



Bottom-up civic diplomacy in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict: digital storytelling by non-state actors

Stefania Manca & Sara Torre

To cite this article: Stefania Manca & Sara Torre (11 Jul 2026): Bottom-up civic diplomacy in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict: digital storytelling by non-state actors, *Israel Affairs*, DOI: [10.1080/13537121.2026.2688169](https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2026.2688169)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2026.2688169>



© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 11 Jul 2026.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Bottom-up civic diplomacy in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict: digital storytelling by non-state actors

Stefania Manca ^a and Sara Torre ^b

^aInstitute of Educational Technology, Italian National Research Council, Genova, Italy;

^bDepartment of Education, Psychology and Communication, University of Bari “Aldo Moro”, Bari, Italy

ABSTRACT

This article examines how non-state digital actors enact bottom-up civic diplomacy in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict through short-form social media storytelling. Drawing on a qualitative analysis of 106 top-performing Instagram and TikTok videos produced by *Builders of the Middle East* between October 2023 and April 2025, the study investigates how mediation, recognition, and non-violent internal critique are organised within platformed conflict communication. The findings show that civic-diplomatic engagement does not primarily emerge through symmetrical dialogue, explicit reconciliation advocacy, or formal peacebuilding discourse. Instead, it is structured through concentrated narrative authority, uneven perspective distribution, testimonial visibility, and calibrated intra-community dissent. Mediation is enacted through the selective organisation and translation of perspectives; recognition through the public narration of lived experience, suffering, and minority presence; and internal critique through forms of dissent that remain embedded within communal belonging while resisting polarising rhetoric. The article develops the concept of peacebuilding influencers to capture this configuration of platform-mediated civic-diplomatic agency, in which personalised visibility, narrative authority, selective recognition, and calibrated dissent sustain fragile forms of relational engagement under conditions of polarisation, asymmetrical voice positioning, and diplomatic impasse.

KEYWORDS Civic diplomacy; grassroots peacebuilding; Non-state actors; Israeli–Palestinian conflict; digital storytelling; social media

Introduction

In the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, struggles over legitimacy, representation, and public voice now unfold not only in institutional arenas but also across digital platforms where political claims are made visible, contested, and recirculated.¹ Under conditions of recurrent violence and prolonged

CONTACT Stefania Manca  manca@itd.cnr.it  Institute of Educational Technology, Italian National Research Council, Via De Marini 6, Genova 16151, Italy

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

diplomatic impasse, these environments have become important sites in which political voice and relational positioning are articulated beyond institutional settings.²

A growing body of research suggests that social media platforms can intensify polarisation,³ accelerate the circulation of antagonistic conflict narratives,⁴ and amplify the visibility of morally charged content,⁵ particularly in highly contentious or violent contexts. In the Israeli–Palestinian case, digital media have been widely analysed as arenas of strategic communication, public diplomacy, propaganda, and contentious mobilisation.⁶ Scholarship has shown how state actors, advocacy networks, and organised movements use these platforms to project legitimacy, mobilise support, and shape international perception.⁷ These approaches explain much about mobilisation, legitimacy, and narrative contestation online, but they say less about communicative practices aimed at keeping some form of cross-conflict engagement visible even where reciprocity is weak, asymmetry is pronounced, and institutional diplomacy is stalled.⁸

This omission is particularly significant in the Israeli–Palestinian context, where formal diplomatic processes remain at an impasse and communicative practices have become one of the few visible arenas in which minimal forms of engagement across conflict lines are publicly articulated.⁹ Under these conditions, struggles over voice, representation, and moral authority often operate alongside, and at times in place of, formal negotiation processes.¹⁰ In the absence of credible peace processes, modes of engagement oriented towards minimal recognition and communicative continuity acquire heightened significance.¹¹ In this article, such practices are approached through the lens of bottom-up civic diplomacy,¹² understood as non-institutional forms of engagement oriented towards recognition, mediation, and communicative continuity rather than formal negotiation or policy influence.¹³ While fragile and uneven, these forms of engagement suggest that digital platforms may function not only as vectors of polarisation, but also as spaces in which limited forms of dialogue and mediated recognition may be publicly enacted.

The dynamics outlined above are examined through a qualitative case study of *Builders of the Middle East*, a grassroots initiative oriented towards cross-community engagement that was established a few months before 7 October 2023 and later developed a sustained social media presence, particularly on Instagram and TikTok, following the subsequent escalation of violence. Initially focused on regional culture and innovation, the initiative rapidly reoriented its communication towards the conflict. Its content combines personal testimony, dialogic exchange, and civic critique, explicitly distancing itself from both state-led diplomacy and militant political agendas. As such, the case offers an analytically rich entry point for examining

how non-state actors articulate recognition, mediated engagement, and political voice under conditions of extreme polarisation.

The article is based on a qualitative analysis of 106 top-performing short-form videos published between October 2023 and April 2025. These materials are examined as situated political practices embedded in platformed environments shaped by visibility metrics, interactional norms, and algorithmic amplification.¹⁴ In this article, digital storytelling refers to the organisation of voice, perspective, and testimonial narration within short-form platformed formats.¹⁵ The analytical emphasis lies on how such narrative configurations enact mediation, recognition, and non-violent internal critique within an ongoing conflict.

To capture this form of agency, the article introduces the concept of ‘peacebuilding influencers’ as an analytical device developed for the purposes of this study. The concept does not refer to an established strand in the literature, nor is it intended as a fixed ideal type. Rather, it is proposed to capture a specific configuration of non-state civic-diplomatic agency in which platformed visibility, narrative authority, selective recognition, and calibrated intra-community dissent are articulated under conditions of asymmetrical visibility. Building on Divon and Eriksson Krutrök’s notion of ‘war influencers’,¹⁶ the term draws attention to actors whose mediated authority derives less from institutional mandate than from their capacity to organise voice, translate perspectives across divides, and sustain fragile spaces of recognition in fragmented publics. In this sense, the concept is intended to foreground a form of platform-mediated agency oriented towards mediation and minimal recognition across divided publics rather than primarily towards mobilisation. This does not imply that such actors transcend asymmetry; rather, their practices remain embedded in, and may at times reproduce, unequal structures of visibility and authority.

The analysis is guided by two research questions:

RQ1. How do non-state digital actors enact bottom-up civic diplomacy in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict through platform-mediated narrative and relational practices?

RQ2. How are mediation, recognition, and non-violent internal critique structured within these civic-diplomatic practices under conditions of polarisation, platform visibility, and asymmetrical voice positioning?

By addressing these questions, the article makes three contributions. First, it provides an empirically grounded account of how a grassroots digital initiative engages with the conflict during a period of sustained violence and

prolonged diplomatic impasse. Second, it develops the concept of peace-building influencers as a way of theorising a distinct form of non-state civic-diplomatic agency organised through mediation, selective recognition, and calibrated intra-community critique, beyond both formal peace processes and contentious digital mobilisation. Third, it demonstrates that civic-diplomatic engagement in this context is rarely articulated through explicit appeals to reconciliation, but is instead enacted through relational storytelling practices embedded in the platformed logics of short-form social media.

Literature and analytical approach

Scholarship on the Israeli–Palestinian conflict has increasingly examined how struggles over legitimacy, recognition, and political voice extend beyond formal diplomatic arenas into mediated and digital spaces.¹⁷ Work on Israeli digital diplomacy has mainly examined how state and military actors use digital platforms to shape external perception, circulate preferred interpretations of events, and strengthen claims to legitimacy.¹⁸ Parallel scholarship has analysed Palestinian digital activism and grassroots mobilisation, documenting how online spaces are used to bear witness to violence, circulate counter-narratives, and mobilise solidarity in asymmetrical contexts.¹⁹ However, recent scholarship has also begun to examine Palestinian digital diplomacy during the recent Gaza conflict, extending analysis to institutional actors' use of social media to shape diplomatic visibility and external communication.²⁰ Together, these strands of research highlight the centrality of digital media to contemporary struggles over voice and political authority in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict.

