater & Lasater,2009,p.4). This thesis agrees with this statement, but also displays how communication can vary, depending on which communication approach one uses. In addition, this thesis demonstrates how complex the matter of communication really is, and how communication approaches affect the difference in outcome. To support this thesis’ standpoint, a few statements below are provided that reflect the basis for the original idea of this thesis:

-“All types of communication informs”(Eder,2011,p.xiii).
-“Communication, if well managed can be powerful in terms of creating change”(Quirke,2008,p.17).
-“Communication is too often taken for granted, when it should be taken to pieces”(Fiske,2011,p.xlix).
-“To share or exchange information, news, or ideas” can be viewed as a descriptive statement of what communicate is truly about(Keys Running,2015,p.10).

The following thesis’ focuses on communication strategies that can influence and improve peace negotiations and conflict resolutions. Recent global events have shown a troubled world filled with conflicts and violence, many of these being religious ones, and it is hoped that this thesis will highlight ways in which the use of communication can possibly pave the way towards a world with less conflicts. This thesis’ research question in order to support the researchers’ arguments goes as follows: How can communication strategies help promote a more peaceful world and why is communication more challenging than we think? Within this thesis, two different communication models will be researched and highlighted: nonviolent communication and strategic communication.
After having outlined this thesis’ methodology, particular emphasis will first be given to establish an understanding of the concepts of nonviolent communication and strategic communication. For the purpose of achieving a more of an in-depth understanding of the two communication models, they will later be applied to the chosen case study of the Cuban Missile Crisis. This will highlight both strengths and weaknesses within each communication model, where conversations between President Kennedy and his staff members on the 18th of October, 1962, will be analysed, as well as a speech made by President Kennedy on the 22nd of October, 1962. The events will be analysed from the perspective of the two communication approaches. In the case study chapters, the researcher will offer a hypothesis for each communication approach, to showcase the researchers’ thoughts about the approaches before the actual process of applying them to the chosen case study. Furthermore, this thesis will, during the case study chapters, provide with various hypothetical scenarios showing how the case study could have turned out if the two communication methods had been used – if nonviolent communication or strategic communication would have been applied, would the events have happened any differently? Furthermore, the events of the case study will allow the researcher to analyse if the turnout could have been different if nonviolent communication and strategic communication would have been used. In addition, the case study analysis chapters will also provide with research to realise if nonviolent communication or strategic communication were in fact used during some scenarios within the case study, and if that would be the case the results of the usage and outcome will be further stated. With that being said, it will not be too much of focus on describing the historical and political features of the case study – since this thesis focuses mainly on researching nonviolent communication and strategic communication. By applying the communication models to the chosen case study, a comparative analysis will also take place, which will highlight strengths and weaknesses within each model. The comparative analysis will then be followed by what the core of communication entails, which will be based on the gathered research from the previous chapters. Lastly, the provided conclusion will offer a brief summary of the gathered findings as well as concluding that this thesis states that both of the two chosen communication models are useful, but in different ways. This thesis demonstrates that communication can build bridges, make connections, and restore faith in humanity.
Methodology

In this thesis, a qualitative approach will be employed, using both primary and secondary sources and text analysis will occur with the framework of two communication models. Using a qualitative approach allows the researcher to conduct systematic observations in order to reach understanding of the topic of this thesis. Nonviolent communication and strategic communication are the theoretical foundation for the analysis. A comparative analysis between the two communication models will also take place by applying them to the case study of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

In the aspect of objectivity, the researcher will be as objective as humanly possible. But, it is worth mentioning Robert Coles, who argues that since the researcher is part of the actual research he or she is conducting, it will not be possible to be completely neutral. After all, he once stated that: “…it is impossible for us to attend everything we hear or see with fine impartiality. We notice what we notice in accordance with who we are…”(Coles,1997,p.7). He argues that what one thinks can depend upon who one is, how one thinks and how one presents one’s observations(Coles,1997,p.40-41). This thesis agrees with Coles’ assumptions. When analysing the different communication models, and the case study, the researcher will be as objective as possible. However, it has to be kept in mind that complete impartiality within research is hardly possible.
Literature review

Marshall B. Rosenberg has contributed with many valuable sources in regards to nonviolent communication, one explanation for that might be because he is the founder of the actual nonviolent communication approach. There are many useful sources, although naturally very similar since they are about the same approach provided by the founder of the nonviolent communication approach. However, one of the main books about nonviolent communication written by Rosenberg is called: “Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Compassion”. This source provides with informative step by step explanations on how this communication process works. Rosenberg believes that the approach can function as a reminder that humans can live in a world where one can relate to each other in a rather natural manner, which might be the reason why nonviolent communication is sometimes also called compassionate communication (Rosenberg, 2002, p.3).

James P Farwell has in “The Art of Strategic Communication” highlighted how strategic communication can be used, where and why. He is one of the first to admit that “…the art of strategic communication specifically aims to influence behavior” (Farwell, 2012, p.xvi). He also added that the art of communication is very much about informing and influencing key audiences (Farwell, 2012, p.xviii). This source is useful for this thesis since it provides with various beneficial definitions on what strategic communication can entail. One definition he provides with is that strategic communication is about: “…the use of words, actions, images, or symbols to influence the attitudes and opinions of target audiences to shape their behavior in order to advance interests or policies, or to achieve objectives” (Farwell, 2012, p.xviii & xix). Since the term of strategic communication is a very broad one, many definitions exist within the world of literature. However, “The Art of Strategic Communication” provides with clear, concise information regarding the strategic communication approach. Besides enlightening one about the strategic communication as an approach, Farwell also argues that is not merely an approach, but also an art to it. Presumably, an art that one must learn, in order to master.

Christopher Paul also provides with a useful source in regards to strategic communication in “Strategic Communication: Origins, Concepts, and Current Debates”. Paul also highlights the fact that there are various definitions concerning strategic communication, but what is most useful with this source is that Paul provides with a concept of strategic communication that consists of four different elements, which thankfully made the matter of strategic communication much more concrete and understandable. The first element believes that informing, persuading, and influencing are essential features within strategic communication,
Secondly, the next element argues the importance of having clear objectives. The third element believes in the qualities of coordination and deconfliction. And the final element believes that actions communicate (Paul, 2011, p. 4-7). This source provides with essential information, more in-depth statements what strategic communication is not only about but how the process can be applied.

In “The Greatest Speeches of President John F. Kennedy”, edited by Brian R. Dudley, the entire speech made by President Kennedy on October 22nd, 1962, during the Cuban Missile Crisis is outlined, word for word. This is an extremely valuable source for this thesis since it provides with worthy analysis material during the case study chapters, when applying the two chosen communication models to certain events during the Cuban Missile crisis, where one of the events being the broadcasted speech made by President Kennedy.

Another useful source for the case study chapters is “The Kennedy Tapes”, edited by Ernest R. May and Philip D. Zelikow. This source provides with valuable actual transcripts from the recorder of Kennedy himself. This source gives this thesis the opportunity to analyse actual conversations from within the White House between President Kennedy and his staff members. It is an important source since it makes it possible to truly analyse actual conversations that took place.
Chapter 1, Nonviolent Communication

Nonviolent communication “NVC” is a communication model founded by Marshall B. Rosenberg, who once stated: “What I want in my life is compassion, a flow between myself and others based on a mutual giving from the heart”(Rosenberg, 2003, p.1). NVC is about the rediscovery of one’s first language: “…the language of the heart, the language of compassion”(Dickinson, 1998, p.61). When researching humans’ ability to remain compassionate, he realised the importance of language and use of words and created NVC in order to be able to communicate in a manner that leads one to give from the heart. According to Rosenberg, when one gives from the heart it does not only create a connection with one’s self, but with others as well, which will consequently result in the natural state of compassion to flourish(Rosenberg, 2003, p.2). It is an approach which “…affords the skilful dialogue with others cradled in a shared sense of significance and supports the development of meaningful identity – one that is formed through the realisation of what exists beyond the self”(Nosek, 2012, p.829).

The term nonviolence is used within NVC to refer to humans’ natural state of compassion, where violence has diminished from the heart(Rosenberg, 2003, p.2). The approach works as a reminder that humans can live in a world where one can relate to each other in a rather natural manner, which might be the reason why NVC is sometimes also called compassionate communication(Rosenberg, 2002, p.3). Rosenberg views NVC as a language of life because according to him it is: “…a way of being, thinking, and living in the world”(Rosenberg, 2012, p.vii). Rosenberg has once stated: “NVC is founded on language and communication skills that strengthen our ability to remain human, even under trying conditions”(Rosenberg, 2002, p.3). It is clear that he believes in humanity itself, and that with NVC the goodness of humanity will show its true potential. Furthermore, Rosenberg described NVC as a display of his understanding of what love entails(Rosenberg, 2012, p.60-61).

In order to relate to one another, it is out of importance to think about how one chooses to express one’s self and how one decides to hear others. Within NVC, one’s chosen words are viewed as conscious responses where one’s awareness reflects what one is perceiving, feeling and wanting(Rosenberg, 2003, p.3). It has been suggested that NVC assists with the necessary tools in order to achieve a more peaceful state of mind since the communication process encourages one to focus on what one truly needs, instead of focusing on what is wrong with one’s self and/or others(Rosenberg, 2003, p.173). When communicating within NVC, one
should express one’s self with honesty in a clear manner whilst at the same time paying attention to others in a respectful and empathic manner. When expressing one’s self with NVC, Rosenberg argues that one will not only hear one’s true needs – but also the needs of others. NVC makes one realise and articulate what one wants in any given situation, and one will realise what the others want in any given situation(Rosenberg,2003,p.3). It goes both ways.

As mentioned, NVC involves the quality of listening, both to one’s self and to others. Rosenberg argues that as a result, this communication approach fosters qualities such as respect and empathy, which in effect promotes a mutual desire to give from the heart(Rosenberg,2003,p.4). It has been suggested that, in the end of the day, NVC is much more than a type of language or a communication process, rather it is an :”…ongoing reminder to keep our attention focused on a place where we are more likely to get what we are seeking”(Rosenberg,2003,p.4). However, what is interesting is that Rosenberg also argues that: “If we stay with the principles of NVC, stay motivated solely to give and receive compassionately, and do everything we can to let others know this is our only motive, they will join us in the process, and eventually we will be able to respond compassionately to one another”(Rosenberg,2003,p.5). One can argue that this statement of his is a nice thought, although also naïve. Since it has already been stated that NVC encourages one to focus on how to get what one is seeking – it seems rather naïve to claim that NVC only consists of the motive of giving and receiving compassionately. Yes, NVC consists of the motive of giving and receiving – but one might wonder how one can be sure that it is all done with compassion in mind, and not strategies.

The NVC process consists of four components. It is this process which should be followed in order for both parties to arrive at a mutual desire to give from the heart. The first component is observations, where one observes what is happening in a situation. One can ask one’s self: What are others saying or doing, and are these events enriching one’s life or not? The second component is called feelings. Here one states one’s feelings after having observed what has just happened – one might be feeling happy or sad, for example. Needs is the third component within the process, where one states which needs one has that are connected to the feelings one has identified. The final fourth component consists of requests. More specifically, in this final component one makes a request by addressing what one wants from the other person that would enrich one’s life(Rosenberg,2003,p.6).
When using the communication process it is advised to not only express the four components in a clear manner, but also to be able to receive these four components of information from others (Rosenberg, 2003, p.6). In other words, it goes both ways. One is allowed to express one’s self, and so is the other party. When following the NVC process, when one is expressing, one should express one’s self in an honest manner. And when one is receiving, one should receive in an empathetic manner (Rosenberg, 2003, p.7). It has been stated that the four components of NVC, if followed, will eventually create a sense of flow within the communication – back and forth – and eventually compassion will be created in a natural manner. The process can either start by empathically receiving these four components of information from others, or by starting with expressing one’s self (Rosenberg, 2003, p.7). With this being said, one might not help but wonder if the process will not be as easy as it sounds, it might be challenging (at least at first) to create a natural flow from the start. Although, it might be that persistence will be enough to provide with enough flow to the conversation. Still, at first one might believe that it sounds almost too optimistic how to get the dialogue started. Rosenberg argues that if one stays focused and motivated to both give and receive in a compassionate manner, whilst letting others know that there are no ulterior motives, the others will eventually join one in the process where both parties will be capable to respond in a compassionate manner towards one another (Rosenberg, 2002, p.5).

