

Expanding peace journalism: comparative and critical approaches

Edited by Ibrahim Seaga Shaw, Jake Lynch, and Robert A Hackett



SYDNEY UNIVERSITY PRESS

Published 2011 by Sydney University Press
SYDNEY UNIVERSITY PRESS
University of Sydney Library
sydney.edu.au/sup

© Individual authors 2011
© Sydney University Press 2011

Reproduction and Communication for other purposes

Except as permitted under the Act, no part of this edition may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or communicated in any form or by any means without prior written permission. All requests for reproduction or communication should be made to Sydney University Press at the address below:

Sydney University Press
Fisher Library F03
University of Sydney NSW 2006 AUSTRALIA
Email: sup.info@sydney.edu.au

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry

Title: Expanding peace journalism : comparative and critical approaches / edited by Ibrahim Seaga Shaw, Jake Lynch, and Robert A. Hackett.

ISBN: 9781920899707 (pbk.)

Notes: Includes bibliographical references and index.

Subjects: Peace--Press coverage.
Mass media and peace.
Social conflict--Press coverage.

Other Authors/Contributors:
Shaw, Ibrahim Seaga.
Lynch, Jake.
Hackett, Robert A.

Dewey Number:
070.44930366

Cover design by Miguel Yamin, the University Publishing Service
Printed in Australia

Contents

Preface	5
<i>Johan Galtung</i>	
Introduction. Expanding peace journalism: comparative and critical approaches	7
<i>Jake Lynch, Robert A Hackett and Ibrahim Seaga Shaw</i>	
PART I. Conceptualising peace journalism: limitations and extensions	33
1. New vistas for peace journalism: alternative media and communication rights	35
<i>Robert A Hackett</i>	
2. International security and language: expanding the peace journalism framework	70
<i>Birgit Brock-Utne</i>	
3. 'Human rights journalism': a critical conceptual framework of a complementary strand of peace journalism	96
<i>Ibrahim Seaga Shaw</i>	
4. Empathy and ethics: journalistic representation and its consequences	122
<i>Annabel McGoldrick</i>	
PART II. Case studies: peace journalism in wartime and peacebuilding	145
5. Documenting war, visualising peace: towards peace photography	147
<i>Stuart Allan</i>	
6. Oligarchy reloaded and pirate media: the state of peace journalism in Guatemala	168
<i>Lioba Suchenwirth and Richard Lance Keeble</i>	

7. The gaze of US and Indian media on terror in Mumbai: a comparative analysis <i>Sudeshna Roy and Susan Dente Ross</i>	191
8. Peace journalism–critical discourse case study: media and the plan for Swedish and Norwegian defence cooperation <i>Stig A Nohrstedt and Rune Ottosen</i>	217
9. Conflict reporting and peace journalism: in search of a new model: lessons from the Nigerian Niger-Delta crisis <i>Matt Mogeckwu</i>	239
10. Peace process or just peace deal? The media’s failure to cover peace <i>Virgil Hawkins</i>	261
PART III. Agencies and openings for change	285
11. Can the centre hold? Prospects for mobilising media activism around public service broadcasting using peace journalism <i>Jake Lynch</i>	287
12. Globalisation of compassion: women’s narratives as models for peace journalism <i>Elissa J Tivona</i>	317
13. Examining the ‘dark past’ and ‘hopeful future’ in representations of race and Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission <i>Peter A Chow-White and Rob McMahon</i>	345
Notes on contributors	375
Index	383

Preface

Johan Galtung

This book, so rich in content, is a testimony to the need for empirical, critical and constructive scrutiny of media. Each chapter opens a new window, a new angle; all of them important.

The problem some 50 years ago was what criteria an event had to meet to qualify as news, and we – my fine assistant Mari Holmboe Ruge and myself – came up with 12. When the news represents a distorted world image, the distortions are worth knowing. Recently I have added entertainment value as a news factor, in the form of ‘infotainment’.

I then focused on four: high status of persons, countries, actor-orientation (as opposed to nature, culture, structure) and something negative. That high status – class, gender, race, whatever – attracts attention happens almost by definition, and actor-orientation is built into the Indo-European sentence structure: subject–predicate–object; not only a smoking gun, but ‘who done it’. But negativism? Where does it come from? Media as we know them are Western efforts to mediate between the world and the reader/listener/viewer. But isn’t the West based on an idea of progress? Maybe, but also on apocalypse. Negativism both highlights the abnormal and warns of clear and imminent danger. Then, Aristotle enters.