Existing studies have also examined non-state engagement through the frameworks of digital activism, strategic communication, and organised dialogue initiatives, variously privileging mobilisation, advocacy, and inter-group contact as their main analytical lenses.²¹ In the specific context of TikTok and the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, however, recent scholarship has more often highlighted how platform affordances sustain highly memetic and antagonistic modes of political address, frequently oriented towards boycott, repudiation, and symbolic exclusion.²² More specifically, scholarship on Palestinian digital media has largely foregrounded witnessing, mobilisation, counter-narrative production, and platformed resistance,²³ whereas research on Israeli digital communication has more often focused on strategic communication, public-facing framing, and efforts to shape public perception and recognition, especially in the aftermath of 7 October 2023.²⁴ Taken together, these strands of research have tended to structure the field around two contrasting poles: contentious, oppositional mobilisation on the

one hand,²⁵ and explicit forms of dialogue, coexistence, or recognition on the other.²⁶ What remains underexplored, however, are intermediate forms of digitally mediated engagement oriented less towards overt contestation or formalised dialogue than towards mediation, the negotiation of voice, and the management of relational boundaries under conditions of conflict. Recent analyses of the Gaza war further underscore the narrowing horizon for sustained diplomatic initiatives in the current period,²⁷ thereby making non-institutional forms of mediation and recognition all the more analytically salient. The limited scholarly attention paid to such intermediate forms becomes particularly significant in contexts marked by prolonged diplomatic impasse and asymmetrical visibility, where engagement may persist without crystallising either into overt contestation or into formalised dialogue.

This marginalisation of intermediate, mediation-oriented forms of engagement is further reinforced by scholarship on the polarising dynamics of platformed communication. Algorithmic amplification, affective intensity, and visibility competition often privilege emotionally charged and antagonistic framings, reinforcing binary constructions of victimhood, blame, and moral authority.²⁸ In the Israeli–Palestinian context, digital environments have therefore often been conceptualised primarily as vectors of escalation, information warfare, and narrative contestation rather than as spaces in which fragile forms of dialogue or mediated recognition may be sustained.²⁹ This emphasis has contributed to treating platformed communication mainly as a site of confrontation, leaving less room for analysing how forms of mediation, acknowledgement, and relational continuity may also be enacted within the same environments.

To address this gap, the article draws on scholarship that conceptualises diplomacy as a set of representational and relational practices through which actors claim authority, translate perspectives, and manage boundaries under conditions of contestation.³⁰ From this perspective, diplomacy extends beyond formal negotiation to include performative acts of speaking-for, perspective translation, and boundary management. This understanding resonates with work on representative claims, which emphasises publicly articulated voice rather than formal mandate,³¹ and is particularly relevant in contexts where institutional diplomacy is paralysed or lacks legitimacy.

In protracted and asymmetrical conflicts such as the Israeli–Palestinian case, recognition constitutes a central dimension of these practices. In this article, recognition³² refers to moments in which the other is publicly acknowledged as having a speakable experience, a legible grievance, and a claim to narrative presence, without this implying agreement, reconciliation, or moral consensus. Used in this analytical sense, it denotes a performative and relational process through which suffering, perspective, and moral standing are rendered publicly legible. Such acknowledgement remains partial, uneven, and politically fraught, yet it can still be analysed as

performing a diplomatic function insofar as it renders alternative perspectives publicly intelligible within otherwise exclusionary narrative environments.³³ In platformed short-form communication, recognition is enacted less through deliberation than through testimonial visibility, selective acknowledgement, and the public articulation of experience across conflict lines.

In the present analysis, civic diplomacy refers to non-institutional practices through which actors keep channels of recognition, translation, and limited relational engagement open, even when they are not engaged in formal negotiation, policy advocacy, or constituency mobilisation.³⁴ The emphasis here is not primarily on mobilisation or persuasion, but on sustaining engagement across conflict lines through practices of translation, acknowledgement, and calibrated interaction. In asymmetrical conflicts, such practices operate through uneven distributions of voice and visibility, involving strategic positioning, selective amplification, and situated forms of mediation.³⁵ The Israeli–Palestinian conflict provides a particularly salient context in which to examine how such practices emerge within digitally mediated public spheres.³⁶

Analytically, the study approaches civic diplomacy through three inter-related functions: mediation, understood as the translation and alignment of perspectives across divided publics; recognition, referring to the performative acknowledgement of moral standing within conflict narratives; and non-violent internal critique, whereby actors address their own communities in ways that sustain credibility while distancing themselves from polarising rhetoric.³⁷ These functions provide the analytical bridge between the theoretical framework and the empirical analysis, and guide the examination of how non-state digital actors organise voice, perspective, and relational positioning. Within this framework, asymmetrical voice positioning is treated not as a separate analytical function, but as a cross-cutting condition that shapes how mediation, recognition, and internal critique are enacted and distributed within platformed conflict environments. The article's theoretical contribution lies in conceptualising these practices as a distinct form of civic-diplomatic agency that becomes visible when mediation, recognition, and internal critique are analysed together rather than through separate literatures on activism, influencer politics, or dialogue.

Within this framework, the concept of 'peacebuilding influencers' is introduced not as a new ideal type, but as an analytical device for identifying a recurrent configuration of platform-mediated civic-diplomatic practice that existing frameworks only partially capture. Existing work on activism and influencer politics tended to foreground mobilisation, visibility, and audience-building, while scholarship on public diplomacy and digital peacebuilding has more often centred strategic communication or structured dialogue.³⁸ This leaves less room for

understanding forms of non-state digital agency in which voice, perspective translation, and minimal recognition are organised together across divided publics. In this article, peacebuilding influencers refers to cases in which mediated authority³⁹ is structured through a combination of concentrated narrative visibility, selective recognition across conflict lines, and calibrated intra-community critique. The concept is meant to distinguish this configuration both from contentious digital activism, which primarily foregrounds mobilisation, and from generic influencer culture, which primarily foregrounds audience-building and visibility without necessarily involving mediation or recognition. It draws in particular on influencer studies, scholarship on war and political influencers,⁴⁰ digital peacebuilding research,⁴¹ and recognition⁴²- and narrative⁴³-based approaches to testimonial visibility and acknowledgement. This does not imply that such actors transcend asymmetry; rather, their practices remain embedded in, and may at times reproduce, unequal structures of visibility and authority.

Building on Divon and Eriksson Krutrök's notion of 'war influencers',⁴⁴ the concept shifts attention from the amplification of wartime narratives to the structuring of civic-diplomatic visibility in conflict-saturated digital environments. Rather than deriving authority from institutional mandate, peacebuilding influencers operate through personalised digital visibility, the orchestration of narrative authority, and cross-perspective address within fragmented publics shaped by polarisation. While activism foregrounds political commitment and social change,⁴⁵ and influencer culture is often associated with audience-building and monetisable visibility,⁴⁶ peacebuilding influencers orient their mediated presence towards selective mediation, calibrated dissent, and minimal recognition across divided publics.

Materials and methods

Case selection and research design

This article adopts a qualitative case study design⁴⁷ to examine how bottom-up civic diplomacy is enacted by non-state actors through digital storytelling in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. The case of *Builders of the Middle East* was selected as a strategically relevant instance of non-state digital engagement that combines a sustained social media presence with practices of cross-perspective address, testimonial storytelling, and intra-community critique. While other initiatives in the region, such as *Sharaka*,⁴⁸ also promote cross-community dialogue and regional exchange, they are positioned closer to the diplomatic openings and normalisation dynamics associated with the Abraham Accords. *Builders of the Middle East* is better suited to the present analysis because it enables examination of how bottom-up civic-diplomatic

practices are articulated through a grassroots digital initiative operating outside formal diplomatic structures.

Founded a few months before the escalation of violence in October 2023, *Builders of the Middle East* initially focused on regional culture, innovation and cross-border exchange, before rapidly reorienting its communicative practices towards the conflict. This reorientation, combined with the initiative's emphasis on dialogue, personal testimony and civic critique, makes it a theoretically relevant case for examining how non-state digital actors perform civic-diplomatic functions under conditions of diplomatic stagnation. The initiative's recurring narrative figures also allow examination of how civic-diplomatic agency is embodied through identifiable digital actors within platform-mediated environments.