It is worth mentioning that the core of NVC is very much about one’s awareness of the four components that should be followed, and not so much about the actual words that are being expressed (Rosenberg, 2003, p.8). One might argue that what that means is that one should focus mostly on the four components process. But, it is still rather interesting – since even though the use of words is significant where one should be detailed and careful how one expresses one’s self – it can be argued that it is in fact the compassionate and empathic sense of being that counts the most.

By using NVC, with one’s self, with others, or in a group, the natural state of compassion will flourish, and therefore, Rosenberg argues, it is an approach that can be applied in various situations and at all levels of communication. With the help of NVC, one can connect with one’s self and with others in a manner that allows one’s natural compassion to flourish. In addition, it has been suggested that NVC can be applied to conflicts and disputes of any nature (Rosenberg, 2002, p.12). Even though one can view that as a rather impressive factor, one might still wonder if the approach does not have too much faith in compassion. If the quality of compassion is what is needed in order to solve conflicts that is wonderful,
especially since it is a quality that humans can create from within themselves, but at first it might sound rather overwhelming. Can something so easy solve something that is anything but?

The four components within the NVC process show how one should express one’s self and how one should listen to others. By using NVC one highlights qualities such as listening, empathy and respect towards one’s self and towards others(Rosenberg,2003,p.12). The first component of NVC, observations, should not be mixed with evaluation, because when these two are combined, people will tend to hear criticism and resist hearing what is actually being said. The key is to avoid generalizations, and make observations that are specific to both time and context(Rosenberg,2003,p.32).

Feelings, to express one’s feelings is the second component of NVC, which might sound easier than it is, especially since professional codes often discourage people from expressing emotions(Rosenberg,2003,p.38). Within the second component, it is crucial to be able to, in a clear manner, express one’s self and one’s emotional state(Rosenberg,2002,p.38). Within NVC, one should remember that when one clearly identifies one’s emotions, it will be easier to connect with one another. One reason for this can be that when expressing one’s feelings, one also simultaneously expresses a sense of vulnerability, which might be helpful when resolving different types of conflicts(Rosenberg,2002,p.41).

The third component of NVC, needs, focuses on acknowledging the root of one’s feelings. NVC states that what others say and do might be the stimulus of one’s feelings – but never the actual cause of one’s feelings. One’s feelings result from how one chooses to receive what others say and do, and also result in one’s needs in that moment(Rosenberg,2003,p.49). There are four options for when one is receiving negative messages. The first option is that one can blame one’s self, where one has accepted the judgement that has been made. The second option is to not accept the judgment, and instead protest and blame others. The third option is to sense one’s own feelings and needs whilst the fourth option is to sense the feelings and needs of others(Rosenberg,2003,p.49-50).

If one connects one’s feelings to one’s needs, and expresses one’s needs in a clear manner, it will be easier for others to respond in a compassionate manner which increases the chances of getting one’s needs met(Rosenberg,2002,p.64). It is often unusual for many to think about needs, especially since people are often used to think about what is wrong with other people and spend their energy on other peoples’ flaws instead of thinking how one can achieve one’s
needs to be met (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 53). It is worth remembering that if one doesn’t value one’s own needs, others might not value them either (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 56). It is rather simple – if one wants one’s needs met, one has to begin by expressing them to others (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 55).

The fourth component, requests, focuses on what one would like to request of others in order to enrich one’s life. When one’s needs are not being met, one follows the process of NVC with the components of what one is observing, feeling, and needing, with a request where one asks for actions that can be able to fulfil one’s needs (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 67). In order for others to be more willing to respond compassionately to meet one’s needs, one should be as specific as possible when making requests (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 74). It can be fruitful to make one’s request in a clear manner that reveals what one truly wants, therefore one should not use vague language in order to avoid confusion (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 70). Especially since often people find it challenging to realise what is actually being requested (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 71). It may be confusing for the one at the receiving end to understand what is being asked from them (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 77).

In regards to confusion, the message that one sends out is not always the message that will be received, if there is any uncertainty if the message has been received as intended, one must be able to request in a clear manner a response which informs how the message has been interpreted, in order to handle any possible confusion or misunderstandings (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 74). One can ask the other to reflect back what he or she heard one say, since his or her reflection will then give one the opportunity to correct any possible misunderstandings (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 79). There can be instances where the listener does not want to reflect back, one can then listen to his or her underlying feelings and needs and begin to empathize with the listener (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 75). Rosenberg has once suggested that one can, ahead of time, be proactive and explain why one will sometimes ask he or she to reflect back one’s words (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 75). However, the fact that one is advised to beforehand explain a possible action one might use in the future makes it arguably a lot of a bigger deal than it is in the first place, which can possibly create a rather uncomfortable energy between one’s self and the other. With this being said, it might depend on how one chooses to provide the needed explanation – perhaps being empathic is enough for the other to feel comfortable.

After having expressed one’s self and having made sure that one’s expression has been understood the way one wanted to, one often would like to realise the other person’s reaction
to what one has said. To realise the other person’s reaction, one wants to either know what the listener is feeling, what the listener is thinking, or whether the listener would be possibly willing to take a specific action (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 77). It might be essential to note that one’s requests are viewed as demands if others believe to be blamed or punished if refusing to comply (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 79). One can show others that one is requesting, not demanding, by clearly showing the desire for others to comply only if they want to do so freely by their own will (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 90). This might be a good idea since the others will not feel like the choice has already been made for them, but rather that they realise it remains their own choice to make.

After having highlighted the first main part of NVC: how to express one’s self in an honest manner, it is now time to cover the second main part of NVC: how to receive in an empathic manner, the NVC process from the receiving end of things. In order to receive empathically, one uses the four components to hear what others are observing, feeling, needing, and requesting (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 91). To be able to understand what receiving empathically truly means, it is worth mentioning the words by Rosenberg, who argued that: “Empathy is a respectful understanding of what others are experiencing” (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 97). When receiving empathically, one listens with one’s whole being, providing with a sense of great presence (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 91-92). Empathy should not be confused with advice or reassurance, rather, empathy is about focusing whole-heartedly on the other person’s message, providing with the necessary time and space for them to express themselves and to feel understood by the receiver (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 92). Being empathic means being present with the other party (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 94). For the receiver, creating empathy is very much about receiving expressions whilst creating a great sense of presence at the same time (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 93). Within NVC, one should only listen to how the other(s) is observing, feeling, needing and requesting (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 94). In other words, when one is listening at the receiving end, one searches for the four components of NVC (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 100).

When one is at the receiving end, it is valuable to paraphrase how one has understood the other party’s message. It has been suggested that paraphrasing saves time (Rosenberg, 2003, p. 100), arguably since confusion can be avoided. When paraphrasing, one forms a set of questions which shows how one has understood the message, in that way it stimulates any necessary corrections to be brought up to surface from the speaker (Rosenberg, 2002, p. 104). By paraphrasing, the other party will either receive an
confirmation that the message has been understood correctly, or it will be realised that there has been a misunderstanding which will give the speaker an opportunity to explain this and correct the receiver (Rosenberg, 2003, p.96).

Rosenberg has once argued: “Empathy is a respectful understanding of what others are experiencing” (Rosenberg, 2002, p.111). It is important to be present when providing empathy where one’s attention remains on the feelings and needs of the other (Rosenberg, 2005a, p.11). One knows when one has correctly empathized with the other person when a sense of relief will be experienced, where tension decreases. Another sign that signals when one has empathized in the most suitable manner is when the other party has stopped speaking, because then the other party has said what it needed to say and feels content with their release of words (Rosenberg, 2003, p.103). Rosenberg has once stated: “We need empathy to give empathy” (Rosenberg, 2003, p.103). To create a sense of understanding between one’s self and others, one must be understanding towards each other, it goes both ways. As Rosenberg once stated: “If I want them to hear my needs and feelings, I first need to empathize” (Rosenberg, 2005c, p.35). In addition, when one listens for feelings and needs, one will not forget people’s humanness, since when one focuses on feelings and needs, one will realise which needs are not being met and it will be easier for one to empathise with the other and create a sense of connection between one another (Rosenberg, 2003, p.120). Even though this might very well be true, it might arguably take practice to create such a connection in particularly stressful situations where the needed focus might be missing.

When one feels unable to empathize, there are various options. The first one is that one can stop, breath and try to give empathy to one’s self. This can be done by listening and reflecting as to what’s going on within one’s self (Rosenberg, 2003, p.103-104). The second option is to scream non-violently, which means that one speaks about ones pain, with no blame involved, using the four components of NVC, where one states one’s feelings and needs (Rosenberg, 2003, p.103-104). The third option is to simply take a time out, where one leaves to gather the needed empathy before returning to tackle the situation at hand with a new state of mind (Rosenberg, 2003, p.104).

It has been suggested that it might be challenging to be empathic towards others that are considered to be one’s superiors (Rosenberg, 2002, p.121). This might be because one feels threatened and uncomfortable since it might be harder for one to relax and at least attempt to empathising with one’s superiors. With that being said, one can argue that being empathic includes overcoming backgrounds and details of a person, since one ought to focus on putting
one’s energy solely on being there for the other. One’s ability to offer empathy gives the opportunity for one to remain vulnerable, stop potential violence, and hear the word no without taking it personally and view it as a rejection (Rosenberg, 2002, p.133).

Within NVC, one has to remember how to treat one’s self. Everyone makes mistakes, and instead of focusing one’s energy on moralistic self-judgments, one can adapt self-forgiveness and realise how one can grow from the experience. One should listen in an empathic manner to one’s self, and then one will be able to listen to the underlying need that one tried to meet – when this connection occurs, so does the realisation of self-forgiveness (Rosenberg, 2003, p.133 & 140). NVC mourning is also considered to be a useful tool to stop criticising one’s self, since NVC mourning trains one’s self to realise when judgmental self-talk appears, so that one can instantly focus one’s attention on the underlying needs that lies behind the judgmental self-talk (Rosenberg, 2003, p.132.). Both self-forgiveness and mourning are considered to be tools to lead one’s self into the path of learning and growing from experiences (Rosenberg, 2003, p.134).

NVC is an approach that believes it is within human nature to enjoy giving and receiving in a compassionate manner, but with this being said, humans have learned various types of life-alienating communication that remove humans from the natural state of compassion, which results in language and behaviours that cause harm not only to one’s self but others as well (Rosenberg, 2003, p.23). It is not unusual that words expressed by humans can cause both hurt and pain (Rosenberg, 2003, p.3). Rosenberg argues that it is not an easy task to change one’s old patterns and behaviour and naturally adapt new thoughts and behaviours that are: “…of value and of service to life” (Rosenberg, 2003, p.171). In order to adapt new valuable thoughts and behaviours, one needs to be able to connect with one’s self, and others to realise which needs would like to be met, but again, Rosenberg argues it is a process since our inherited language has not encouraged to be aware of one’s needs, but to rather be aware of the rules of authority (Rosenberg, 2003, p.171-172). With this being said, Rosenberg notes that it is possible to break the old inherited ways of language pattern and behaviour by remembering some of the main guidelines within NVC: namely to “…separate observation and evaluation, to acknowledge the thoughts or needs shaping our feelings, and to express our requests in clear action language…” (Rosenberg, 2003, p.172).

Furthermore, in regards to life-alienating communication, compliments within NVC are in fact considered to be viewed as a type of life-alienating communication since compliments are viewed as judgments, although “positive” ones (Rosenberg, 2002, p.181). Rosenberg argues,
when discussing compliments that: “…appreciation expressed in this form reveals little of what’s going on in the speaker; it establishes the speaker as someone who sits in judgment”(Rosenberg,2003,p.185). One might wonder how an innocent rewarding compliment can be viewed as a judgment, but Rosenberg argues that there is no such thing as an innocent compliment since one will eventually realise that there is a hidden intent to get something out of having uttered that compliment, which will make the sense of appreciation vanish(Rosenberg,2003,p.186). With NVC, one can express appreciation – but not by uttering a compliment, rather to express appreciation to “…purely celebrate, not to get something in return”(Rosenberg,2003,p.186). It can be suggested that expressing appreciation purely to celebrate is a rather beautiful thought, but one might wonder if it is really possible to overcome the old patterns of giving compliments, especially since there might be people who actually give compliments – without expecting anything from it, and if that is the case it might be hard to see any harm in it.