He did us a colossal dis favour by dividing the human drama in two: tragedy or comedy; Shakespeare being the showcase. Either it ends badly or it is laughable; the former for people high up, the latter for the rest. What is missing? Muddling through, regular life, the fact that we generally manage. And if literature is tailored to fit Aristotle, then why not also the lesser fry among authors – the journalists? Maybe mainstream journalists are as afraid of peace as authors are of the human condition of happiness, tearing at it the moment it rears its smiling face? Or, even worse, they do not even recognise it when it is there?

Expanding peace journalism

My basic concern was and is peace; and the four factors, with negativism up front, make peace journalism – as opposed to violence and war journalism – an uphill struggle. And yet it is possible: I have witnessed its increase in the last decades. But there are plenty of hurdles to overcome, like the strange idea that firing a bullet is somehow objective whereas saying or doing peace is not.

Happy reading – and please join the search for better media!

Versonnex, France, April 2011

Introduction

Expanding peace journalism: comparative and critical approaches

Jake Lynch, Robert A Hackett and Ibrahim Seaga Shaw

In a single month – January 2011 – a million Egyptians created their own accounts on Facebook. Weeks later, after a series of eye-catching demonstrations coordinated via social media, the hated regime of Hosni Mubarak was gone. State TV was still giving out the official line – that the actions were the work of foreign infiltrators and ‘terrorists’ – even as negotiations were underway for the military to take temporary charge, pending the adoption of a new constitution, leading to free elections.

The protests in Cairo drew inspiration from the ousting of Tunisia’s President Ben Ali, weeks before. Here, another iconic new media phenomenon, Wikileaks, was implicated in social upheaval. According to ‘Sam’, a Tunisian blogger, ‘Wikileaks revealed what everyone was whispering’, thereby playing an important catalysing role as the first domino in the fall of repressive Arab governments began to wobble.

‘President Ben Ali and his regime’, the US Ambassador in Tunis had written, ‘have lost touch with the Tunisian people ... They rely on the police for control and focus on preserving power’. Following its disclosure by Wikileaks, the cable was published in a Lebanese newspaper, launching Tunisia’s web-savvy youth on a game of cat and mouse with the censors to devise ways to access the pages via internet proxies.

Most research on social movements supports the notion that internet usage – putting in the hands of activists more tools and opportunities for symbolic production – has had an effect on the capacity to bring about extra-movement outcomes, of ‘simple accentuation’ (Earl et al.

2010, p426). After all, other communications technologies had already played important enabling roles in social transformations: from newspaper journalism, then SMS messaging, in the two ‘people power’ uprisings in the Philippines which deposed presidents in 1986 and 2001 respectively; to the production and circulation of VHS cassettes of demonstrations against martial law in Thailand in 1992, drawing on the resources of Bangkok’s large-scale pirate video industry (Williams & Rich 2000).

The events of the so-called Arab Spring may signal a further intensification of a syndrome identified by Manuel Castells as ‘an evolution [now underway]: a historic shift of the public sphere from the institutional realm to [a] new communication space’ – one in which ‘insurgent politics and social movements can intervene more decisively’ (Castells 2007, p238). Castells goes as far as to argue that ‘the media have become the social space where power is decided’ (2007, p238). One need not accept the media-centrism of this position to recognise that further scrutiny of the power relations at work within media domains, and of attempts to challenge them, is warranted.

It is in this context that interest in peace journalism has grown rapidly over recent years. Peace journalism (PJ) emerged in the mid-1990s as a new, transdisciplinary field of interest to professional journalists in both developed and developing countries and to civil society activists, university researchers and others interested in the conflict–media nexus. Significantly, it drew impetus by looking through Castells’ telescope, as it were, from the other end: the insight sharpened in particular by experiences in the 1991 Gulf War, that militaries increasingly viewed the communication space as a crucial battleground, and that journalists were therefore ‘caught up, whether they like[d] it or not, in the loops and coils of conflict and political process’ (Lynch 2008, p193).