Rather than aiming for representativeness, the case study is designed to generate analytically rich insights into forms of agency emerging at the intersection of digital communication, peacebuilding and civic diplomacy. The focus is therefore on depth, contextualisation and interpretive analysis rather than on generalisable causal claims.⁴⁹

Data collection

The empirical material consists of 106 top-performing short-form videos posted on Instagram and TikTok by the *Builders of the Middle East* account between October 2023 and April 2025. To construct the corpus, the overall period was divided into four consecutive intervals of equal duration, and from each platform the top 25 videos per interval were identified through Fanpage Karma on the basis of platform-reported engagement and reach indicators. This strategy was intended to capture comparatively strong-performing content while distributing the sample across the broader temporal arc of the case, thereby avoiding concentration on a single peak moment of attention and allowing the analysis to cover different temporalities of the post-7 October period. The study is not, however, designed to support a systematic event-by-event comparison of narrative variation across specific moments of escalation. Because platform metrics are not fully equivalent across Instagram and TikTok (e.g. reach, views, impressions), these rankings were treated as a pragmatic proxy for comparatively strong platform performance rather than as a standardised cross-platform measure. This approach is consistent with established digital and platform research strategies for social media sampling.⁵⁰

After removing duplicates and near-duplicates, the final corpus comprised 106 short-form videos. In line with qualitative sampling principles guided by information power,⁵¹ this corpus was considered sufficient to identify recurrent configurations of mediation, recognition, and internal

critique across the material without aiming at statistical representativeness. The sampling strategy therefore focused on materials through which civic-diplomatic practices became most publicly legible within attention-driven and highly mediated conflict environments. Rather than seeking to reconstruct algorithmic distribution mechanisms directly, the study examines the publicly accessible traces through which platform-mediated civic-diplomatic practices can be analysed. The focus on top-performing content reflects the study's interest in forms of civic-diplomatic storytelling that achieved substantial circulation within platformed attention economies. A comparison with lower-performing content would require a different research design centred on variation in visibility and engagement rather than on the narrative configurations that attained the greatest public salience.

All selected videos were manually archived together with their captions and hashtags. User comments were not included in the dataset, as the analysis focuses on creators' civic-diplomatic practices as expressed in the videos and their textual framing. Audience response is nonetheless partly reflected in the selection criteria, which privilege content that performed comparatively strongly in terms of reach and engagement. What falls outside the scope of this study is a systematic analysis of comments, which would require a distinct reception-oriented design and remains a direction for future research.

Analytical approach

The analysis adopts a qualitative, interpretive approach oriented towards understanding digital storytelling as a situated political practice rather than as a media text or persuasive message.⁵² In line with interpretive traditions in qualitative research, the focus is on meaning-making, relational dynamics and contextual positioning rather than on measuring audience effects or communicative impact.⁵³

Analytically, the study draws on reflexive thematic analysis as a flexible method suited to identifying recurrent patterns of meaning while remaining attentive to context, positionality and interpretive judgement.⁵⁴ Coding was conducted iteratively, moving between close engagement with the material and conceptual reflection informed by scholarship on civic diplomacy, recognition and conflict narratives.⁵⁵ Given the politically sensitive nature of the material, the analysis was conducted with explicit attention to reflexivity and interpretive judgement throughout the coding process. Care was taken to distinguish analytical description from normative endorsement and to treat categories such as recognition, mediation, and internal critique as theory-informed lenses rather than evaluative labels. Because interpretation of voice, recognition, and critique is shaped by researcher judgement, coding

decisions were developed iteratively and checked for consistency against the full corpus.

The analytical focus was structured around three interrelated dimensions derived from the theoretical framework: (1) mediation, examined through the organisation of narrative authority, perspective distribution and acts of translation across audiences; (2) recognition, examined through testimonial articulation, acknowledgement of suffering and the public positioning of moral standing; and (3) non-violent internal critique, examined through forms of dissent, intra-community address and tonal calibration. These dimensions guided the interpretive analysis of how voice, perspective and relational positioning are organised within short-form digital formats.

Coding framework and use of descriptive counts

To support systematic engagement with the corpus, an explicit coding framework was developed iteratively during the analytical process, combining data-driven coding with theoretically informed categories.⁵⁶ The codebook operationalised key dimensions relevant to the study, including perspective (e.g. Arab, Israeli, Palestinian, Jewish, collective), voice type (e.g. personal testimony, activist address, documentary narration), relational positioning, tonal orientation and narrative format. Coding was applied across the full dataset, allowing recurrent configurations of narrative authority and perspective to be identified.

While the study remains interpretive in orientation, descriptive counts were used to trace the distribution of particular features across the corpus. They provide transparency regarding the relative prominence of specific perspectives, voice types and communicative arrangements. The use of descriptive frequencies is consistent with reflexive thematic analysis when employed to support, rather than replace, interpretive judgement.⁵⁷

Ethical considerations

The study is based exclusively on publicly available social media content. No private material was accessed, and no direct interaction with content creators or audiences was undertaken. The analytical focus is placed on the initiative and its communicative practices rather than on individual users, in line with established ethical guidance for research on publicly accessible digital content in conflict settings.⁵⁸

Table 1. Distribution of selected narrative features in the video corpus (N = 106).

Dimension	Category	n	%
Perspective	Arab	51	48.1
	Israeli	19	17.9
	Palestinian	9	8.5
	Jewish	6	5.7
	Collective	13	12.3
Voice type	External/hybrid	8	7.5
	Personal	35	33.0
	Activist address	37	34.9
	Documentary narration	34	32.1
Format	Dialogic	5	4.7
	Interview	21	19.8
	Other/monologic	80	75.5
Tonal orientation	Assertive	56	52.8
	Light	7	6.6
	Dramatic	26	24.5
	Neutral	17	16.0

Note: Percentages are calculated on the full corpus of 106 videos. Categories within each dimension are mutually exclusive.

Results

This section presents the findings in relation to the three civic-diplomatic functions outlined in the analytical framework: mediation, recognition, and non-violent internal critique. Across the 106 short-form videos analysed, recurring configurations of voice positioning, perspective distribution, narrative structure, and tonal calibration emerge. Table 1 provides a descriptive overview of selected narrative features across the corpus and helps situate the interpretive discussion that follows. Rather than appearing as isolated narrative strategies, these features form patterned arrangements through which civic-diplomatic practice becomes visible within platform-mediated environments. The following sections examine how mediation, recognition, and calibrated dissent are organised across these configurations.

Mediation and the organisation of narrative authority

Across the 106 videos analysed, mediation is most clearly enacted through the organisation of narrative authority. A clear concentration of narrative presence emerges: 71 of the 106 videos are narrated or anchored by Luai Ahmed,⁵⁹ who appears either as the primary speaker or as the structuring host of the communicative sequence. This recurrent presence provides a relatively stable point of address through which other viewpoints, experiences and claims are introduced, contextualised or translated. This pattern is visible, for example, in videos such as ‘A Yemeni is Going To Dinner in Israel’,⁶⁰ where mediation is enacted through the framing of proximity across

perspectives rather than through symmetrical dialogue, with Luai Ahmed positioning himself as a publicly legible embodiment of Arab–Jewish social proximity. A related form of mediation appears in ‘Palestine’s Next President’,⁶¹ where a Palestinian political figure is introduced through host-led framing that makes this political voice publicly intelligible without relying on dialogic reciprocity.

The distribution of articulated perspectives across the dataset is uneven. Fifty-one videos are primarily voiced from an Arab standpoint. Israeli perspectives appear in 19 videos, Jewish perspectives in 6, and Palestinian perspectives in 9. A further 13 videos are coded as ‘collective’, adopting a cross-communal positioning in which the narrative voice speaks in inclusive or bridging terms, while 8 are categorised as ‘external or hybrid’. The latter category refers to videos in which the primary narrative perspective is either attributed to actors not directly positioned within the Israeli–Palestinian conflict or reflects a blended standpoint that does not align predominantly with a single communal category. Perspectives are rarely presented in symmetrical proportion within a single video. Rather, one standpoint functions as the principal organising voice, with alternative positions incorporated through quotation, paraphrase, or commentary.