Anger is arguably like life-alienating communication in a sense, since it can result in injuring one’s self but also others. According to Rosenberg, anger is created by: “…thinking about the wrongness of others…” where instead of focusing on fulfilling needs, one focuses to create judgments about others(Rosenberg,2005c,p.12). Furthermore, it has been suggested that anger does in fact activate one to blame and punish others(Rosenberg,2005c,p.35). Anger is, within NVC, handled by reminding one’s self that anger tries to inform that one’s way of thinking will not likely meet one’s needs. If anger were to be repressed, one would likely express one’s self in an unsafe manner, creating danger for both one’s self but also towards others. NVC tries to avoid any possible danger by using the anger as a trigger to help one realise which unmet needs are causing one’s anger. In that way, one can then start the process of meeting those unfulfilled needs(Rosenberg,2012,p.95-96). It has been suggested that one can start the process by searching within one’s self, to create a higher sense of awareness concerning one’s needs(Rosenberg,2005c,p.11). NVC chooses to search within one’s self when anger occurs in order to realise what the underlying need is, instead of simply using life-alienating communication and making judgments(Rosenberg,2005c,p.11). The sense of anger can almost be seen as a blessing in disguise according to NVC, since it has been stated that: “…anger gives way to life-serving feelings” when one has realised the needs behind the anger(Rosenberg,2002,p.140).

On another note, the ability to sense the needs of one’s self and the needs of others can also be a useful quality in regards to conflict resolutions(Rosenberg,2005d,p.7). It has been discussed
earlier about how to sense needs of one’s own, but it is also worth mentioning that one can train one’s self to sense which needs are being portrayed behind any message of others, no matter how the others decide to express themselves(Rosenberg,2005d,p.7). To be able to sense what people need can be thought of as an essential quality when mediating conflicts. If each side are able to hear the other side’s needs a possible connection can occur that ends the actual conflict(Rosenberg,2005d,p.7).
Chapter 2, Strategic Communication

It has once been stated that: “It appears that those critical of strategic communication view all strategic communication as manipulative, while those who practice it rather view strategy as the best way to reach specific goals (Holtzhausen, 2010, p.75). The word strategy stems from the Greek word “strategos” which can be translated into “the art of the general”. Originally, strategy was a term solely used within the military (Eriksson, 2015, p.509), and so was the concept of strategic communication (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p.3). This changed when the term was adapted and started to be expressed in relation to business situations (King, 2010, p.20), and has now transformed into an umbrella concept which embraces different types of goal-directed communication activities (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p.3). There might be a reason as to why strategic communication has been successfully expanded from the world of military into the world of business administration and organisations, and that reason might be that strategic communication ultimately focuses on conflict – and not the use of force (Nothhaft & Schölzel, 2015, p.19). Here, the connection between business and strategy is yet again shown, since both strategy and business are words that are often associated with competition or conflict (King, 2010, p.21). One possible definition, made by Hallahan et al in 2007, defined strategic communication as: “in its broadest sense, (as) communicating purposefully to advance (the organizations’) mission” (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p.4). Another possible definition, is that strategic communication is about: “…the use of words, actions, images, or symbols to influence the attitudes and opinions of target audiences to shape their behavior in order to advance interests or policies, or to achieve objectives” (Farwell, 2012, p.xix).

In addition, it has also been stated that: “…no tool offers more practical power on a day-to-day basis to advance interests, fulfil policies, attain objectives, and help create conditions that satisfy the requirements of a desired end-state” (Farwell, 2012, p.228). In other words, the term has produced many different definitions as to what it entails (Farwell, 2012, p.xv), however - “…what is clear is that perceptions and understandings of images, policies and actions matter, that the success of many policies is contingent on the support they receive from various populations (both foreign and domestic), and that perceptions are influenced both by what you do and what you say” (Paul, 2011, p.1). The notion of strategic communication is broad, and can be applied in various dimensions (Farwell, 2012, p.xx). It is worth noting that there are various definitions of what strategic communication is about. It is a debated topic and it has
been, and still is, a continuous struggle as to how one should define it, since strategic communication means different things to different people (Paul, 2011, p.2).

It has been suggested that strategic communication is when one coordinates the things one does and the things one says, in support of one’s objectives. It has been argued that strategic communication concerns “…coordinated actions, messages, images, and other forms of signalling or engagement intended to inform, influence, or persuade selected audiences in support of national objectives” (Paul, 2011, p.3). In addition, it has been argued that there are four main elements within the concept that is strategic communication. The first element believes that informing, persuading, and influencing are essential features within strategic communication, especially when persuading policy objectives. Secondly, the next element argues that in order to inform, influence and persuade in an efficient manner, one must have clear objectives, knowing how one’s audience will show support for these objectives. The third element trusts that in order to avoid information fratricide it is essential to obtain the qualities of coordination and deconfliction. And the final and fourth element states simply that actions communicate, where one believes that what one does matters as much as what one says, perhaps even more (Paul, 2011, p.4-7).

Organisational values can be referred to the beliefs of the organisation which creates the foundation for its policies and actions (Mahoney, 2011, p.147). It has been suggested that one should view strategic communication as a strategic communication process, and not so much as a strategic organisational process since then there is a risk that the important focus of communication itself will be forgotten about (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p.4). However, even though there might be a small risk, one can possible disagree with this statement since one can view the actual strategic organisational process as a type of communication process as well, hence the focus on the actual communication process will not be removed. In addition, it has in fact been suggested that the strategic communication process can be viewed as a process which highlights an organisation’s strategic plan whilst putting emphasis on the role of communication when in the process of fulfilling the strategic goals and objectives of the organisation (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p.4). Both organisations and individuals use the term strategy when one describes planned acts of what one will do in order to achieve certain set goals (Mahoney, 2013, p.1). So, in a way the values of an organisation are linked with actions, which are in turn linked with strategic communication. It can be suggested that they are all interlinked. It has been argued that: “Strategic communication is about planning how an organisation will respond to issues that concern it” (Mahoney, 2013, p.12). Furthermore, it
has been suggested that by developing a sense of mutual understanding between the organisation and its key constituencies, the strategic objectives of an organisation can be further advanced. One can view this to be the role of strategic communication (Ristino, 2013, p.1).

What seems clear is that many believe that there is a strong connection between strategic communication and organisation(s), and that the use of strategic communication will be favourable for the organisation(s) – in one way or another. This might be correct since it has, after all, been stated that an organisations’ success is depending on communication skills (O’Hair, Friedrich & Dee Dixon, 2010, p.20). In a general sense, communication makes an important role within organisations (Allen, 2016, p.11). In addition, it has been suggested that one can view strategic communication as not only an organisational discipline but also an organisational practice (Møberg Torp, 2015, p.34). Thus, due to its place within organisations and such that can focus on the public good, strategic communication finds itself somewhere in between “good” and “bad”, since it has the capabilities to do both (Riley et al., 2015, p.202).

It can be argued that strategic communication carries out the main goal of communications according to organisations – purposeful influence (Kryger Aggerholm & Thomsen, 2015, p.174). Strategic communication is often involved when an organisation wants to communicate in a purposeful manner in order to reach its goal and achieve its mission. To be strategic means that the organisation must value communication activities, and be able to, in a clear manner, identify its desired outcomes (Hallahan, 2015, p.256). In order to achieve its mission one should conduct effective strategic communication by firstly analysing situations – where one realises problems and/or opportunities. Then one should confront the entity by the act of researching. When one has decided which particular goals and objectives one wants to achieve, the foundation for planning and evaluating, and also strategy and message development, has been created (Hallahan, 2015, p.244). Both strategic thinking and strategic planning involves an identification process in realising the organisations direction and purpose. The strategy that will be created will be based on the current situation and its circumstances, and alternative courses of action, in case of future need (Hallahan, 2015, p.248).

One might wonder if strategic communication seeks to influence, or if strategic communication focuses solely on informing and communicating? Strategic communication can be viewed as any communication that influences a public, either foreign or domestic (Farwell, 2012, p.35). When influencing, it has been argued, that strategic thinking takes place (Farwell, 2012, p.43). It might be that strategic communication is really about
influence since: “…any thoughtful effort to inform is an effort to influence…”(Paul, 2011, p.43). The art of strategic communication can be viewed as aims to influence behaviour (Farwell, 2012, p.xvi). The strong link between the words influence and strategic communication can harm the reputation of strategic communication as a communication approach. This is because it has been highlighted that many do not approve of the word influence, since it has a bad reputation of being associated with exploitation and manipulation. It has been suggested that if one wants to influence, without having to admit it, one can call it informing instead (Paul, 2011, p.14&43). Although, with this being said, it is worth noting that even though strategic communication can be about informing/influencing, that does not necessarily mean it is manipulative or deceiving as a communication model (Paul, 2011, p.43). It has been suggested that just because one is engaging in deliberate communication and being strategic does not automatically have to mean that one is expressing manipulation, in fact, some strategic communicators view manipulation as time consuming, believing that it will be more efficient and a better choice to, in a strategic sense, act in a collaborate manner whilst being inclusive to others (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p.4). One can suggest that one would not call it a deceiving model, if one exerts influence for the sake of creating change for the better, but then again – who has the power to decide if the change would be worth the act of influence? It would have arguably been helpful if strategic communicators had a sense of shared values that could act as a general form of guidelines, in order to avoid the approach being called words as manipulative and such.

Strategic communication can be used within several areas, such as public relations and marketing. The areas where strategic communication exists, are all areas that in some manner, are familiar with influence and persuasion (Møberg Torp, 2015, p.44). It is a rather complicated process to be able to influence the behaviour of others. It involves cognition (what they actually know), affect (how they feel) and conation (actions). These steps create the foundation for persuasion (Hallahan, 2015, p.251). Persuasion is seen as a crucial quality in order to express one’s self in an effective communicating manner (Cooper & Theobald, 2012, p.95), strategic communication seems to agree with this statement, since it has been suggested that one exerts influence when one persuades, where one can adjust the message in response to the perceived needs and reactions of the one who is being persuaded. It has been argued that due to the fact that both the persuader and the recipient will be on some level both satisfied, the act of persuasion can be viewed as beneficial for both parties (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 2004, p.6). This might be true, although it might be
challenging to view it as beneficial in some ways since persuasion is connected to influence – which is in itself often viewed as a sense of deception. The ability to create persuasive messages is considered to be one of the qualities of an effective communicator (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 2004, p.75). The more shaped one’s message is towards the target audience(s), the more influential one will be as a communicator (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 2004, p.107).

Propaganda is another negatively charged word that one does not liked to be linked to, but it has been argued that there are similarities between propaganda and strategic communication, with the difference being that the word propaganda is more negatively charged than strategic communication. Finding a clear difference between information and propaganda is challenging, hence why propaganda is inevitably linked to strategic communication, since the approach puts focus on the matter of how one should express information (Paul, 2011, p.45). Propaganda and persuasion are intentional and organised acts, motivated by one's own desired outcomes, where one seeks to influence one’s audience in order to get one’s way (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 2004, p.6).

If strategic communication is about communication, then one should value the quality of listening. Listening is important in terms of evaluation, dialogue and policymaking (Paul, 2011, p.162). One can suggest that strategic communication can be viewed as a combination of both communication but also strategy, but even so listening is important, not only in terms of the mentioned acts above, but listening is important in terms of life. If one can’t hear others, then one will not make one’s self heard, which would seriously affect one’s ability to communicate. Strategy itself is a rather forceful notion, since it requires a sense of strategic appreciation of all the factors (such as economic, military, political, and cultural) which will affect the ability to accomplish the needed success (Farwell, 2012, p.153). It is considered to be out of importance to include the development of a strong concept of design within the concept of strategic communication (Farwell, 2012, p.154).

Words are an important factor within strategic communication. The language used when ideas are expressed is essential in regards to the strategy itself (Farwell, 2012, p.57). The power of language within strategic communication is in itself very broad, but it is clear that words have an enough of a strong impact to shape the attitudes and opinions of people (Farwell, 2012, p.58). In regards to speeches, repetition can create a higher emotional intensity level. Also, the use of platforms are often required factors in order to create an effective speech (Price, 2015, p.215). Furthermore it is a good idea to use language that
connects to the audience(s) not only on an emotional level, but also on an intellectual level (Farwell, 2012, p.60-61).

In order to apply the use of strategic communication in a successful manner, it has been suggested that one should have a communication mind-set, meaning highlighting the considerations of what one’s plan will communicate to others and then take into account these considerations in further planning (Paul, 2011, p.178-179). This might be true, since it has been argued that when creating a message, it is out of value to think about the message design beforehand (Allen, 2016, p.16), since message credibility is significant within strategic communication (Allen, 2016, p.61). Within strategic communication, it is not about creating one type of message that works for everyone, rather, messages need to be shaped depending on the audience(s) (Farwell, 2012, p.167).