Perhaps the largest single category of published PJ research takes the form of operationalising the PJ model to derive sets of evaluative criteria to gauge the extent of peace journalism in the manifest content of mainstream media: usually newspapers for ease of access, television and radio. And in non-research environments, PJ supporters have sought to catalyse immanent critique, using the legitimating norms of journalistic

practice to call for reforms in professional standards, urging the case for peace journalism as ‘good journalism’ (Patindol 2010). Most PJ activity, then, has focused on the representation of conflict in corporate media, often called mainstream media – a category encompassing public broadcasting as well as journalism commercially produced and sold.

A growing number of PJ researchers advocate, instead, a root-and-branch critique of mainstream journalism as a privileged professional practice, indissociable from the predominant ‘war journalism’ style of reporting that PJ sets out, in scholarly research, to problematise; with adjacent exhortatory and pedagogical initiatives typically promoting feasible and preferable alternatives. Instead of examining or championing the case for marginal reforms in corporate media, these scholars argue that PJ should concentrate on ‘the tradition of radical journalism [openly] committed to progressive social change’ (Keeble 2010, p50); a tradition now enlivened and greatly expanded by new media technologies.

According to Hanitzsch (2007), on the other hand, journalism can be distinguished, as a form of public communication, precisely by its declared commitment to ‘internal goals’, in contrast to such endeavours as, say, political advertising, which are avowedly instrumentalist. This, Kempf argues (2007), accounts for the ‘trust bonus’ that journalism still enjoys, and PJ advocates would squander it at their peril.

Interest in PJ spans many fields, but its main ‘home’ has been in peace research, which is characterised by a value-explicit approach: ‘with both a positive valuation of peace ... and a commitment to examine trade-offs between values’ (Stephenson 1999, pp810–11). It shapes a key question: if the focus of PJ research, advocacy and training were to switch, from mainstream to alternative media, would it – in the classic PJ definition – ‘create [more] opportunities for society at large to consider and value non-violent responses to conflict’? (Lynch & McGoldrick 2005, p5) Would it further the value-explicit remit of peace research, and the mission of peace activism to ‘give peace [more of] a chance’ by boosting the potential for extra-movement outcomes?

‘Alternative media’ represent a ‘challenger paradigm’, Robert A Hackett writes, in his contribution to this volume, to the objectivity

regime, as its own structural underpinnings erode; one that opens up new 'vistas' for PJ by offering 'new venues and allies' for implementation. But Hackett chooses, as a spatial metaphor to convey the relationship between mainstream and alternative media, the word 'parallel', implying that they never meet. The much wider access to media per se now supplements, without necessarily challenging, what Molotch and Lester (1997) call the 'habitual access' to the privileged domain of mainstream media journalism enjoyed by official sources. Non-elite peace actors may therefore remain stuck in what the peace researcher John Paul Lederach termed the 'interdependence gap ... the lack of responsive and coordinated relationships up and down the levels of leadership in a society' (Lederach 1999, p30).

Gamson (1975) proposed 'acceptance in [a] polity' as the presumed aim of any social movement. It implies traction in what McKee calls the 'official public sphere' (McKee 2005, p41): a connection between Lederach's 'grassroots leadership' and 'top-level leadership' – being the level where institutional decision-making takes place. If such distinctions are under erosion by the evolution identified by Castells in the assessment quoted above, then he himself adds a reminder of the continuing salience of what Bennett (1990) described as 'indexing': factors limiting the range of reported political viewpoints and issues to those expressed within the mainstream political establishment, that still 'weigh heavily ... on the process of events-driven reporting' (Castells 2007, p241).

This is the very pattern – events-driven, and dominated by official sources – that is problematised as 'war journalism' in the PJ model. PJ, in Shinar's definition, is distinguished by:

1. Exploring backgrounds and contexts of conflict formation, and presenting causes and options on every side so as to portray conflict in realistic terms, transparent to the audience
2. Giving voice to the views of all rival parties
3. Offering creative ideas for conflict resolution, development, peacemaking and peacekeeping
4. Exposing lies, cover-up attempts and culprits on all sides, and

revealing excesses committed by, and suffering inflicted on, peoples of all parties

5. Paying attention to peace stories and postwar developments (Shinar 2007, p200).

Bennett's indexing model is just one of a range of scholarly accounts of the relationship between structure and agency, as they bear upon the everyday working life of the journalist. Assessments of the unexploited scope for individual reporters, even editors, to shape their coverage in terms recognisable as belonging under Shinar's list of headings, vary accordingly. Lynch declares, simply, that in every case where the PJ model has been applied in exercises of content analysis, 'there is some peace journalism, even if not known, to its creators, by that name; so there could be more' (Lynch 2008, p234).