Dialogic formats constitute a visible but not dominant portion of the corpus. Explicitly dialogic structures account for 5 of the 106 videos, while a further 21 adopt an interview format, together representing 26 videos in which distinct voices are positioned within a shared communicative sequence. In these materials, interviews or structured conversational exchanges place different perspectives in proximity, with the host facilitating the progression of the interaction. In the remaining 80 videos, distinct perspectives are not presented through direct exchange, but appear, where present, within a narrative structure organised around a single dominant voice.

Across the corpus, mediation is structured less through formalised dialogue, which appears in 26 of the 106 videos, than through the recurring concentration of narrative authority in a limited number of speakers. Together with the uneven distribution of primary perspectives, this pattern suggests that mediation is enacted chiefly through voice centralisation and perspective management rather than through symmetrical exchange.

Recognition through testimonial visibility

Recognition is observable in the corpus through the structured visibility of personal testimony, conflict-related narratives, and the representation of socially marked identities. Of the 106 videos analysed, 34 adopt an explicit testimonial structure in which speakers recount

personal experiences, memories, or direct encounters with conflict-related events. In these instances, the narrative is organised around first-person articulation, frequently foregrounding vulnerability, loss, or lived experience rather than policy claims or geopolitical argumentation. This configuration is visible, for example, in videos such as 'I Escaped Hamas',⁶² where recognition is enacted through an Israeli Jewish survivor's first-person account of escaping the 7 October Hamas attack, while foregrounding the role of a Bedouin rescuer from the Negev in her survival.

Conflict- and trauma-related content appears in 21 videos, including civilian stories (9), conflict testimony (5), memorial-oriented narratives (5), explicit references to trauma (1), and 1 coded as 'other'. These materials centre on personal or communal suffering, with the speaker positioned as a witness or affected participant. They render conflict experience legible not through abstraction or strategic argument, but through embodied accounts of fear, survival, grief, and loss.

Recognition is also structured through the representation of socially marked groups within the dataset. Twenty-seven videos foreground minority identities, alongside 13 centred on women, 4 on youth, and 3 on mixed or hybrid identities. In these instances, visibility is organised around the articulation of specific social locations, often linked to everyday experience, vulnerability, or resilience. This dynamic is also visible in videos such as 'He Saved The Lives Of 30 People!'⁶³ which recounts the story of a Bedouin man from the Negev who rescued young people fleeing the Hamas attack at the Nova Festival. Here, recognition is organised not only through the visibility of civilian suffering, but also through the public framing of Bedouin moral agency and minority presence within the conflict narrative.

Communicative intent coded as oriented towards empathy-building appears in 27 videos, while inclusive positioning is coded in 45. In a subset of testimonial narratives, speakers reference suffering, fear, or loss experienced by other communities, extending recognition beyond self-articulation. Dramatic tonal registers appear in 26 videos, whereas neutral tone is coded in 17, indicating variation in the affective framing of testimonial content.

Across the corpus, recognition is enacted less through symmetrical narrative exchange than through the patterned co-occurrence of testimonial structure (34 videos), minority visibility (27 videos), empathy orientation (27 videos), and tonal calibration. Together, these features indicate that recognition operates primarily through the public narration of lived experience and the selective rendering of moral standing within short-form digital storytelling.

Non-violent internal critique and calibrated dissent

Non-violent internal critique is observable in 39 of the 106 videos analysed. These videos are coded as containing intra-community critique, indicating instances in which the speaker addresses their own community, leadership, or prevailing narratives rather than positioning critique exclusively outward. In these materials, dissent is articulated from within an identified standpoint, often through direct address, clarification, or corrective commentary. This configuration is visible, for example, in videos such as ‘A Palestinians Message To Al Jazeera’,⁶⁴ where critique is articulated from within a Palestinian standpoint and framed both as a corrective intervention against Al Jazeera’s reporting and as an internal attribution of responsibility to Hamas for the war in Gaza, rather than as outward denunciation alone.

A related category, coded as resistance and critique, appears in 34 videos. These include explicit challenges to dominant narratives, policy positions, or public rhetoric. While these categories partially overlap, they capture analytically distinct dimensions: intra-community address and explicit counter-framing. The articulation of critique in these materials does not typically adopt an escalatory or antagonistic structure. Instead, dissent is frequently framed through explanatory sequences, contextualisation, or appeals to broader principles such as coexistence or shared civic responsibility. A related dynamic is visible in videos such as ‘I Wore a Niqab as a Man. And It Broke Me’,⁶⁵ where Luai Ahmed’s critique is organised through embodied experience and used to challenge gendered forms of religiously justified constraint from within a Muslim standpoint rather than through external denunciation.

Tone provides an additional indicator of how dissent is organised. An assertive tonal register appears in 56 videos across the corpus. Assertiveness is not limited to instances of internal critique, but it frequently co-occurs with intra-community critique and resistance-oriented content. At the same time, inclusive positioning is coded in 45 videos, suggesting that dissent is often embedded within communicative strategies that avoid polarising escalation.

In several instances, critique is accompanied by explicit reaffirmations of shared belonging or identification with the addressed community, reinforcing the speaker’s position as an internal rather than external critic. Across the corpus, the combination of intra-community critique (39 videos), resistance-oriented content (34), assertive tone (56), and inclusive positioning (45) forms a recurrent configuration of calibrated intra-community dissent within the dataset.

Across the corpus, mediation, recognition, and internal critique do not appear as uniform or symmetrical practices. Instead, they emerge through differentiated but recurring configurations of voice concentration,

testimonial visibility, and calibrated dissent. These empirical patterns provide the basis for examining how civic diplomacy operates under conditions of polarisation and platform visibility.

Discussion

Building on scholarship that conceptualises diplomacy as a set of representational and relational practices rather than solely as intergovernmental negotiation,⁶⁶ this analysis suggests that bottom-up civic diplomacy in platformed conflict environments operates through patterned and asymmetrical configurations of voice, authority, and relational positioning. Rather than approximating deliberative dialogue or explicit reconciliation advocacy, civic-diplomatic engagement emerges as an organised arrangement of narrative authority, selective visibility, and calibrated dissent.

In line with recognition-oriented approaches to protracted conflict,⁶⁷ these configurations show how non-state digital actors sustain minimal relational engagement amid polarisation and uneven visibility. Engagement, in this sense, is not premised on symmetry or consensus, but on the patterned organisation of communicative presence within fragmented publics.

Narrative configurations of civic diplomacy

The findings indicate that bottom-up civic diplomacy does not take the form of balanced exchange or overt peace advocacy. Instead, it materialises through concentrated narrative authority, testimonial recognition and intra-community critique. Civic-diplomatic work is relationally patterned: it is mediated through identifiable figures, unevenly distributed across perspectives and embedded in short-form storytelling formats. Diplomacy thus appears less as messaging and more as the strategic organisation of voice and perspective under polarised conditions.

First, mediation unfolds through concentrated narrative authority rather than dispersed deliberation. Recurrent anchoring by identifiable figures such as Luai Ahmed structures how perspectives are translated and sequenced across fragmented audiences. Mediation occurs through contextualisation, selective incorporation of alternative viewpoints and performative acts of speaking-for, rather than institutional negotiation. This aligns with conceptualisations of diplomacy as representational practice⁶⁸ and with theories of representative claims that foreground performative voice positioning over formal mandate.⁶⁹ Within platformed environments, mediation becomes a matter of organised visibility and narrative alignment rather than symmetrical exchange.

Importantly, the concentration of narrative authority reflects not only diplomatic strategy but also platform affordances. Scholarship on diffused war and platform vernaculars demonstrates how contemporary conflict communication privileges personalised visibility and recognisable communicative figures.⁷⁰ Work on war influencers further shows how authority becomes embodied and centralised under algorithmic conditions that reward coherence, recognisability and affective legibility.⁷¹ Civic-diplomatic mediation operates within these attention hierarchies.

Second, recognition is enacted through testimonial visibility and the public articulation of lived experience. Rather than functioning as an abstract moral stance, recognition becomes a narrative practice embedded in specific storytelling formats. Personal testimony, minority representation and empathy-oriented address render suffering communicatively legible within contested digital arenas. Consistent with recognition theory⁷² and scholarship on acknowledgement in asymmetrical conflict,⁷³ recognition does not imply agreement or reconciliation. Instead, it operates through recurrent inclusion of experiential accounts that resist totalising exclusion. In short-form digital environments, recognition becomes a question of narrative presence and affective framing rather than institutional endorsement.