It has been suggested that what makes strategic communication stand out from other types of communication processes is that it is an intentional process which is considered to be objectives-driven (Kioussis & Strömbäck, 2015, p.384), it can be viewed as an intentional communication process that commits to fulfilling a certain objective (Møberg Torp, 2015, p.44). It has been stated that strategic communication comes with two assumptions. The first one being that the status quo is not satisfactory. And the second assumption is that change is necessary (Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009, p.14). Strategic communication has the ability to provide with wanted information, it has the capacity of influence attitudes towards desired ones, and it has the capability of encouraging specific desired behaviours (Teruggi Page, 2015, p.312). Strategy can be viewed as a planning process that includes: evaluating the current situation, setting goals and specify how they can be implemented and later evaluating how effective the decisions made were (Raupp, 2015, p.524). Tactics can be seen as the steps of the staircase that leads towards the strategic end, where tactics are seen as specific actions necessary to perform one’s chosen strategy (Farwell, 2012, p.175).

Within strategic communication, there are certain strategies one can adapt if needed when in certain scenarios. One of these is called a persuasive strategy which can be used when connecting to the public’s emotions and/or values. It often consists of a selected part of information that one chooses to present to the public. When presenting it, it is not unusual to talk in a language that is not neutral. Furthermore, a persuasive strategy consists of persuasive messages calling for the need to act by highlighting the situation that is at stake (Werder, 2015, p.272-273). Another one is called power strategy, which is considered to
be a coercive technique due to the fact that one brings out one’s use of power as an attempt for compliance by the other party. This sort of strategy is seen to be useful when there might be potential resistance to change (Werder, 2015, p. 273).

Since strategic communication has the ability to influence it has been argued that this communication process should not be taken lightly (Holzhausen & Zerfass, 2011, p. 73), it can be seen as a rather powerful process since it has the ability to influence – and it also has the ability to create change. Since the spectrum of strategic communication is rather large and varied, as a result, strategic communication efforts can either encourage conflict by spreading negative ideas, or the strategic communication efforts can reduce conflict and promote peace by supporting change for the better (Price, 2015, p. 20). In other words, there is a risk with strategic communication, since, if badly executed, consequences can occur (Paul, 2011, p. 9).

With this being said, there is no certainty that the use of well executed strategic communication results in a successful outcome. Although, it has been argued that if one lacks completely any strategic communication there will most certainly not be a chance of a successful outcome (Ristino, 2013, p. 151).

It has been argued that strategic communication must evolve, not only as a theory but as a practice as well (Coombs et al, 2016, p. 153). As stated earlier, strategic communication is an emerging, very broad, phenomenon, and in order to attempt to find a united vision of what strategic communication actually entails, it has been suggested that one important aim of the strategic communication process should be to create a new group of practitioners that might be able to share their experiences and shed some light on what strategic communication truly entails (Holtzhausen & Zerfass, 2015, p. 15).

A possible vision for the future of strategic communication has been highlighted. In this vision, national objectives have been clearly outlined, since one can then realise which objectives can be fulfilled by persuasion and influence (Paul, 2011, p. 8). Furthermore, in this vision, the developing plans of actions one consults with is not just communication and influence experts but also with the ones who have useful situational and cultural knowledge. This vision highlights that communication should work as a dialogue, two-way street, since that can lead to the possibility of policy being shaped based on not only one’s own interests but the interests of others as well in mind (Paul, 2011, p. 9). This vision believes that strategic communication should not only be about explanations but also about: “…finding shared perspectives and common ground, about compromise, about credibility, about legitimacy, about partnership, about support” (Paul, 2011, p. 9). If strategic communication were to be
practiced as in the vision provided above, it has been suggested that an international support can be created, where one aims to do good in the world. With that being said, when selfish interests are being pursued by using effective strategic communication, and when the promise of violating the interests of others are said to be limited to only what is absolutely necessary, one will believe in that promise (Paul, 2011, p. 9). This can suggestively be viewed as a rather unexperienced idea, since one might ask on what specific grounds would make one so easily believe in that promise? The vision does not really say.
**Chapter 3, Nonviolent Communication applied to case study**

*Hypothesis:* The researcher does not believe that the approach of nonviolent communication was used during the Cuban Missile Crisis. This is because the researcher finds it hard to believe that the president and his staff members had compassionate dialogues with each other under such trying circumstances. Nonviolent communication might be a fruitful communication approach, *when time allows it.* Therefore, the researcher cannot imagine that there were patient, ongoing dialogues, back and forth between Kennedy and his staff members. With that being said, when applying the approach of nonviolent communication during certain events, the researcher believes that the dialogues could have turned out differently, by becoming more peaceful and focused. However, even though the dialogues could have changed with the help of NVC, the researcher does believe that the result of the Cuban Missile Crisis events would have remained the same, since within this case study situation the NVC might not be as powerful as needed, although the approach perhaps would have brought up the possibility of a friendlier stance between Kennedy and Khrushchev.

It is worth noting, in order to avoid confusion, that the following text in *italics* below are extracts, provided from direct quotes from President John F. Kennedy and his staff members, in: “The Kennedy Tapes”, edited by Ernest R. May and Philip D. Zelikow. The aim is not to outline every single statement fully, rather, it will be a few statements highlighted which can be applied to NVC. In addition, when the extracts are applied in terms of nonviolent communication, these are only to use in terms of connecting the case study with the communication process. There does not have to be necessarily any truth in the speculations provided of what people should or could have said – it is only for the reason of demonstrating how the communication model works by showing how the researcher believes the communication process could have been applied by speculating in possible (fictional) outcomes.

The first event that will be discussed in regards to the Cuban Missile Crisis is the day of Thursday, the 18th of October, 1962. It was when the final parts of the discovery process took place, where CIA had found more missile sites, and provided with evidentiary support in the form of photos that showed Soviet arms build-up taking place where constructions for a new launch site were in preparation (Munton & Welch, 2012, p.54-55).

On the 18th, the newfound events were being discussed. John McCone stated: *“We think we got the entire island. What we didn’t get because of clouds, we won’t know until after we*
develop them. I think you should know that these six missions involve... ”(May & Zelikow,2002,p.76). Here, one could remember the second component of NVC, to express feelings that allows one to connect with others further(Rosenberg,2003,p.46). John McCon could have said for example: “We feel insecure if we got the entire island” – since he provided with an explanation afterwards it felt like he had to justify his and his colleagues actions, which strengthen the belief that he did not feel secure enough. After this statement, Arthur Lundahl said: “Yes, sir. Mr. President, gentlemen, the first and most important item I would seek to call to your attention is a new area hitherto never seen by us...”(May & Zelikow,2002,p.76). The fourth component of NVC requests(Rosenberg,2003,p.67) is clearly shown in this statement made by Lundahl. He has here, in a clear manner requested what he would like others to do in order to fulfil his needs – to be attentive when he was giving information about a matter.

Later, President Kennedy asked Lundahl the following: "If an unsophisticated observer... If we wanted to ever release these pictures to demonstrate that there were missile there, it would not be possible to demonstrate this to the satisfaction of an untrained observer, would it?"(May & Zelikow,2002,p.77). Within NVC, moralistic judgments is one type of life-alienating communication, where wrongness or badness are implied on the people who don’t act in harmony with one’s own values. Blame, insults, labels, criticism, comparisons are included in the category of moralistic judgements(Rosenberg,2003,p.15). The promotion of violence is being triggered when one uses life-alienating communication, where one for example judges another person(Rosenberg,2003,p.18). If one chooses to live in a judgment filled world, one’s concern will solely focus on who is what(Rosenberg,2002,p.15).

According to Rosenberg one should not exercise the use of blaming since it will not add anything to the motivations one would like to inspire in others(Rosenberg,2002,p.163). Kennedy, by asking that question has actually, if one follows the principles of NVC, expressed himself in life-alienating ways due to several reasons. First, his question signalled an attempt to try to put blame on Khrushchev, by wondering, in a slightly nonchalant yet obvious manner, if an unsophisticated observer would be able to see the missiles in the photos – because if one would, then Kennedy could perhaps put Khrushchev on the spot by blaming him openly. In addition, moralistic judgments occurred from Kennedy’s side by implying wrongness made by Khrushchev and his decision to put missiles in Cuba. In other words, within NVC, Kennedy actually promoted violence, in his attempt of trying to hinder it.
When one expresses one’s self in the life-alienating manner, it means that one is not in touch with one’s feelings and needs (Rosenberg, 2002, p.23). This is rather dangerous since Rosenberg has once stated: “When we’re not able to say clearly what we need and only know how to make analyses of others that sound like criticism, wars are never far away, whether they are verbal, psychological, or physical (Rosenberg, 2012, p.5) – the potential for war was indeed not far away. In other words, it is out of essence to focus on the needs involved, and not on throwing judgments at one another – because when judgments are involved it can be challenging in solving any type of conflict (Rosenberg, 2005d, p.12).

Lundahl replied the question by stating: "I think it would be difficult, sir. By some eight years of experience in looking at the evolution in the Soviet Union, the signature emerges very clearly to us. I think the uninitiated would like to see the missile and the tube that it fits in" (May & Zelikow, 2002, p.77). Here, Lundahl, since being at the receiving end, he should have listened to Kennedy in an empathic manner (Rosenberg, 2003, p.7). In addition it could have been necessary to paraphrase (Rosenberg, 2002, p.104), how he had understood the question made by Kennedy where he could have stated how he had understood the message by saying something like: “It sounds like you are terribly frustrated with this situation because you would like to feel in control and you are unsure how to handle the situation”, and then he would have waited for Kennedys reply. Kennedy’s potential reply could have then given Lundahl the chance to ask him what he would like to request in order to get his needs met.

Another dialogue that took place on the 18th was between Kennedy and Thompson. Kennedy stated: "In other words, under this plan however, we would not take these missiles that they now have out, or the planes they now have out". Whereby Thompson said: “Not in the first stage. I think it would be useful to say that if they were made operational we might, or would - " Kennedy seemingly then interrupted and said: “Of course then he would say that: “Well, if you do that, then we will…” (May & Zelikow, 2002, p.86). This would not have been a discussion if one were to communicate within NVC. Rosenberg provided with a rather powerful statement concerning conflict resolution when he stated: “If people just asked: “Here are the needs of both sides, here are the resources. What can be done to meet these needs?” the conflict would be easy to resolve” (Rosenberg, 2012, p.9). In conflict resolution, it is helpful if both parties can in a clear manner express what they do want – and not just state what they don’t want – for the sake of fulfilling everyone’s needs (Rosenberg, 2012, p.13). It is shown in the extracts just mentioned above that the focus of need is lacking – instead the focus goes to how they (Kennedy and staff) would react if the other side (Khrushchev) did...
something that they would not approve of. It is interesting, because Kennedy has his mind on
interaction with Khrushchev in a sense since he tried to predict how he would have possibly
responded, but what he chose to focus on was not within the right prioritisation level
according to NVC. Furthermore, he didn’t show any eagerness to try to connect with the
other party. It has been stated that: “Respect is a key element of successful conflict
resolution”(Rosenberg,2012,p.15), and at the time where the dialogue took place between
Kennedy and Thompson, Kennedy did not have much focus on respect. Even though that
might be understandable, one might still wonder if it would have made any significant impact
on the process of conflict resolution between the two parties. In order to reach a compromise,
it has been suggested that when discussing strategies both parties clearly state what is wanted
from the other side – at that exact moment by beginning with asking: “Would you be willing
to…”. If the other party is not willing, one can then find out the reason
why(Rosenberg,2005d,p.15).

However, in a sense, perhaps Kennedy, had already come up with the realisation of NVC,
which argues that one can never make others do anything(Rosenberg,2003,p.22). What
Kennedy could have done in that moment though, would be to attempt to connect with the
other party instead of speculating possible fictional scenarios with Thompson. It is worth
noting that, when two disputing parties both have had the chance to express themselves and
receive empathically by using the four components of NVC, observing, feeling, needing and
requesting a solution can often be reached that meets the needs of both parties. With that
being said, there is not always an opportunity for an NVC dialogue to
exist(Rosenberg,2003,p.161). For example, it might be because of time limits when facing
some sort of danger, or it might be that one of the parties may be unwilling to communicate. It
can be suggested that those two reasons just mentioned might have been the case in regards to
the Cuban Missile Crisis.