This statement highlights one of the significant ambiguities contained in such studies – necessitating, as an opening gambit, a threefold distinction. First, PJ may be a consciously applied editorial philosophy – still a relative rarity in conventional media (though it has occurred in particular circumstances of time and place, as with several Indonesian newspapers – see Lynch 2008, pp92–112). Second, some media may intentionally pursue practices that challenge war journalism, such as seeking common ground between contending parties, or reporting events from the viewpoint of all victims of war; but the practitioners are not necessarily informed by or trained in the PJ model as such. (A good example would be the Al Jazeera satellite television network, whose proponents have proclaimed that while Western-owned media like CNN report what happens when the missile is launched, Al Jazeera reports what happens when it lands.) Finally, there is 'accidental' peace journalism – news patterns that resemble those of peace journalism, but that are contingent byproducts of routine news imperatives in specific situations, such as the geopolitical locus of the news organisation in relation to a particular conflict.

This last factor may account for the apparently high PJ quotient in the editorials of Indian newspapers in the wake of the attack by masked gunmen on civilian targets in Mumbai in November 2008 – discussed

in the chapter by Sudeshna Roy and Susan Dente Ross. Among the prevalent framings characteristic of the hegemonic ‘war on terrorism’ discourse, there remain, they record, ‘infrequent yet rich “seams” in which resources of resistance can be mined’ – linked, it is suggested, with key ambiguities over India’s strategic orientation vis-à-vis the US.

Despite evidence of what Freedman (2009) calls ‘plurality ... and variegation’ in the outputs of mainstream media, of the enduring ‘trust bonus’ that professional journalism may enjoy, and of the continuing salience of distinctions between the official and alternative public spheres, several of the contributors to this book make strong arguments for PJ to find what they see as more fertile ground in various branches of alternative media.

This emerging debate in peace journalism overlaps with another: whether PJ should, in keeping with the value-explicit approach of peace research, take an avowedly ‘proactive’ role. The community media, identified in the chapter by Lioba Suchenwirth and Richard Lance Keeble as the most promising milieu for PJ, ‘actively promot[e] human rights and social change.’ In chapter 3, Ibrahim Seaga Shaw’s rallying cry for human rights journalism – as a complementary strand to the existing conceptual framework – urges journalism ‘not only [to] illuminate the problems but also identify, recommend, advocate and mobilise actionable solutions to address them’.

There are, as Elissa Tivona shows in her account of women engaged in grassroots peacebuilding, plenty of actionable solutions being implemented around the world, all the time. They exemplify a different, more nurturing and more sustaining set of values and ideas than the male-dominated realist paradigms that exert hegemony over economic development and international relations; but mainstream media representations are complicit in keeping them in the background. It took a collaborative, non-commercial journalistic initiative – assembling the stories of 1000 peacewomen to be nominated for the Nobel Prize – to draw this narrative together, in what amounts to a notable paradigmatic exercise in peace journalism.

Matt Moge kwu calls on PJ to ‘free itself from the mainstream journalism strait-jacket to be able to focus on bringing about change,

preventing the escalation of crises, and doing its utmost to institute dialogue among people with conflicting ideas and values.' And even Rob McMahon and Peter Chow-White, although their data are drawn from examples of 'accidental' PJ in a mass-circulation newspaper, characterise PJ's theoretical stance as one that 'incorporates principles of conflict analysis to promote news production practices that *aim towards* conflict transformation' (emphasis added).

Peace journalism and its critics

Rhetorical commitments such as these will potentially reactivate an important line of critique encountered by PJ in response to earlier iterations, which sees it as a threat to journalists' professional objectivity and integrity, imposing on them criteria external to their proper purpose. From a scholarly perspective, such a position begs the question of whether any form of journalism can be truly neutral vis-à-vis its broader political, economic and ideological contexts. One of the chief journalistic foes of PJ, the BBC correspondent David Loyn, accepts that 'objectivity' may be 'chimerical', but argues that it remains an appropriate aim in reporting and preferable to any attempt to 'load' the job with 'unhelpful ... prescriptions' for what it should and should not do (Loyn 2007).