Third, non-violent internal critique functions as a relational stabiliser. Calibrated dissent directed towards one's own community enables actors to maintain embeddedness while distancing themselves from polarising narratives. This interpretation resonates with scholarship that frames diplomacy as relational calibration under tension⁷⁴ as well as with dialogic engagement approaches that prioritise communicative continuity.⁷⁵ It also aligns with narrative-based approaches to coexistence that foreground intra-group reflexivity as a precondition for cross-group recognition.⁷⁶ Rather than amplifying outrage, such critique preserves channels of communication across fragmented publics. In this sense, intra-group reflexivity becomes a precondition for limited cross-group recognition.

Taken together, mediation, recognition and critique coalesce into a coherent civic-diplomatic configuration. Mediation is centralised, recognition is narratively operationalised, and critique is internally calibrated. Contrary to scholarship that treats digital media primarily as accelerators of polarisation,⁷⁷ these findings demonstrate how platform vernaculars can also sustain practices of translation, acknowledgement and relational continuity within conflict-saturated environments. The findings also speak to existing scholarship on non-state and grassroots peace-oriented initiatives in the Israeli–Palestinian context.⁷⁸ Whereas earlier work has often examined such initiatives through the lenses of dialogue, coexistence education, inter-group contact, or digital peacebuilding, the present case points to a more asymmetrical and platform-mediated configuration of civic engagement.

What emerges here is not sustained reciprocity or structured dialogue, but a form of civic-diplomatic practice organised through selective visibility, concentrated narrative authority, and calibrated dissent.

One productive lens for interpreting these dynamics is Fairey's concept of multiperspectival 'strategic narrative peacebuilding',⁷⁹ which rejects the pursuit of a singular shared account in favour of braided and plural narrative arrangements. Rather than seeking consensus, such approaches accommodate divergent experiences while opening limited dialogic space. In the present case, civic-diplomatic storytelling does not construct a unified conflict narrative. Instead, it organises selective multiperspectival visibility through testimonial inclusion, careful language and calibrated framing. Peace is not advanced as an explicit programme or institutional roadmap but is rendered narratively conceivable as a limited horizon through patterned juxtaposition, acknowledgement of suffering across communities, and the avoidance of dehumanising rhetoric. In this sense, these practices open a limited digital imaginative space in which coexistence, recognition, and relational continuity become publicly imaginable.⁸⁰ Civic diplomacy thus emerges as a political practice structured through narrative authority, operationalised recognition and calibrated dissent.

Asymmetrical voice positioning in civic-diplomatic practice

While the preceding section examined how civic diplomacy is narratively enacted, the second research question foregrounds how these practices are shaped by asymmetry and platform visibility. Mediation and recognition do not unfold under conditions of communicative equality. Instead, they are organised through uneven distributions of authority, narrative centrality and representational legitimacy.

Recognition, in this configuration, is not evenly distributed but remains embedded within hierarchical voice structures.⁸¹ In line with recognition theory and scholarship on protracted conflict,⁸² acknowledgement operates within persistent inequalities of legitimacy. The concentration of narrative authority and the uneven distribution of primary perspectives illustrate how civic-diplomatic engagement remains embedded within broader hierarchies of visibility.

Crucially, these practices do not neutralise asymmetry; they operate through it. Bottom-up civic diplomacy does not equalise structural power differentials or redistribute representational capacity. Rather, it navigates asymmetrical conditions through selective amplification, tonal calibration, and strategic positioning, thus reflecting an understanding of diplomacy as boundary management under contestation.⁸³

Platform architectures further shape these dynamics. Research on digital conflict communication shows how algorithmic systems privilege

recognisable figures, emotionally legible narratives and coherent voice positioning.⁸⁴ The centralisation observed in the corpus thus reflects both relational strategy and platform affordances. As scholarship on influencer politics suggests, authority in digital environments is frequently personalised and embodied rather than institutionally dispersed.⁸⁵

Under these conditions, asymmetry is not merely a contextual constraint but a constitutive feature of civic-diplomatic practice. Voice positioning becomes the mechanism through which relational engagement is sustained across unequal landscapes of legitimacy, memory and visibility. Civic diplomacy therefore operates not by equalising communicative power, but by organising interaction across persistent asymmetries.

These interpretations must be read in light of the study's scope. The analysis is based on a single theoretically selected case and focuses exclusively on top-performing videos identified through comparatively strong reach and engagement indicators. It does not examine audience reception, algorithmic distribution mechanisms, or off-platform dynamics that may shape circulation and impact. The study is also not designed as an event-based temporal analysis of narrative production in relation to specific political or military developments across the period examined. In addition, the analysis is limited to the initiative's publicly curated self-presentation and therefore cannot assess the internal dynamics, organisational decision-making, or off-platform relational practices through which these narratives are produced. It also does not claim representativeness across the broader field of Israeli–Palestinian digital communication.

Conclusions

The analysis suggests that, in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict, some diplomatic functions are now being enacted in places not usually treated as diplomatic at all, including short-form social media environments shaped by visibility, testimony, and personalised authority. In a context characterised by prolonged diplomatic paralysis and recurrent violence, practices conventionally associated with mediation and recognition are increasingly enacted beyond formal institutions and within digitally mediated public arenas. Civic actors operating through short-form platforms do not substitute for institutional diplomacy; rather, they reconfigure the communicative terrain on which legitimacy, authority and relational positioning are negotiated.

For practitioners and civil society initiatives, the findings suggest that digitally mediated engagement cannot be reduced to advocacy or strategic messaging. The organisation of narrative authority, the calibration of dissent and the strategic positioning of perspective emerge as central mechanisms through which communicative continuity is sustained in polarised

environments. Digital infrastructures function not merely as channels of transmission but as constitutive settings that shape how mediation and acknowledgement become publicly articulable within Israeli and Palestinian spheres.

For scholars of Israel–Palestine and of diplomacy more broadly, the analysis underscores the importance of incorporating platform logics, attention economies, and influencer-style authority into the study of civic and para-diplomatic practice. The contemporary public sphere surrounding the Israeli–Palestinian conflict is increasingly structured by personalised authority and algorithmic amplification. This suggests that the boundaries between communication, representation, and diplomacy are not fixed but dynamically reconfigured through platformed visibility. Studying diplomacy today therefore requires attention not only to institutional arenas, but also to the mediated architectures through which political voice becomes legible and authoritative.

Future research should examine how digitally mediated civic practices interact with audience reception, algorithmic distribution, and off-platform political dynamics. Comparative studies across initiatives and conflict settings would help determine whether the configuration identified here reflects a context-specific adaptation or signals a broader transformation in contemporary conflict mediation and diplomatic agency. The concept of peace-building influencers is therefore best understood as a context-specific analytical intervention rather than a fully portable category. Its broader applicability, and its distinction from adjacent forms of digital activism, influencer politics, and civic mediation, remain questions for future comparative research.

In a setting marked by absent peace processes and fragile political trust, digital storytelling constitutes a significant arena in which civic actors negotiate authority, recognition, and the limits of coexistence. These practices do not resolve structural asymmetries or produce immediate reconciliation; rather, they unfold through uneven distributions of perspective and authority rather than symmetrical exchange. They nonetheless reorganise how relational engagement is sustained under conditions of impasse. Understanding such practices is therefore essential not only for analysing evolving Israeli and Palestinian public spheres, but for clarifying how diplomatic functions are increasingly enacted through digitally mediated configurations of authority, recognition, and voice under conditions of institutional impasse.