At one time, the following dialogue took place; President Kennedy: "And then if he says:
“Well if you do that, we’re going to grab Berlin.” The point is, he’s probably going to grab
Berlin anyway”. Ball replied: “Sure. We go ahead”. Kennedy then stated: “He’s going to take
Berlin anyway”. Whereby Alexis Johnson said: “We pay that price”(May &
Zelikow,2002,p.91). This dialogue is another case of life-alienating communication; to deny
responsibility is also considered to be life-alienating communication, since the chosen
language removes awareness of personal responsibility. It clouds one’s awareness of the fact
that one is responsible for one’s own thoughts, feelings and also
actions (Rosenberg, 2003, p.19). It is understood that their thought process was to cause as little harm as possible, considering the alternative – but even though it is stated that they will pay the price and will go ahead, they still, in a way, removed personal responsibility by arguing that, no matter what, the take down of Berlin will happen, acting as if it was out of their hands anyways.

The second event that will now be discussed in regards to the Cuban Missile Crisis is the day of President Kennedy’s radio and televised speech on Monday the 22\(^{nd}\) of October, 1962. On the day of his speech, President Kennedy sent an extensive letter to the Soviet chairman where he, amongst other things, stated the following: “In our discussions and exchanges on Berlin and other international questions, the one thing that has most concerned me has been the possibility that your Government would not correctly understand the will and determination of the United States in any given situation, since I have not assumed that you or any other sane man would, in this nuclear age, deliberately plunge the world into war which it is crystal clear no country could win and which could only result in catastrophic consequences to the whole world, including the aggressor” (Kennedy, 1999, p.61-62). This is worth noting since it displays an attempt from Kennedy’s side to reach out to the other party, which is in a way a part of NVC since it shows an awareness of the other party and an attempt to connect with the other party. With that being said, the letter was not written in a NVC manner.

It is worth noting, in order to avoid confusion, that the following text in italics below, are extracts from the speech made by President John F. Kennedy, which is provided in: “The Greatest Speeches of President John F. Kennedy”, edited by Brian R. Dudley. The aim is not to outline every single part of the speech, rather, it will be a few statements highlighted that can be related to NVC in some manner or form. In addition, when the extracts are applied in terms of nonviolent communication, these are only to use in terms of connecting the case study with the communication process. There does not have to be necessarily any truth in the speculations provided of what Kennedy could or should have said in the speech – it is only for the reason of demonstrating what the communication model is about by showing how the researcher believes the communication process could have been applied by speculating in possible (fictional) outcomes of the speech.

In order to apply the speech on NVC, it is thought to be innovating to apply NVC in terms of the NVC process of the four components: observation, feelings, needs and requests (Rosenberg, 2003, p.7). It is out of importance to keep in mind that, normally, NVC is not really applied on speeches, because, for example, the events in speeches are often past
tense, whilst NVC works with present situations. However, the case study aims to achieve a greater understanding of the NVC as a model, and by applying it to the speech the important components of the NVC process will still be very much highlighted, just not applied as they normally would have been in present tense and as a full on process ritual. Furthermore, other guidelines and NVC remarks will be highlighted whenever suitable.

The beginning of the speech was expressed in the following manner: “Good evening, my fellow citizens: This Government, as promised, has maintained the closest surveillance of the Soviet military build-up on the island of Cuba. Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere(Dudley,2000,p.37). Here, it can be suggested that President Kennedy expressed himself partly within the first component of NVC – observations. One can argue this since he stated in a clear and obvious manner how the actions have been observed by himself and the government. However, it is out of importance that within the first component that one should express one’s self being free from judgment or evaluation(Rosenberg,2003,p.7), and Kennedy almost succeeded since he mostly expressed himself in a very “matter of fact” manner – but he used judgment when calling the missiles offensive, and he took for granted that the bases were there in order for a nuclear strike capability to exist against the Western Hemisphere. Later in the speech he was more able to express himself within the first component that is observations where he in a detailed, but non-judgmental manner said the following: ”The characteristics of these new missiles sites indicate two distinct types of installations. Several of them include medium range ballistic missiles, capable of carrying a nuclear warhead for a distance of more than 1,000 nautical miles”(Dudley,2000,p.37).

Later in the speech, Kennedy stated the following: “...by the presence of these large, long-range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction – constitutes an explicit threat to the peace and security of all the Americas... ”(Dudley,2000,p.38). Here it can be suggested that the speech would have been more powerful and even more relatable if he would have expressed himself within the second component that is feelings. To express what one is feeling when having observed a certain action(Rosenberg,2003,p.6) would have been suitable here. In the speech later on, it would have also been appropriate to express in a more evident form what he is feeling when he stated: “The size of this undertaking makes clear that it has been planned for some months”(Dudley,2000,p.38) – was he feeling scared, or maybe
irritated? One could argue that he must have been scared, since the majority would react that way when being presented with such an enormous threat. Yes, nonviolent communication should arguably be used in present tense, but Kennedy could have taken inspiration from the second component at least, since his feelings during certain discoveries would have been manifested, which arguably could not have hurt the outcome of the speech, rather, it could have arguably strengthened it.

The following extract from the speech can be related to the third component of NVC which are needs: “But this secret, swift, and extraordinary build-up of Communist missiles – in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere, in violation of Soviet assurances, and in defiance of American and hemispheric policy – this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil – is deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country, if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe”(Dudley,2000,p.39). Which needs that create one’s feelings(Rosenberg,2003,p.6), as argued he must have felt scared because of the presented threat, and in the extract just mentioned above one can argue that Kennedy’s needs are for the threat to disappear.

The fourth component is clearly shown within the speech of Kennedy later on. The fourth component, requests – states what one wants from the other person in order to fulfil one’s (so far) unmet needs(Rosenberg,2003,p.6). The fourth component of NVC is clearly shown within the following statement: “I call upon Chairman Khrushchev to halt and eliminate this clandestine, reckless, and provocative threat to world peace and to stable relations between our two nations. I call upon him further to abandon this course of world domination, and to join in an historic effort to end the perilous arms race and to transform the history of man. He has an opportunity now to move the world back from the abyss of destruction – by returning to his government’s own words that it had no need to station missiles outside its own territory, and withdrawing these weapons from Cuba – by refraining from any action which will widen or deepen the present crisis – and the by participating in a search for peaceful and permanent solutions’”(Dudley,2000,p.41).

It seems like Kennedy was familiar with the views of NVC since this approach has argued that it is out of essence to remember that one can replace language, by instead of using language that implies lack of choice, one can adapt a language that actually acknowledges choice(Rosenberg,2003,p.21). Kennedy did so in arguably a unique way – he acknowledged
choice, many times, in various formulations – but in the end it was actually only one choice it was all about: withdraw the missiles and return home. The way he formulated it though, was rather impressive, since it did not sound like a harsh demand. Normally, people who hold positions of authority, often communicate in a manner where one’s desires sound like demands, which can block the quality of compassion since a demand is often connected to punishment or blame if orders would not to be followed(Rosenberg,2003,p.22). It could not have been easy to articulate in a manner that did not sound like a demand, but rather more of a journey to take together towards a brighter future.

Within the approach of nonviolent communication, it has been suggested that when one expresses one’s vulnerability, it can help resolve conflicts(Rosenberg,2003,p.40). This element of NVC is shown in the speech by Kennedy when he stated the following: “We have no wish to war with the Soviet Union – for we are a peaceful people who desire to live in peace with all other peoples. But it is difficult to settle or even discuss these problems in an atmosphere of intimidation”(Dudley,2000,p.41). Sometimes it can be brave to be fragile – arguable by showing vulnerability it is easier for one to relate on a more humane level.

Towards the end of the speech, Kennedy turned to the people of Cuba and stated: “Finally, I want to say a few words to the captive people of Cuba, to whom this speech is being directly carried by special radio facilities. I speak to you as a friend, as one who knows of your deep attachment to your fatherland, as one who shares your aspirations for liberty and justice for all”(Dudley,2000,p.41). Kennedy also stated, at a later stage: “And I have no doubt that most Cubans today look forward to the time when they will be truly free – free from foreign domination, free to choose their own leaders, free to select their own system, free to own their own land, free to speak and write and worship without fear or degradation. And then shall Cuba be welcomed back to the society of free nations and to the associations of this hemisphere”(Dudley,2000,p.42). One can argue that it would be impossible when showing sympathy that one could block compassionate communication, but within NVC it is stated that when thinking based on terms of “who deserves what” it blocks compassionate communication(Rosenberg,2003,p.22). Frankly, it can easily be seen that it was meant as an act of sympathy, but in terms of NVC it might be speculated that the blockage occurs due to the fact that then the “language of life”, the language of compassion all of a sudden becomes divided, when it should arguably be a united language for everyone. Again, these are only speculations, but there might be something to them.
The reason why violence exists is, according to NVC, when one argues that it is because of others that one is in pain and the others should therefore rightfully be punished for causing that pain (Rosenberg, 2002, p.141). In his speech, Kennedy could have easily argued that it is because of Khrushchev that they were put in a threatening, unknown situation. But he didn’t. Thus, viewed from this perspective, NVC would have argued that Kennedy did not contribute to any reason for violence to exist, when he uttered the following: “The path we have chosen for the present is full of hazards, as all paths are – but it is the one most consistent with our character and courage as a nation and our commitments around the world. The cost of freedom is always high – but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission” (Dudley, 2000, p.42). Not once did Kennedy within this extract say that they were in that situation because of someone else, instead that passage focused on the challenges of life, where one shall stay united and follow through, despite any obstacles that might occur.

NVC involves the art of connecting, both with one’s self and others (Hanson Lasater & Lasater, 2009, p.14), and the elements within the speeches that were NVC friendly, truly displays that as well. The nonviolent communication approach has, as shown above, proved that one can connect with people, without having to disconnect with others. NVC shows that one can express one’s self, in a peaceful, yet efficient, manner. NVC can be considered efficient since this communication approach has realised how to listen to one’s inner needs and how to express them – in fact, it has been argued, that the clearer one is about what one wants, the more likely it is that one will get it (Rosenberg, 2003, p.74). In addition, when speaking of NVC, Judith Hanson Lasater highlighted three mantras, namely the following: “Tell the truth. Tell the truth. Tell the truth” (Hanson Lasater & Lasater, 2009, p.13). It can be argued that Kennedy agreed with these mantras – he remained honest throughout his speech, without the need of provoking with unnecessary comments.
Chapter 4, Strategic Communication applied to case study

Hypothesis: The researcher does believe that the approach of strategic communication was applied during the Cuban Missile Crisis, due to the fact that it is easy to believe that the president and his colleagues discussed strategic alternatives in order to realise which option to decide for when attempting to tackle the problem called the Cuban Missile crisis. Also, since the term of strategic communication is a rather elastic notion, it means that there is a broader spectrum of what strategic communication entails – which is as to why the researcher believes will increase the possibilities of strategic communication taking place within the case study. With that being said, when applying the approach of strategic communication during certain events, the researcher believes that the dialogues could have turned out differently, by becoming more influential and further altered in order to enhance the prospects for one’s self and its organisation, which in this case, would be the government of the United States. The researcher does believe that the result of the Cuban missile crisis events would have remained the same, due to the belief that there were a lot of strategic communication already involved. However, with that being said, the case study might shed light on further strategic communication options that the researcher would not have noticed otherwise.

It is worth noting, in order to avoid confusion, that the following text in *italics* below are extracts, provided from direct quotes from President John F. Kennedy and his staff members, in: “The Kennedy Tapes”, edited by Ernest R. May and Philip D. Zelikow. The aim is not to outline every single statement fully, rather, it will be a few statements highlighted which can be applied to strategic communication. Some of the extracts might be the same as from previous chapter, which is intentional. It can be suggested that it will highlight further differences and possible similarities between the two chosen communication models. In addition, when the extracts are applied in terms of strategic communication, these are only to use in terms of connecting the case study with the communication process. There does not have to be necessarily any truth in the speculations provided of what people should or could have said – it is only for the reason of demonstrating how the communication model works by showing how the researcher believes the communication process could have been applied by speculating in possible (fictional) outcomes.