Attempts to engage with this view, in order to mobilise journalistic agency around the distinctions in the PJ model, have led its advocates to confine their rhetoric instead to forms that mesh naturally with the branch of professional journalism most committed – notionally, at least – to openness and transparency, namely public service broadcasting. The editorial policies adopted by the doyen of the genre, the BBC, commit its journalists to '*enable* national and international debate' (emphasis added) – rather than, say, attempting to lead it. This is the significance, in the Lynch and McGoldrick definition of PJ, cited earlier, of the emphasis on 'creating opportunities' for audiences to consider and value non-violent responses. If society, furnished with such opportunities, decides it still prefers violent responses, then 'there is nothing more journalism can do about it, while remaining journalism' (Lynch 2008, p4).

Liberate PJ from the expectation that journalistic agency in mainstream media can be cultivated and cajoled to bring about a significant expansion of such opportunities, according to several contributors to this book, and such restraints can be thrown off. This more avowedly radical critique suggests that peace journalism has not sufficiently challenged professional norms, and has unwittingly mirrored war journalism by focusing on media roles in armed conflict at the expense of attention to structural violence and peacebuilding.

One critic who draws elements from both the professional/conservative and radical perspectives is Thomas Hanitzsch (2007), who throws nearly everything but the kitchen sink at peace journalism. Epistemologically, he accuses PJ of a naïvely positivist faith in untrammelled ‘truth’ (which in Galtung’s model was counterposed to war journalism’s ‘propaganda’ orientation). Theoretically, Hanitzsch sees in PJ an outdated conception of media effects as powerful and linear. Normatively, he says that PJ calls for ‘bad news’ to be suppressed when it jeopardises peaceful outcomes, and for journalism to take on inappropriate advocacy, peacekeeping or campaigning tasks that are better left to political, legal or military actors.

PJ advocates have effectively refuted these particular criticisms. PJ theory has been updated since Galtung’s original model, to recognise epistemological pluralism and the de-centring of meaning-making: rather than reflect *the* truth as such, PJ aims to identify and deconstruct propaganda, and can be recognised as supplying ‘cues to form negotiated and/or oppositional readings’ of dominant iterations of meaning (Lynch 2008, p143). Media effects are not in fact conceived as linear; Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) hypothesise a ‘feedback loop’ whereby previous patterns of news reportage influence the expectations and strategies of political actors as sources, who shape reportable news events in conflict situations. As for how to handle news that is ‘inconvenient’, such as atrocities committed by one side that has already been demonised, peace journalists call not for censorship but for contextualisation.

But Hanitzsch offers several criticisms that are more telling. The peace journalism research tradition needs to attend more to the institutions and contexts of journalism itself. In Hanitzsch’s view, PJ

is prone to equating journalism with media in general, collapsing it with public relations, advertising, entertainment, and more recently the hybrid forms of quasi-journalism emerging in social media and the blogosphere. It over-blames journalism for militarising popular consciousness and state policies, implicitly letting other social and political forces off the hook. News values, the criteria that govern news selection and framing, cannot take hold without a purchase in popular culture. In addressing the alleged shortcomings of journalism, structural factors must be given their due weight, including workaday news routines; media organisations' need for reliable and credible flows of news, technology, budgets, relationships with advertisers, and the legal framework (Shoemaker & Reese 1996).

Such insights can be synthesised into a conceptual schema flexible enough for PJ to be modelled as potentially influential on journalistic practice. We do not need to conclude that editors and reporters are mere cogs in a machine not of their own making, and that therefore efforts to reform journalism from within are pointless. Structural constraints govern the content of news, but they do not altogether determine it. Pressure from without and renewal from within are not mutually exclusive avenues, an issue explored by Jake Lynch's chapter in this volume; they may, indeed, be necessary counterparts.

To Majid Tehranian's aphorism – 'structural pluralism [in media] may be considered a *sine qua non* of content pluralism' (Tehranian 2002, p58) – one might add that PJ reform efforts have generally devoted themselves to attempts to invoke and implement the political and perspectival pluralism already notionally provided for, whether in public service agreements – the particular terrain identified in Lynch's chapter as a promising milieu – or the general transmitted assumption about the essential honesty of journalism, inscribed in Kempf's formula of a 'trust bonus'. Such a strategy is capable of extending the writ of PJ only so far, of course, and the differences of emphasis among its exponents, briefly rehearsed in this introduction, encompass, between them, a range of agendas, explicit or otherwise, for more thoroughgoing structural changes.