Notes

1. Papacharissi, *Affective Publics*; Wolfsfeld, “The role of the media in violent conflicts.”

2. Hoskins and O'Loughlin, *War and Media*; Lavie-Driver and van der Linden, "Social media, AI, and the rise of extremism"; and Urman and Makhortykh, "My war is your special operation."
3. Lerman et al., "Affective Polarization and Dynamics of Information Spread in Online Networks."
4. Zeitzoff, "How Social Media Is Changing Conflict."
5. Brady et al., "Emotion Shapes the Diffusion of Moralized Content in Social Networks"; and Tanesini, "Affective Polarisation and Emotional Distortions on Social Media."
6. Moreno-Mercado and Calatrava-García, "Multilingual public diplomacy."
7. Ayad and Sytnik, "Israeli Digital Diplomacy"; Hadari and Turgeman, "Public Diplomacy in Army Boots"; Moreno-Mercado and Calatrava-García, "Multilingual public diplomacy"; and Shahvar and Sepahan, "Grassroots Diplomacy in Practice."
8. Mac Ginty, "Everyday Peace."
9. Hitman and Yefet, "Nation-State Interests Prevail."
10. Bar-Tal, *Intractable Conflicts*; Chouliaraki, *The Ironic Spectator*.
11. Salomon, "A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education."
12. Holoborodko, "From State Actors to Citizens."
13. Rosyidiyani et al., "Reframing cultural diplomacy."
14. Gibbs et al., "#Funeral and Instagram"; Hoskins and O'Loughlin, *War and Media*.
15. Mueller and Rajaram, *Social Media Storytelling*.
16. Divon and Eriksson Krutrök, "The rise of war influencers."
17. Hadari and Turgeman, "Public Diplomacy in Army Boots"; and Handelman and Chowdhury, "The Limits of Political-Elite Diplomacy."
18. Bjola and Holmes, *Digital Diplomacy*; Manor, *Digitalisation of Public Diplomacy*; Moreno-Mercado and Calatrava-García, "Multilingual public diplomacy"; and Daoudi, "Communications Strategy of the IDF."
19. Abbas et al., "TikTok Intifada"; Cervi and Divon, "Playful Activism"; Cervi and Marín-Lladó, "Freepalestine on TikTok"; and De Vries, Simry and Maoz, "Like a Bridge over Troubled Water."
20. Kazzou and Lim, "Leveling the Playing Field?"
21. Dessel and Ali, "Minds of Peace"; Kelman, "Interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian National Identities"; Kelman, "Reconciliation from a Social-Psychological Perspective"; Mor, Ron and Maoz, "'Likes' for Peace"; Ron, Suleiman and Maoz, "Women for Peace"; and Chaitin and Avlagon, *Striving for Peace through Personal Narratives*.
22. Shamis and Rasumni-Urşar, "BDS on TikTok."
23. Divon, "Playful Publics on TikTok"; Abbas et al., "TikTok Intifada"; Cervi and Divon, "Playful Activism"; Cervi and Marín-Lladó, "Freepalestine on TikTok"; Satkhed, Thaloor, and Indrakanti, "Instagram activism"; and Abdel Wahab, *The war on Gaza*.
24. Yair, "Hamas's 7 October massacres"; Mabillard et al., "Responding to the October 7th attack"; and Vasiliu, Shibli, and Yavetz, "Social media, anxiety, and ethnic disparities."
25. Divon, "Playful Publics on TikTok"; and Abbas et al., "TikTok Intifada."
26. De Vries, Simry and Maoz, "Like a Bridge over Troubled Water"; Simons, "Fields and Facebook"; Salomon, "A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education"; Hirblinger et al., "Digital Peacebuilding: A Framework for

- Critical–Reflexive Engagement”; and Tellidis, Richmond, and Visoka, *Peace in Digital International Relations*.
27. Hitman and Yefet, “Nation-State Interests Prevail”; and Kravetz, “The Israel-Hamas War.”
 28. Papacharissi, *Affective Publics*; Tufekci, “Algorithmic Harms Beyond Facebook and Google”; Karizat et al., “Algorithmic Folk Theories”; Brady et al., “Emotion Shapes the Diffusion of Moralized Content in Social Networks”; Tanesini, “Affective Polarisation and Emotional Distortions on Social Media”; and Lerman et al., “Affective Polarization and Dynamics of Information Spread in Online Networks.”
 29. Zeitzoff, “How Social Media Is Changing Conflict”; Wolfsfeld, “The role of the media in violent conflicts”; and Yarchi and Boxman-Shabtai, “Image War Moves to TikTok.”
 30. Neumann, “Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn”; Neumann, *At Home with the Diplomats*; Pouliot, *International Pecking Orders*; and Constantinou, Cornago and McConnell, *Transprofessional Diplomacy*.
 31. Saward, *The Representative Claim*.
 32. Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*; and Fraser, “Rethinking Recognition.”
 33. Salomon, “A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education”; Fairey, “Peace is Possible”; and Chaitin and Avlagon, *Striving for Peace through Personal Narratives*.
 34. See note 12 above.
 35. See note 8 above.
 36. Bar-Tal, *Intractable Conflicts*; and Wolfsfeld, “The role of the media in violent conflicts.”
 37. Salomon, “A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education”; and Chaitin and Avlagon, *Striving for Peace through Personal Narratives*.
 38. Riedl, Lukito and Woolley, “Political Influencers on Social Media”; Arnesson and Reinikainen, *Influencer Politics*; Manfredi, Arredondo and Danzek, “Social Media Influencers and Diplomacy’s Evolution”; Bjola and Holmes, *Digital Diplomacy*; Manor, *The Digitalisation of Public Diplomacy*; Hirblinger et al., “Digital Peacebuilding”; Reuss and Stetter, *Social Media and Peacebuilding*; Dessel and Ali, “The Minds of Peace”; and Salomon, “A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education.”
 39. Arnesson and Reinikainen, *Influencer Politics*.
 40. Riedl, Lukito and Woolley, “Political Influencers on Social Media”; and Manfredi, Arredondo and Danzek, “Social Media Influencers and Diplomacy’s Evolution.”
 41. Reuss and Stetter, *Social Media and Peacebuilding*; Hirblinger et al., “Digital Peacebuilding”; and Stepanović, *Influencers, Online Alliances and Reconciliation*.
 42. See note 32 above.
 43. See note 37 above.
 44. See note 16 above.
 45. Riedl, Lukito and Woolley, “Political Influencers on Social Media”; and Arnesson and Reinikainen, *Influencer Politics*.
 46. Scharff, “Are We All Influencers Now?”
 47. Yin, *Case Study Research and Applications*.
 48. <https://www.sharakango.com/>

49. Flyvbjerg, “Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research”; and Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*.
50. Highfield and Leaver, “Instagrammatics and Digital Methods”; and Kozinets, *Netnography*.
51. Malterud, Siersma and Guassora, “Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies.”
52. Basaraba et al., “New Media Ecology and Theoretical Foundations.”
53. Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*; and Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, *Qualitative Data Analysis*.
54. Braun and Clarke, “Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology”; and Braun and Clarke, *Thematic Analysis*.
55. Bar-Tal, *Intractable Conflicts*; and Chouliaraki, *The Ironic Spectator*; Chaitin and Avlagon, *Striving for Peace through Personal Narratives*.
56. Braun and Clarke, “Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology”; and Miles, Huberman and Saldaña, *Qualitative Data Analysis*.
57. Braun and Clarke, *Thematic Analysis*.
58. Economic and Social Research Council, *Framework for Research Ethics*.
59. During the period analysed (October 2023–April 2025), Luai Ahmed appeared as a recurring on-screen narrator within the initiative’s video output, articulating a cross-communal framing centred on dialogue and coexistence. His prominence in the findings reflects the empirical distribution of narrative authority across the corpus.
60. <https://www.tiktok.com/@buildersofmideast/video/7437083267305688338>
61. <https://www.instagram.com/reels/C3m6iYxt1Nz/>
62. <https://www.instagram.com/reels/Cz6kLjwNee-/>
63. <https://www.instagram.com/reels/CzJduXmtHXf/>
64. <https://www.instagram.com/reel/C17DfISNraL/>
65. <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DHdDEcpNJKo/>
66. Neumann, “Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn”; Pouliot, *International Pecking Orders*; and Constantinou, Cornago and McConnell, *Transprofessional Diplomacy*.
67. Kelman, “Interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian National Identities”; Kelman, “Reconciliation from a Social-Psychological Perspective”; Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*; and Fraser, “Rethinking Recognition.”
68. Neumann, “Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn”; and Pouliot, *International Pecking Orders*.
69. See note 31 above.
70. Hoskins and O’Loughlin, *War and Media*; Gibbs et al., “#Funeral and Instagram.”
71. See note 16 above.
72. Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*; Fraser, “Rethinking Recognition.”
73. Kelman, “Interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian National Identities”; Kelman, “Reconciliation from a Social-Psychological Perspective”; and Bar-Tal, *Intractable Conflicts*.
74. Handelman and Chowdhury, “The Limits of Political-Elite Diplomacy.”
75. Kent and Taylor, “Fostering dialogic engagement.”
76. Salomon, “A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education.”
77. Hameleers, “The visual nature of information warfare”; and Yarchi and Boxman-Shabtai, “Image War Moves to TikTok.”