18th of October and 22nd of October, in the year of 1962, are the days that will be highlighted within this case study, starting with the 18th.
It has been suggested that strategic communication means realising one’s potential within four areas: situational knowledge, goal setting, communication competence and anxiety management (O’Hair, Friedrich & Dee Dixon, 2010, p.24&178). President Kennedy stated, when in dialogue with Lundahl the following: “If an unsophisticated observer... If we wanted to ever release these pictures to demonstrate that there were missile there, it would not be possible to demonstrate this to the satisfaction of an untrained observer, would it?” Whereby Lundahl replied: "I think it would be difficult, sir. By some eight years of experience in looking at the evolution in the Soviet Union, the signature emerges very clearly to us. I think the uninitiated would like to see the missile and the tube that it fits in’" (May & Zelikow, 2002, p.77). This question raised by President Kennedy supports the argument that the “reality” within politics is a sense of perception, where one chooses how to share certain information by calling it insights (Farwell, 2012, p.186). Within the view of strategic communication, Kennedy wanted to share this information and use it to his advantage. Here the display of situational knowledge can be found (O’Hair, Friedrich & Dee Dixon, 2010, p.24). It can be suggested that this was what Kennedy attempted to do, he tried to, in a strategic manner, gather situational knowledge and find a solution with the resources that he had. The reply by Lundahl, can consequently highlight the use of words within strategic communication. It is argued that the words one uses does not solely communicate things to others but in fact also forms how one’s self thinks about the words which were uttered (Paul, 2011, p.59-60). If one were to reflect back on the answer made by Lundahl, it can be suggested that he understood the reasons for asking the question, since he did not seem to be surprised in any way. It arguably was somewhat of a disappointing response where he didn’t want to turn down the idea, but rather had to, since it was not going to be fruitful in the end.

Goal setting, can be seen within strategic communication as the realising of potential, when stating clear goals for the communication situation at hands, by expressing clear goals the communication itself is more likely to succeed where one’s vision will be expressed suitably (O’Hair, Friedrich & Dee Dixon, 2010, p.24). Goal setting occurred in the following extract where Dean Rusk stated: “The first question we ought to answer is: Is it necessary to take action? And I suppose that there is compelling reason to take action here. For if no action is taken, it looks now as though Cuba is not going to be just an incidental base for a few of these things, but basically an...” (May & Zelikow, 2002, p.77). Dean Rusk later continued and stated: “That best course would be, he says, a carefully worded and serious
letter to Khrushchev, before we take the action, the steps, and then followed by a declaration of war. We were talking about this last night. I think it is in this range of problems that we need to concentrate our attention, Mr. President. Otherwise we just… how we see the nature of the threat. I think our Defense colleagues ought to talk a moment about the actual military aspect of the threat itself” (May & Zelikow, 2002, p.81). These provided examples show a clear goal setting, first by stating a clear goal for the communication itself – to answer the question of taking action or not. Furthermore, Rusk continued with goal setting later on as well, when the goal was to concentrate one’s attention on certain problems in order to arguably obtain some sense of control.

Anxiety management is viewed to be an area where one’s potential is shown within the use of strategic communication, strategic communication views anxiety management as the management of a pressured situation that would, in normal case cause anxiety, but instead it gets handled by using one’s nerves as an energetic advantage. When handling anxiety management correctly within strategic communication, one’s passion will be clearly shown amongst one’s sense of responsibility (O’Hair, Friedrich & Dee Dixon, 2010, p.24&178). During the 18th of October, the following extract from a conversation took place; Dillon: “Well, that’s the danger. To have already acted in Cuba and –“, McNamara: “Well, when we’re talking about taking Berlin, what do we mean exactly? Does he take it with Soviet troops?”, President Kennedy: “That’s what it would seem to me”, McNamara: “Then we have...I think there’s a real possibility. We have U.S. troops here. What do they do?”, Taylor: “They fight”, McNamara: “They fight. I think that’s perfectly clear”, President Kennedy: “And they get overrun”, McNamara: “Yes, they get overrun, exactly”, Unidentified: “Well, you have a direct confrontation”, Robert Kennedy: “Then what do we do?”, Taylor: “Go to general war, if it’s in the interest of ours”, Unidentified: “It’s then general war. Consider the use of...”, President Kennedy: “You mean nuclear exchange?” (Brief pause.) Taylor: “Guess you have to”, Bundy: “I do see your... If you...” (May & Zelikow, 2002, p.92). During this conversation, anxiety management was shown in more ways than one. First of all, every participant in that conversation expressed anxiety management, at least on some level. Every participant expressed a sense of passion, since they were all involved in the dialogue, adding to the dialogue in an efficient manner, without showing anxiety when discussing possible outcomes. With that being said, one can argue a flicker of nerves showing when the discussion eventually lead to general war, and later possible nuclear exchange.
The following passages will now focus on the events of 22\textsuperscript{nd} of October, when President Kennedy held his speech. One can begin by mentioning that communication competence is another area considered to be within the approach that is strategic communication. When one is planning communication in a strategic manner, a number of factors will be included, for example: type of message, type of channel and type of delivery for when expressing the message(O’Hair, Friedrich & Dee Dixon, 2010, p. 24). The outline for which type of message that was going to be sent out with the help of the speech can be seen in the following dialogue that occurred mere hours before the speech, where President Kennedy stated: \textit{A blockade as it will be announced will be for the movement of weapons into Cuba. But we don’t know what the (Soviet-) block ships will do. In order not to give Mr. Khrushchev the justification for imposing a blockade on Berlin, we are going to start with a blockade on the shipment of offensive weapons into Cuba but stop all ships. Now we don’t know what the bloc ships will do. We assume that they will probably... We don’t know what they’ll do, whether they’ll try to send one through, make us fire on it, and use that as a justification on Berlin or whether he’ll have them all turn back. In any case were going to start on offensive weapons’”(May & Zelikow, 2002, p. 170). Later, President Kennedy further clarified his decision when stating: ”\textit{As for the choice between doing nothing, we felt that that would imperil Berlin rather than help it, and imperil Latin America}(May & Zelikow, 2002, p. 171). In the extract just mentioned, one can see how the type of message was created, not only as a plan of action but also a message to the world. The type of message Kennedy and his close surroundings one might argue was indeed a very tactical one, due to several reasons. The message followed two assumptions of strategic communication, by signalling that the status quo was not viewed, from their side at least, as satisfactory. Furthermore, the message signalled that not only was change needed, but change was also coming(Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009, p. 14). The chosen message was tactical, powerful – without being too extreme. It took a while for Kennedy and his team to realise which approach to follow, and by starting off with a blockade showed enough aggressiveness to show one takes the matter seriously, but still not coming off too aggressive by giving the other party’s side the opportunity to terminate their initial plan. It is worth noting, in order to avoid confusion, that the following text in \textit{italics} below, are extracts from the speech made by President John F. Kennedy, which is provided in: \textit{“The Greatest Speeches of President John F. Kennedy”}, edited by Brian R. Dudley. The aim is not to outline every single part of the speech, rather, it will be a few statements highlighted that can be related to strategic communication in some manner or form. Some of the extracts
might be the same as from previous chapter, which is intentional. It can be suggested that it will highlight further differences and possible similarities between the two chosen communication models. In addition, when the extracts are applied in terms of strategic communication, these are only to use in terms of connecting the case study with the communication process. There does not have to be necessarily any truth in the speculations provided of what Kennedy could or should have said in the speech – it is only for the reason of demonstrating what the communication model is about by showing how the researcher believes the communication process could have been applied by speculating in possible (fictional) outcomes of the speech.

To create efficient messages, they should be appropriate within the cultural context and they should also display a sense of understanding if one wants others to listen carefully. Furthermore, one should also match messages to appropriate media channels in order to reach full effect (Paul, 2011, p.163). In the speech, Kennedy said: “Good evening, my fellow citizens: This Government, as promised, has maintained the closest surveillance of the Soviet military build-up on the island of Cuba. Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere” (Dudley, 2000, p.37). In terms of strategic communication, the extract just mentioned above can be viewed as appropriate within the cultural context since he started off the speech with “my fellow citizens” it was a clear signal showing that he stood not only by the people – he was amongst the people, united. In terms of cultural context he had managed within the first sentence to show his loyalty whilst following the norms of cultural context. In a way, by showing his loyalty it kind of promoted a sense of understanding as well, arguably sending off signals that since they were all in the same situation he knew how they felt because he felt the same. However, his display of understanding was more obvious when he said: “...this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in fullest detail” (Dudley, 2000, p.37). He understood his fellow people, and could connect with their state of emotions. By stating “in fullest detail” also, rather strategically, arguably showed that he was a man with honour and one that one could have fullest confidence in.

It was, one can suggest, strategically appropriate to hold a speech reaching out to the broadest possible audience, since within politics at least, it has been suggested that one must address any negative message, since, if not, the audience will believe them (Farwell, 2012, p.196).
Hence, even though a negative message will continue to be a negative message no matter how one tries to express it – it is suggested to set the record straight in order to take control over the situation and to avoid any unnecessary speculation. Thus, in order to avoid confusion and show where one stands in regards to the matter one should address the message sooner rather than later. Within strategic communication, one should be the first in exposing any type of negative news since it is, in the long run, better to share it, before anyone has the time to accuse one. As it has been stated: “Protecting credibility is more important over the long term than the short-term negative consequences of whatever error has been committed”(Paul,2011,p.151). In addition, since it has been suggested that uncertainty often causes more stress for people, than that it does by bad news(Quirke,2008,p.143), one can argue that it was strategically correct to address the situation at the time that he did.

In regards to type of channel, Kennedy chose to send out his message by broadcasting it via mass media communication channels, namely radio and television. Television can be used as a rather powerful tool within strategic communication, since it has been proved that it can shape attitudes, values, and opinions(Farwell,2012,p.183). Furthermore, radio is also considered to be yet another useful mass communication tool within the strategic communication sphere(Farwell,2012,p.201). People turn to the mass media in order to attempt making sense of the world one lives in(Johnson-Cartee & Copeland,2004,p.127), this might then be why Kennedy decided on both of these mass media tools, since at that time it was arguably the most used mass media communication channels that existed, which meant that he had the opportunity to reach out to people in the most efficient, and back then arguably most reliant, manner.

Strategy can be viewed as a planning process that includes: evaluating the current situation, setting goals and specify how they can be implemented and later evaluating how effective the decisions made were(Raupp,2015,p.524). It can be suggested that one can then use the process of tactics to help one in the planning process. This is because tactics can be seen as the steps of the staircase that leads towards the strategic end, where tactics are seen as specific actions necessary to perform one’s chosen strategy(Farwell,2012,p.175). Kennedy evaluated the situation in his speech in the following manner: “The characteristics of these new missiles sites indicate two distinct types of installations. Several of them include medium range ballistic missiles, capable of carrying a nuclear warhead for a distance of more than 1,000 nautical miles. Each of these missiles, in short, is capable of striking Washington, D.C., the Panama Canal, Cape Canaveral, Mexico City, or any other city in the southeastern part of
the United States, in Central America, or in the Caribbean area. Additional sites not yet completed appear to be designed for intermediate range ballistic missiles – capable of traveling more than twice as far – and thus capable of striking most of the major cities in the Western Hemisphere... ”(Dudley,2000,p.37). By evaluating in this manner, Kennedy expressed the seriousness of the situation so that everyone understood that this was an urgent matter that had to be dealt with.

When one wants to persuade someone to adopt a new point of view, one should not attack that someone’s current view(Paul,2011,p.60). This is arguably because that someone could then become defensive and it will be harder for one to execute persuasion, which is an important factor within strategic communication, as mentioned earlier. In the speech Kennedy said: "Only last Thursday, as evidence of this rapid offensive build-up was already in my hand, Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko told me in my office that he was instructed to make it clear, once again, as he said his government had already done, that Soviet assistance to Cuba, and I quote, “pursued solely the purpose of contributing to the defense capabilities of Cuba,” that, and I quote him, “training by Soviet specialists of Cuban nationals in handling defensive armaments was by no means offensive, and if it were otherwise,” Mr. Gromyko went on, “the Soviet Government would never become involved in rendering such assistance”. That statement was also false”(Dudley,2000,p.38). One might understand the reason for uttering this statement, to enhance the honest image of himself, whilst putting blame on the Soviet Union. One of the possible main goals within strategic communication is to create a sense of credibility(Paul,2011,p.50), and arguably he just did that by showing his honest efforts being shattered by manipulative actions. However, since he wanted to persuade them to change their point of view and planned action, according to strategic communication one should not have then attacked someone’s current view, and already made actions might be included here as well. In order to persuade someone it might not be the best of ideas to blame them first. In this scenario, Kennedy should have kept in mind the suggestion saying that successful leadership involves knowing how to conduct effective strategic communication(Farwell,2012,p.115).

Another long term goal within strategic communication is to promote the importance of shared values(Paul,2011,p.51), which he in a way did when he stated: “For many years, both the Soviet Union and the United States, recognizing this fact, have deployed strategic nuclear weapons with great care, never upsetting the precarious status quo which insured that these weapons would not be used in the absence of some vital challenge”(Dudley,2000,p.39). Here, he pointed out that they had been on the same page in regards to the nuclear matter, and that
they should continue to promote the importance of shared values. Furthermore, by using the word status quo, the element of strategic communication was shown, since after all – the word status quo means within strategic communication that one should be happy with it, and if not one should do something about it. So, his statement above, where he mentioned status quo – he remembered a time where that status quo was acceptable for him and the US. But with that being said, it also showed that the crisis changed the status quo into something that the US felt the need to change, arguably understandably so.