78. Salomon, “A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education”; Dessel and Ali, “The Minds of Peace”; Chaitin and Avlagon, *Striving for Peace through Personal Narratives*; De Vries, Simry and Maoz, “Like a Bridge over Troubled Water”; Simons, “Fields and Facebook”; and Hirblinger et al., “Digital Peacebuilding.”
79. Fairey, “Peace is Possible.”
80. Hirblinger et al., “Digital Peacebuilding.”
81. Saward, *The Representative Claim*;
82. Honneth, *The Struggle for Recognition*; Fraser, “Rethinking Recognition”; Kelman, “Reconciliation from a Social-Psychological Perspective”; and Bar-Tal, *Intractable Conflicts*.
83. See note 68 above.
84. Hoskins and O’Loughlin, *War and Media*; Gibbs et al., “#Funeral and Instagram”; and Yarchi and Boxman-Shabtai, “Image War Moves to TikTok.”
85. Arnesson and Reinikainen, *Influencer Politics*; and Divon and Eriksson Krutrök, “The rise of war influencers.”

Acknowledgments

This manuscript was prepared with the assistance of ChatGPT (version GPT-5.3, developed by OpenAI), which was used solely for language improvement and idea clarification. All research, analysis, and conclusions presented are entirely the authors’ own. All AI-generated outputs were reviewed to ensure accuracy and originality.

Author contributions

CRedit: **Stefania Manca**: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Sara Torre**: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Dr Stefania Manca is Research Director at the Institute for Educational Technology of the Italian National Research Council (CNR-ITD), Italy. Her research investigates the socio-political dynamics of digital cultures at the intersection of education, media, memory, and public discourse. Her work focuses particularly on digital political communication, online hate and antisemitism, digital Holocaust memory, and civic engagement in contexts of conflict and polarisation. She examines how online environments shape public debate, identity formation, and the circulation of harmful or counter-narrative discourses, as well as how media literacy, memory

education, and pedagogical interventions can foster critical digital engagement, civic resilience, and peacebuilding processes.

Sara Torre is a PhD candidate in Psychology at the Department of Education, Psychology and Communication, University of Bari “Aldo Moro”, Italy. Her research focuses on identity construction, socio-emotional dynamics, and learning processes in digital and educational contexts.

ORCID

Stefania Manca  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0348-7139>

Sara Torre  <http://orcid.org/0009-0001-7399-6692>

Data availability statement

Data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author on request.

Bibliography

- Abbas, L., S. S. Fahmy, S. Ayad, M. Ibrahim, and A. H. Ali. “TikTok Intifada: Analyzing Social Media Activism Among Youth.” *Online Media and Global Communication* 1, no. 2 (2022): 287–314.
- Abdel Wahab, A. *The War on Gaza: How Social Media Constructed Narratives and Solidarity Among Gazans*. Haifa: 7amleh – The Arab Center for the Advancement of Social Media, 2025.
- Arnesson, J., and H. Reinikainen. *Influencer Politics: At the Intersection of Personal, Political, and Promotional*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2024.
- Ayad, F., and A. Sytnik. “Israeli Digital Diplomacy Towards Arab States: Social Media Engagement Analysis.” In *Digital Transformation in Governance and Society*, edited by A. Chugunov, O. Filatova, Y. Kabanov, H. Misra, L. Smorgunov, and W. Zhang, 1–14. Cham: Springer, 2025.
- Bar-Tal, D. *Intractable Conflicts: Socio-Psychological Foundations and Dynamics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Basaraba, N., P. Arnds, J. Edmond, and O. Conlan. “New Media Ecology and Theoretical Foundations for Nonfiction Digital Narrative Creative Practice.” *Narrative* 29, no. 3 (2021): 374–395.
- Bjola, C., and M. Holmes. *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2015.
- Brady, W. J., J. A. Wills, J. T. Jost, J. A. Tucker, and J. J. Van Bavel. “Emotion Shapes the Diffusion of Moralized Content in Social Networks.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114, no. 28 (2017): 7313–7318.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. “Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology.” *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2 (2006): 77–101.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: SAGE, 2021.
- Cervi, L., and T. Divon. “Playful Activism: Memetic Performances of Palestinian Resistance in TikTok #Challenges.” *Social Media + Society* 9, no. 1 (2023): 1–13.

- Cervi, L., and C. Marín-Lladó. "FreePalestine on TikTok: From Performative Activism to (Meaningful) Playful Activism." *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 15, no. 4 (2022): 414–434.
- Chaitin, J., and E. Avlagon. *Striving for Peace Through Personal Narratives of Genocide and War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2025.
- Charmaz, K. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. London: SAGE, 2014.
- Chouliaraki, L. *The Ironic Spectator: Solidarity in the Age of Post-Humanitarianism*. Cambridge: Polity, 2013.
- Constantinou, C. M., N. Cornago, and F. McConnell. *Transprofessional Diplomacy*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017.
- Daoudi, O. "The Communications Strategy of the IDF's Arabic Spokesperson on X During Operation Breaking Dawn in 2022." *Global Media and Communication* 2, no. 3 (2025): 233–250.
- Dessel, A. B., and N. Ali. "The Minds of Peace and Intergroup Dialogue: Two Complementary Approaches to Peace." *Israel Affairs* 18, no. 1 (2012): 123–139.
- De Vries, M., A. Simry, and I. Maoz. "Like a Bridge Over Troubled Water: Using Facebook to Mobilize Solidarity Among East Jerusalem Palestinians During the 2014 War in Gaza." *International Journal of Communication* 9 (2015): 2622–2649.
- Divon, T. "Playful Publics on TikTok: The Memetic Israeli-Palestinian War of #Challenge." In *Critical Meme Reader II: Memetic Tacticality*, edited by C. Arkenbout and L. Scherz, 88–105. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, 2022.
- Divon, T., and M. Eriksson Krutrök. "The Rise of War Influencers: Creators, Platforms, and the Visibility of Conflict Zones." *Platforms and Society* 2 (2025): 1–18.
- Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). *Framework for Research Ethics*. Swindon: UK Research and Innovation, 2025.
- Fairey, T. "Peace Is Possible: The Role of Strategic Narratives in Peacebuilding." *Media, War & Conflict* 17, no. 1 (2024): 3–24.
- Flyvbjerg, B. "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12, no. 2 (2006): 219–245.
- Fraser, N. "Rethinking Recognition." *New Left Review* 3, no. 3 (2000): 107–120.
- Gibbs, M., J. Meese, M. Arnold, B. Nansen, and M. Carter. "#Funeral and Instagram: Death, Social Media, and Platform Vernacular." *Information, Communication & Society* 18, no. 3 (2015): 255–268.
- Hadari, G., and A. Turgeman. "Public Diplomacy in Army Boots: The Chronic Failure of Israel's Hasbara." *Israel Affairs* 24, no. 3 (2018): 482–499.
- Hameleers, M. "The Visual Nature of Information Warfare: The Construction of Partisan Claims on Truth and Evidence in the Context of Wars in Ukraine and Israel/Palestine." *Journal of Communication* 75, no. 2 (2025): 90–100.
- Handelman, S., and J. Chowdhury. "The Limits of Political-Elite Diplomacy: Leaders, People and Social Conflicts." *Israel Affairs* 23, no. 3 (2017): 468–495.
- Highfield, T., and T. Leaver. "Instagrammatics and Digital Methods: Studying Visual Social Media, from Selfies and GIFs to Memes and Emoji." *Communication Research and Practice* 2, no. 1 (2016): 47–62.
- Hirblinger, A. T., J. M. Hansen, K. Hoelscher, Å. Kolås, K. Lidén, and B. O. Martins. "Digital Peacebuilding: A Framework for Critical-Reflexive Engagement." *International Studies Perspectives* 24, no. 3 (2023): 265–284.