In regards to the status quo he later added: “...this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil – is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country, if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe”(Dudley,2000,p.39). Here he made it abundantly clear that the status quo had been changed into an US disadvantage. Also, the above statement showed Kennedy’s thoughts being yet again familiar with the strategic communication approach by arguing that they were strategic weapons due to their position in Cuba.

Kennedy then later highlighted his aims by stating: “Our unswerving objective, therefore, must be to prevent the use of these missiles against this or any other country, and to secure their withdrawal or elimination from the Western Hemisphere”(Dudley,2000,p.39). Later, he provided with an explanation how his goals could be fulfilled by stating: “I have directed that the following initial steps be taken immediately: First: To halt this offensive build-up, a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba is being initiated. All ships of any kind bound for Cuba from whatever nation or port will, if found to contain cargoes of offensive weapons, be turned back. This quarantine will be extended, if needed, to other types of cargo and carriers”(Dudley,2000,p.40). He stated further how his goals could be fulfilled by providing with a public message to Chairman Khrushchev where he stated: “I call upon Chairman Khrushchev to halt and eliminate this clandestine, reckless, and provocative threat to world peace and to stable relations between our two nations. I call upon him to further abandon this course of world domination, and to join in an historic effort to end the perilous arms race and to transform the history of man. He has an opportunity now to move the world back from the abyss of destruction – by returning to his government’s own words that it had had no need to station missiles outside its own territory, and withdrawing these weapons from Cuba – by refraining from any action which will widen or deepen the
present crisis – and then by participating in a search for peaceful and permanent solutions” (Dudley, 2000, p.41).

There are additional guidelines that can be followed with the aim of creating successful outcomes within strategic communication, these ones are being highlighted here: The first one is to define the winning objectives, what success looks like. The second one is to identify assumptions that makes it possible to reach the objectives. Thirdly, one shall create a strategy that will lead to victory. Then, one should create a design concept where the strategy turns into actionable tactics so that one can later implement the plan. The next step will then be to use strategy to highlight the issues that need to be tackled and to see who are involved within the strategy. Here on should also create a message which defines the stakes. It is then time for identifying credible messengers and also the most suitable channels of communication. Then one should think about how to tackle media responses and then identify the overall level of success (Farwell, 2012, p.144). As perhaps already realised, these guidelines have already, in a manner, been followed by Kennedy. The winning objectives being the Soviet’s retreat from Cuba and the removal of missiles. Identifying options in order to reach objectives was made when Kennedy requested Khrushchev to retreat but also in creating the blockade with the help of the quarantine. The chosen strategy was to be truthful, informative and detailed in his broadcasted television and radio speech where he requested action in order to avoid possible global destruction, this was in a way also the design concept since the actionable tactics were presented here as well. The strategic choice of broadcasted speech highlighted the issues that needed to be dealt with. It was detailed in its message where the stakes were outlined. Being president might arguably be the most credible messenger and suitable channels had already been decided on. In other words, these guidelines were in general followed, just not necessarily in the order mentioned above.

It is also worth noting that the order in which messages are delivered - when they are being communicated, is vital in terms of how not only to create impact, but then how to be able to increase it step by step (Farwell, 2012, p.166). Kennedy managed to create an impact, since the severity of the situation was truly realised. Furthermore, one can also suggest that his speech increased by each paragraph in terms of creating reactions and achieving the audience(s) attention.
Chapter 5, Analysis

The following comparative analysis will be based on the two chosen communication approaches when applied to the case study of the Cuban Missile Crisis. The case study of the Cuban Missile Crisis was largely based, as noted, on “The Kennedy Tapes”, edited by Ernest R. May and Philip D. Zelikow. The researcher has realised that even though it was decided by Kennedy himself on what to put on record, there was still enough evidentiary support to realise that his and his teams’ communication style was genuine. Hence, “The Kennedy Tapes” was the main source when applying both concepts from nonviolent communication and concepts from strategic communication during scenarios where dialogues took place.

With this being said, in terms of applying the chosen communication models on the speech made on the 22nd of October, the source that proved to be useful was “The Greatest Speeches of President John F. Kennedy”, edited by Brian R. Dudley.

To being with, it might be out of interest to shed some light on the stated hypotheses that were contributed in the beginning of each case study chapters. In regards to the hypothesis made before applying NVC to the case study, it can be seen that it was not perhaps the most accurate one, but not the most incorrect one either. The researcher was right in thinking that the NVC approach had not been the most used communication approach, although there were glimpses of it in terms of the ability to make requests. However, the lack of use of NVC did not affect the ability to still apply it and imagine possible outcomes. Rather, it was interesting, to realise, how easy it is to communicate in a non-compassionate manner, without even reflecting upon it. For example, the matter of life-alienating communication within NVC is shockingly easy to end up with, without even realising it. It is interesting to think about the fact that the promotion of violence can be triggered solely by the use of life-alienating communication (Rosenberg, 2003, p.18). In fact that is rather scary if thinking about it – all these people across the globe silently judging or blaming others (or one’s self) whilst simultaneously, without knowing, contributing to violence.

NVC highlighted that even though it might be challenging in adapting the process without having the arguably requested time, it still highlighted the possibility to live in a friendlier environment, if one were to focus on needs of others. It was shown clearly where the dialogue between Kennedy and Thompson took place and the view of conflict resolution within NVC was highlighted. Imagine if Kennedy and his staff would have focused on needs instead of wasting energy by focusing on how they would have reacted if Khrushchev acted in a manner that would not have been approved of.
In addition, the hypothesis showed the researcher’s belief that dialogues could have turned out differently – is correct. Luckily though, the Cuban missile crisis ended in the best possible way, which is rather surprising when thinking about how they communicated with each other. With that being said, if NVC would have been fully applied the crisis could have transformed into something less than a crisis and closer to something more viewed as negotiations. In the hypothesis the researcher stated that it might be a fruitful approach if time allowed it, which might be very well true. But – sometimes it was sad to see how two prominent world leaders decided to willingly communicate towards each other. This was why the researcher, in a very brief manner, provided with an extract of how Kennedy had written a letter to Khrushchev on the day of the televised and radio broadcasted speech. Kennedy and Khrushchev had some discussions and some conversations took place – but not nearly enough. Again, how can two prominent educated leaders decide to be stubborn and scared of hurting one’s pride by choosing not to communicate as often as one would be advised to do, especially during a crisis? In the aftermath, now when thinking about it – one is very lucky to be alive today. That discovery was truly heart wrenching, to notice the possibilities of enhanced communication that could have simplified matters to a great extent where tension could have been avoided, to then see them slip away because of arguably their stubbornness. Yes, it was trying circumstances, but if they would have spent as much time talking to each other instead of about each other the rapid development to the worse could have slowed down and improved relationships by communicating – to each other. In the hypothesis, the researcher had a hard time believing that the usage of NVC could have affected the crisis to an extended level, but after having applied it to the case study the researcher has now had a change of heart. Even though NVC might not look as powerful as other approaches, in the end it might be.

In regards to the second hypothesis concerning the application of strategic communication to the case study, it was correct in terms of strategic communication being applied during the crisis. Although, that was not a challenging guess, since the matter of strategic communication is such an elastic notion, it means it can be applied to many different areas, politics included. What the researcher noted to be really fascinating was when establishing that if one wants to persuade someone, one should not attack that someone’s current view, however President Kennedy did exactly that in his speech, by accusing Gromyko of lying. That was rather surprising in a sense, since before that event within the case study it was clear that Kennedy knew what strategic communication entails. Speaking of which, the researcher believed that the dialogues within the case study could have turned out differently in terms of
becoming more influential, but except for the one just mentioned when accusing Gromyko, there were surprisingly few significant changes in the turn out – perhaps because of the fact that their actual communication already was rather strategic in itself. In terms of strategic communication, the researcher found the matter of anxiety management really interesting, especially since it arguably provided with a sense of sympathy for the contested view that is strategic communication. Anxiety management is a rather brilliant quality where one chooses to use one’s nerves as an energetic advantage. To turn any quality into a purposeful, useful quality might be beneficial to obtain in life in general.

In the end of the second hypothesis, it was stated that the researcher did not believe that the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis would have turned out differently due to the fact that arguably strategic communication was already involved, this proved to be correct. Furthermore, it was hoped within the hypothesis to perhaps discover, when applying the strategic communication approach to the case study, new matters or qualities within the approach that one had not realised just yet – and that actually happened. The researcher gained a new sense of understanding about strategic communication, which was the fact that there is no reason for this communication approach to be as contested as it has been. The researcher struggles to realise why many are so against this approach. First of all, it is such a broad notion, and yes it would have made matters clearer if one exact definition could have been provided – but still the gist of strategic communication does not involve something that should be able to be so contested. Strategic communication persuades, and influences – but frankly, it can be argued that all the people in the world do that on some level, without having to use the strategic communication approach. It is a communication approach which is striving to reach successful outcomes, but isn’t that every aim of a communication approach really? Why else would communication approaches exist if not to help one in achieving positive outcomes?

Moving forward, other insights from the case study will now be highlighted. The Cuban Missile Crisis itself as a case study was really useful in terms of the matter of communication. What was so interesting was the realisation that it was truly the communication dimension within the Cuban Missile Crisis that shaped most of the events of what happened. It became clear, after having two very different strategies applied to the case study, that it was evident that the root of it all, the root which grew the crisis rapidly bigger, was the root of the communication dimension. For some reason, that realisation had been undiscovered until the case study took place. Probably it is because one cannot simply imagine that an event can so
quickly turn into something else in the matter of no time, when it is concerning the “innocent” matter of communication.

With the help of the case study, it was shown that the communication models are indeed very different in lots of ways. Nonviolent communication is a communication process that is very close to dialogue, it is about involvement, tolerance, compassion and acceptance. As mentioned earlier that, in the end of the day, NVC is much more than a type of language or a communication process, rather it is a continuous reminder that one shall keep ones attention focused in a place where one is most likely to get what one is seeking(Rosenberg,2003,p.4). “The objective of NVC is…to establish relationships based on honesty and empathy that will eventually fulfil everyone’s needs” (Rosenberg,2003,p.85).

What was shown within the case study as well, was that NVC makes one realise one’s own needs but also those of others, and that it can shed a different light on various kinds of relationships(Rosenberg,2003,p.3). As argued earlier, Khrushchev and Kennedy could have had an improved relationship if both would have been willing to give NVC an honest try. As it has been stated, NVC is viewed to be a way of life – one can use it as a strict communication process, but there might be a higher chance of adapting it fully, once one has learned how to follow the communication process of the four components since it will then be almost automatically within you. NVC reduces danger in a sense since within this approach one is connected to one’s feelings and needs, but people who are not aware of one’s responsibility to be conscious in terms of how one behaves, thinks and feels can contribute to danger in terms of possible violent behaviour(Rosenberg,2003,p.21). In addition, Rosenberg has once stated the following: “At the root of much, if not all, violence…is a kind of thinking that attributes the cause of conflict to wrongness in one’s adversaries, and a corresponding inability to think of oneself or others in terms of vulnerability—that is, what one might be feeling, fearing, yearning for, missing, etc.”(Rosenberg,2003,p.18). It is out of essence to remember within NVC; that one’s feelings are results of how one interprets behaviours of others(Rosenberg,2005c,p.19).

It is often believed that if one analyses a situation properly, one will be able to get what one wants, however NVC argues that one must be connected with one’s self and others first, in order to later fulfil everyone’s needs”(Hanson Lasater & Lasater,2009,p.31). Thus, nonviolence involves both cooperation but also the promotion of understanding(Gorsevski,2004,p.15). However, it has been argued that nonviolence might not
be able to cure all the problems, but it has the ability to offer hope by providing possible solutions (Gorsevski, 2004, p.7).

Gorsevski argues that Rosenberg’s NVC approach is “…vastly overestimated…” (Gorsevski, 2004, p.166). One might understand her opinion in a sense that, at times, the approach seems rather optimistic. One might think that because it might be frightening to realise what power humans actually possess, but people ought to realise that it is possible to create change for the better. Furthermore, it is clear that NVC has the ability to provide with effective results, as mentioned earlier.

In regards to strategic communication, the importance of language was discovered within the case study, especially during the speech made by Kennedy. One of the main reasons why Kennedy made an impact with that speech is because of the fact that people want genuine and truthful stories that reflect on one’s own hopes and dreams (Orno et al., 2008, p.38 & 62), the speech did exactly that. Kennedy obtained a talent within strategic communication, namely to be a communicator with the ability to employ a language that can influence target audiences (Farwell, 2012, p.72). It is not unusual for leaders to realise that communication can be used as a strategic tool (Quirke, 2008, p.143), but in order to be a successful leader, one must also be able to communicate in an inspirational manner (Quirke, 2008, p.23), and Kennedy was seemingly one of them.

When using strategic communication, the use of narratives are considered to be important. It can assist one’s ability to speak the truth in a manner that is powerful, but yet personal which can create the important needed connection between the speaker and the audience (Eder, 2011, p.54). In regards to strategic communication, it has been stated that the ultimate goal within strategic communication is: “to foster change in the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of specific audiences and stakeholders” (Cabañero-Verzosa & Garcia, 2009, p.35).

It has been suggested that a crisis, like the Cuban Missile Crisis, proves that under certain conditions, history is in the hands of particular people and the results of their encounters with one another (Gibson, 2011, p.408). Which is why it is important to be aware of the power of language and how it can affect relationships (McInnis, 2008, p.162), in order to communicate in the most suitable manner.

One of the most essential qualities concerning leadership, is the ability to handle a crisis (Barnes, 2007, p.187). Even though Kennedy had a leadership style that was not as
structured as leadership roles normally tend to be (Barnes, 2007, p. 143), he still performed when necessary with a force of nature almost unheard of. It was a long process for Kennedy and his team to realise which option to decide for, they had various goals in mind but then eventually took the decision to at least start off with the blockade, giving Khrushchev a chance to retreat. It is important to remember that even though goals can change during the course of certain events, they can still function as useful guidelines in reminding one’s self about the process of where one started and how the thought process went from there (Lewis, 2011, p. 117). Arguably, the process helped Kennedy and his advisors to eventually realise the most suitable choice.

It has been noted that the speaking style of Kennedy was audience focused, where instead of a speech written in a formal manner style that would please the eye, the speech was written in a more causal manner that would please the ear (Barnes, 2007, p. 86). As mentioned within the case study, he seemed to speak to people, almost with them – he united himself with the audience.
Chapter 6, The Core of Communication

During previous chapters, the matter of communication has been researched by focusing on two communication models, namely nonviolent communication and strategic communication. With the help of the case study of the Cuban Missile Crisis, it became further highlighted how the chosen communication models differ from each other – but also what they have in common. This chapter – the core of communication concerns the realisation one has gathered during the course of researching the two communication models. The belief is, that by realising what these two approaches have in common, creates also, in a way, a sense of understanding what the core of communication is about. However, in order to be able to influence and improve peace negotiations and conflict resolutions by communication, one must realise not only what the core of communication is but also achieve a sense of understanding concerning the power that communication actually entails.

It has been suggested that the ability to choose one’s own attitudes, is arguably “…the last of the human freedoms”(Rosenberg,2005b,p.57). This might be true since, within both nonviolent communication and strategic communication it is, in the end, up to one’s self to decide if one wants to commit to the communication approach by adapting one’s attitudes or not. It can be suggested that the core of communication consists of that quality as well, the freedom to choose one’s own attitudes, since the core of communication lies within us, one must have the choice of choosing one’s own attitudes to create the communication process that works for one’s self. It makes sense that the core of communication consists of attitudes. As seen within strategic communication and nonviolent communication, values and attitudes combined with thinking and language can generate the combination that is called communication. However, it might be suggested that it is the attitudes then who shapes which communication approach one actually decides on and finds suitable. For example, it might not be purely coincidental that Kennedy, as seen in the case study, already had, in a rather general sense but still, the knowledge on how to express himself within strategic communication. He was a politician and strategic communication has strong links with politics, it would not have been odd if Kennedy’s attitudes, combined with his thinking, values and language unconsciously decided on the use of strategic communication.

Arun Gandhi once said: “This world is what we have made of it”(Rosenberg,2003,p.xv) – it is time to realise that how one communicates contributes to how the state of the world looks like. Since the world is in desperate need for healing to take place(Rosenberg,2005b,p.83), then this consequently also means that people must learn to understand the value of
communication. If not one learns how to communicate, one will not contribute towards improving the well-being in this world. It is a process to not only realise the value of communication, but also to find the communication approach that works for you, whilst at the same time sending out positive energy into the world. The core of communication can suggestively also be about making a difference, in one’s own way – it has been stated that: “Progress is impossible without change, and those who cannot change their minds cannot change anything” (Rosenberg, 2005b, p.95). Attitudes can change, since people evolve, so does attitudes and so does communication – it is all interlinked, meaning that people can also adapt to new ways of communicating.

Since comparisons have been made between nonviolent communication and strategic communication throughout the thesis, it might be of importance to highlight views concerning strategies (the main focus of strategic communication) and needs (the main focus of nonviolent communication). One point of view is the following distinction between strategies and needs: strategies can be seen as ways of getting needs met, strategies can meet one’s certain need. However, it has been suggested that strategies are in conflict, which needs never are. This is because when one holds on to a strategy to meet a need, one will suffer if the strategy won’t be able to meet that need (Hanson Lasater & Lasater, 2009, p.61-62). In addition, Rosenberg has once argued that the objective of NVC is to create relationships built on the qualities of empathy and honesty, where everyone’s needs will eventually be fulfilled (Rosenberg, 2002, p.90). With this being said, it can presumably be argued that needs are in a sense also strategic since in the end needs make sure to get what one’s self (and also others) wants. So, it can be suggested that in the end, even though nonviolent communication and strategic communication differ in many ways, they both have strategic elements, with the difference being that the strategy of nonviolent communication is less visible since it focuses on everyone’s needs getting met, whilst strategic communication has the habit of focusing first and foremost on the objectives of one’s self.

After having compared these two communication models, further similarities have been found, which can suggestively be seen as qualities belonging to the core of communication. The core of communication involves the ability to communicate in a clear and detailed manner, in order to both value understanding but also to reach understanding. Both strategic communication and nonviolent communication are very clear with the consistent manner of being specific and detailed in order to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings.
The core of communication can also arguably be about the realisation that communication itself is a process, a process that one must learn and adapt to in order to be able to contribute to the needed good energy for the world. Nonviolent communication is a process, where one clearly follows four components in order to get one’s needs met. Strategic communication has so many different approaches due to the fact that there is still no official definition of the process that is strategic communication.

Listening must be involved with the core of communication as well, both strategic communication and nonviolent communication value the ability that is listening, since both approaches have realised that listening provides with helpful means to connect with the other party when communicating.

Both nonviolent communication and strategic communication communicate with specific objectives in mind – certain needs, or certain strategies – wanting to be fulfilled. Thus, one can argue that the core of communication can involve passion for creating solutions.

The core of communication can also be viewed as the ability of not only sensing connections, but in creating connections. In that way, one has the ability to relate to each other and create solutions for problems. With this being said, it has been argued that in order for the communication process to be successful, trust must exist between the giver and the receiver (Keys Running, 2015, p.46-47). Even though it would have certainly been helpful, it would not perhaps be necessary since communication processes prove successful in many areas of life, such as within business organisations. It might be hard to believe that successful business meetings are because of the trust that existed between the giver and receiver – rather, it is arguably because of the ability to create connections with people.

Still, there are obstacles that one needs to overcome. First one has to realise the importance of communication and value its qualities by understanding what a gift communication actually is. Secondly feelings such as fear and power might provide with obstacles in order for the phenomenon of communication to truly allow itself to develop further. Fear might exist because communication is a topic that one takes for granted of knowing, but it is actually an unfamiliar territory for many. Furthermore, one with power might feel threatened of the abilities communication processes obtain, since society can, with these abilities, change the world into one of less structured hierarchical version and more into one of connection, and compassion.
Conclusion

Throughout time, there have been two main perceptions about what communication actually entails. The first perception is when viewing communication as a question of how, through the communicative processes, one gains the opportunity to be part of not only opinion formation but to be part of the decision-making as well. The second perception is when one consider communication as an aim to achieve control and fulfil certain goals (Møberg Torp, 2015, p. 34). This thesis has demonstrated that both perceptions stills stands, connecting nonviolent communication with the first perception and strategic communication with the second one. However, as mentioned in this paper, there are a lot more qualities within the two chosen approaches than what meets the eye at first. Both nonviolent communication and strategic communication are powerful tools in the world within communication today, and will be able to be most helpful for future endeavours in life. What is truly tragic with today’s society is that many seem to have accepted the situation of how the world looks like today with its wars, crisis, violence and sadness. It is easy to believe this assumption since not many decides to act but instead sulks around spreading negative energy and makes the condition of the world worse than it has to be. Furthermore, what is also upsetting is that if finally one does decide to act, it is with violence. To kill violence with violence is not, according to this thesis, the direction to go. Rather, this thesis argues that violence can be killed by communication. Both nonviolent communication and strategic communication are approaches that can make a difference by offering one the ability, in different ways, but with the same final objective, namely to create change.

When thinking about it, humans are created in the most unique magical way. Human beings can be considered to arguably be the most fantastic innovation of all the time, one with a beating heart, pulsating veins, ears that hears, eyes that see, and other rather remarkable features. When a baby is born, a new life starts. And the very first thing that happens, when a baby takes its first deep breath, it tries to express itself, by screaming. The very first thing one does when entering the world, is to use the quality of sound in order to try to communicate. With this in mind, one could believe that with the remarkable innovation that is the one of human beings, there should have been some sort of fine tuning within one’s self that could help choosing which words to use and when to use them. All other qualities are built within human beings – why not a communication application as well? As soon as the baby opens its mouth there should have been a fine tuning that could have helped it in its attempts of delivering its message to the receiver(s). With this being said, the reality is that when conflicts
occur it has most definitely to do with the communication process going wrong, somewhere during the process, where the receiver does not understand the intended message that is trying to be sent out.

Nonviolent communication is a communication approach that is more a way of life. So, once having mastered the art of nonviolent communication it will simply be with you, and it will be natural to apply it in everyday situations and it can be viewed as a truly helpful empathic tool. However, if one is not familiar with the process, NVC might not be the most suitable approach to have applied in one’s lives all of a sudden during stressful situations, since it will take time to adapt to it and it might be challenging in terms of getting the flow of conversation going in time, by applying the four components within the process of NVC. So, if one already is in a rather stressful situation, it might not be the most natural and suitable manner to attempt applying the process of NVC. Furthermore, the process takes an effort in showing the receiver that one is there purely in the aspect of receiving and giving needs, with no ulterior motives, which is also rather time consuming. However, it is an approach that can still be applied quickly in terms of acting in a compassionate manner and remembering its core values where qualities such as empathy is highlighted. But again, under trying and stressful situations, NVC might not be the most suitable model. Strategic communication however, has the ability to be easily applied in the middle of any scenario, no matter if it is under trying or stressful conditions. Furthermore, what is interesting is that even though these approaches are considered to be different, they still have similarities between the two of them. As it has been mentioned earlier, even though NVC does not regard itself as a strategic approach it still has arguably strategic elements, since even though it is about giving and receiving needs where it will be beneficial for both parties, it is still in a sense strategic since one reaches one’s objectives. Strategic communication’s version for needs can be viewed as its requests, where one aims to get one’s requests fulfilled. In a way, they are more similar than what one might believe them to be in the first place.

The researcher believes it is out of the most importance to regard the matter of communication as the highest priority, in all situations of life. Mahatma Gandhi once stated: “Let us become the change we seek in the world”(Rosenberg,2003,p.129). In order to become the change one is seeking, one should value the importance of communication. Furthermore, to be able to influence and improve peace negotiations and conflict resolutions by communication, one must realise not only what the core of communication is but also achieve a sense of understanding concerning the power that communication entails. To create change
with communication one must realise its significance in order to go about things in an appropriate manner.

It is out of essence to rediscover the power of what hope is all about (Werner, 2010, p.11), one should realise that if there is hope, there is possibility, and one should realise the endless possibilities one can provide the world with when realising the power of communication. In addition, Rosenberg once stated: “I think we have been given the gift of choice to create the world of our choosing” (Rosenberg, 2012, p.149).

The words by Haines feels rather suitable as the final contributor of quotes for this thesis, since it can be used as an daily reminder to be the change one wants to see in this world: “If you always do what you’ve always done, you’ll always get what you’ve always gotten” (Haines, 1995, p.23).

As a final concluding remark, the researcher believes that communication can build bridges, make connections, and restore faith in humanity.
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