- Hitman, G., and B. Yefet. "Nation-State Interests Prevail: Gulf States' Policies Towards the Gaza War." *Israel Affairs* (2026): 1–25. doi:[10.1080/13537121.2025.2571501](https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2025.2571501).
- Holoborodko, O. "From State Actors to Citizens: Studying the Concept of Citizen Cultural Diplomacy." *Multidisciplinary Science Journal* 8, no. 4 (2025): 2026228.
- Honneth, A. *The Struggle for Recognition. The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
- Hoskins, A., and B. O'Loughlin. *War and Media: The Emergence of Diffused War*. Cambridge: Polity, 2010.
- Karizat, N., D. Delmonaco, M. Eslami, and N. Andalibi. "Algorithmic Folk Theories and Identity: How TikTok Users Co-Produce Knowledge of Identity and Engage in Algorithmic Resistance." *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, no. CSCW2 (2021): 1–44.
- Kazzou, K., and S. Lim. "Leveling the Playing Field? Palestinian Digital Diplomacy in the 2023–2024 Gaza Conflict." *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* (2025). doi:[10.1057/s41254-025-00422-4](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-025-00422-4).
- Kelman, H. C. "The Interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian National Identities: The Role of the Other in Existential Conflicts." *Journal of Social Issues* 55, no. 3 (1999): 581–600.
- Kelman, H. C. "Reconciliation from a Social-Psychological Perspective." In *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation*, edited by A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, and J. D. Fisher, 15–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Kent, M. L., and M. Taylor. "Fostering Dialogic Engagement: Toward an Architecture of Social Media for Social Change." *Social Media + Society* 7, no. 1 (2021): 1–10.
- Kozinets, R. V. *Netnography: The Essential Guide to Qualitative Social Media Research*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2020.
- Kravetz, J. R. "The Israel-Hamas War and the IDF Strategy Framework." *Israel Affairs* 30, no. 5 (2024): 879–892.
- Lavie-Driver, N., and S. van der Linden. "Social Media, AI, and the Rise of Extremism During Intergroup Conflict." *Frontiers in Social Psychology* 3 (2025): 1711791.
- Lerman, K., D. Feldman, Z. He, and A. Rao. "Affective Polarization and Dynamics of Information Spread in Online Networks." *npj Complexity* 1, no. 1 (2024): 8.
- Mabillard, V., R. Zumofen, G. Yavetz, and J. Bronstein. "Responding to the October 7th Attack: Analyzing Israeli Public Organizations' Crisis Communication and Citizen Engagement on Social Media." *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 16, no. 3 (2025): e12325.
- Mac Ginty, R. "Everyday Peace: Bottom-Up and Local Agency in Conflict-Affected Societies." *Security Dialogue* 45, no. 6 (2014): 548–564.
- Malterud, K., V. D. Siersma, and A. D. Guassora. "Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power." *Qualitative Health Research* 26, no. 13 (2016): 1753–1760.
- Manfredi, J. L., R. Arredondo, and L. Danzek. "Social Media Influencers and Diplomacy's Evolution." *The Washington Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (2024): 79–95.
- Manor, I. *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Miles, M. B., A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldaña. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. London: SAGE, 2020.
- Mor, Y., Y. Ron, and I. Maoz. "'Likes' for Peace: Can Facebook Promote Dialogue in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict?" *Media and Communication* 4, no. 1 (2016): 15–26.

- Moreno-Mercado, J. M., and A. Calatrava-García. "Multilingual Public Diplomacy: Strategic Communication of Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) in Twitter During Operation Guardian of the Walls." *Media, War & Conflict* 16, no. 2 (2023): 282–299.
- Mueller, M.-E., and D. Rajaram. *Social Media Storytelling: Digital Narratives in Networked Communication*. London: Routledge, 2022.
- Neumann, I. B. "Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31, no. 3 (2002): 627–651.
- Neumann, I. B. *At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Papacharissi, Z. *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Pouliot, V. *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Reuss, A., and S. Stetter. *Social Media and Peacebuilding: How Digital Spaces Shape Conflict and Peace*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2024.
- Riedl, M. J., J. Lukito, and S. C. Woolley. "Political Influencers on Social Media: An Introduction." *Social Media + Society* 9, no. 2 (2023): 1–9.
- Ron, Y., C. Suleiman, and I. Maoz. "Women for Peace: Promoting Dialogue and Peace Through Facebook" *Social Media + Society* 6, no. 4 (2020): 1–11.
- Rosyidiyani, T. S., D. Lubis, F. Pramono, and R. Kinseng. "Reframing Cultural Diplomacy Through Communication for Development: A Systematic Review of Participatory Practices." *Multidisciplinary Reviews* 9, no. 5 (2025): 2026255.
- Salomon, G. "A Narrative-Based View of Coexistence Education." *Journal of Social Issues* 60, no. 2 (2004): 273–287.
- Satkhed, B., S. Thaloor, and G. Indrakanti. "Instagram Activism: Analysing the Palestinian Narrative Post-7 October 2023 Attacks." *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research* 18, no. 1 (2025): 161–188.
- Saward, M. *The Representative Claim*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Scharff, C. "Are We All Influencers Now? Feminist Activists Discuss the Distinction Between Being an Activist and an Influencer." *Feminist Theory* 25, no. 3 (2024): 454–470.
- Shahvar, S., and M. Sepahan. "Grassroots Diplomacy in Practice: Initiatives by Israeli Civilians at Bridging the Divide with the Iranian People." *Israel Affairs* 25, no. 5 (2019): 803–825.
- Shamis, A. J., and M. Iboga Rasumni-Urşar. "BDS on TikTok: No Israel Counter-Memes and Israel's Digital Abjection." *Israel Affairs* (2026). doi:[10.1080/13537121.2026.2652288](https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2026.2652288).
- Simons, J. "Fields and Facebook: Ta'ayush's Grassroots Activism and Archiving the Peace That Will Have Come in Israel/Palestine." *Media and Communication* 4, no. 1 (2016): 27–38.
- Stepanović, I. *Influencers, Online Alliances and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe*. London: Routledge, 2024.
- Tanesini, A. "Affective Polarisation and Emotional Distortions on Social Media." *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement* 92 (2022): 87–109.
- Tellidis, I., O. P. Richmond, and G. Visoka. *Peace in Digital International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- Tufekci, Z. "Algorithmic Harms Beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent Challenges of Computational Agency." *Colorado Technology Law Journal* 13, no. 2 (2015): 203–218.

- Urman, A., and M. Makhortykh. "My War Is Your Special Operation: Engagement with Pro- and Anti-Regime Framing of the War in Ukraine on Russian Social Media." *Media, War & Conflict* (2025). doi:[10.1177/17506352251371864](https://doi.org/10.1177/17506352251371864).
- Vasiliu, V., H. Shibli, and G. Yavetz. "Social Media, Anxiety, and Ethnic Disparities: The Case of the Jewish and Arab Population Groups Following October 7 in Israel." *Media, War & Conflict* (2025). doi:[10.1177/17506352251392725](https://doi.org/10.1177/17506352251392725).
- Wolfsfeld, G. "The Role of the Media in Violent Conflicts in the Digital Age: Israeli and Palestinian Leaders' Perceptions." *Media, War & Conflict* 11, no. 1 (2017): 107–124.
- Yair, T. "Hamas's 7 October Massacres: An Appeal to the International Community Through Facebook Images." *Israel Affairs* 30, no. 5 (2024): 893–924.
- Yarchi, M., and L. Boxman-Shabtai. "The Image War Moves to TikTok: Evidence from the May 2021 Round of the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict." *Digital Journalism* 13, no. 1 (2025): 115–135.
- Yin, R. K. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. London: SAGE, 2018.
- Zeitsoff, T. "How Social Media Is Changing Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61, no. 9 (2017): 1970–1991.