Organisation of the book

Part I. Conceptualising peace journalism: limitations and extensions

The first part of this book is devoted to the conceptual and organisational frameworks that have produced the dominant patterns of war journalism, and to prospects for them to be transcended and transformed.¹ Titled 'Conceptualising peace journalism: limitations and extensions', contributions trace and traverse boundaries between peace journalism and other paradigms with potentially overlapping assumptions and orientations.

War journalism attained dominance within structures constitutive of the political economy of media. Such journalism should be seen, in other words, not merely as a successful product but as an epiphenomenon of a 'world information and communication order' – a formulation coined as part of a systematic attempt to promote reforms.

Robert A Hackett considers, in comparative analysis, the respective strengths and weaknesses of 'challenger paradigms' as candidates to overturn and supplant what he calls 'the arguably disintegrating but still dominant regime of objectivity'. He urges a creative synergy of reform efforts, with peace journalism seen as capable of breathing new life into the movement for a new world information and communication order, following the UNESCO initiative of a previous generation, and of reaching out to social movement activists responding to a broad range of concerns – from human rights abuses to environmental degradation – and seeking to exert political agency in symbolic domains.

Alternative media provide new venues, he suggests, for a struggle to democratise the communication field itself, to complement and strengthen existing calls for democracy *through* media. Examining the nature and extent of 'counter-hegemonic' impetus to be found in each of these challenger paradigms enables a systematic appraisal of the potential for a shared project or 'coalition' for social, political and communicative change to be formed between them.

1 Borrowing terms from Johan Galtung – see Galtung 2004.

Birgit Brock-Utne draws attention to the gendered character of cultural production, locating, as she does so, continuities between the representational conventions of news – with a dominant strain of war journalism – and those of school textbooks which inculcate, in the impressionable young, a flat, realist view of our shared human history. And the story is usually ‘his-story’, in both fields.

Not that peace research itself is always much better, she points out. ‘The structure of foreign news’, the 1965 essay that provides the starting-point for peace journalism, was itself co-authored by a woman, Mari Holmboe Ruge, who is often, Brock-Utne remarks, forgotten. In tracing the ‘euphemistic language’ devised by male ‘defence intellectuals’ to disguise the horror of war, in particular nuclear weapons, she reminds us of how familiar such phrases have become over the years through repetition in the news. News of effective nonviolent actions is, by contrast, generally ignored and suppressed, and it is not coincidental that such actions are often devised and carried out by women.

Ibrahim Seaga Shaw extends the dimensions of peace journalism to include human rights. It’s an enticing step, given the common presentation in media reports of human rights as an unalloyed ‘good thing’. It is also a risky one. The list of conflicts in which advocates of peace and human rights have found themselves on opposite sides, in particular debates – over ‘humanitarian’ military interventions against abusive governments in South East Europe and West Asia, for example – testifies to some cognitive dissonance in the formation and application of starting assumptions.

Human rights journalism can be seen as a counter-hegemonic paradigm and practice, Shaw argues, if it is conceived with attention to the ‘unjust political economic structures, put and kept in place for the benefit of powerful interests in the rich world, [which] have the effect of keeping people in the majority world from realising the rights prescribed for them in the wellknown international instruments’ of human rights. He deploys, and significantly elaborates, Lisa Schirch’s (2002) enterprising attempt to devise a conceptual framework in which peace and human rights can be seen as mutually reinforcing, rather than as a set of forks in a road – over how to respond to individual culpability,

for instance, for crimes against humanity committed in the context of deficient structures and cultures. Human rights journalism is presented as a complementary strand of peace journalism, and one that opens up new lines of attack, so to speak, on mainstream reporting.

Annabel McGoldrick situates peace journalism in a collocation of current challenges, with a multitude of disciplinary tributaries, not merely to the hegemonic ‘objectivity’ paradigm in reporting conflict but to the dominant assumptions of Western political discourses, and their conceptions of human motivation and behaviour. She draws on her own experience as a psychotherapist, helping patients to heal family relationships by a series of steps founded on acknowledging the validity of multiple perspectives on the same issue: an acknowledgement enabled, in turn, by harnessing innate capacities for empathy.

‘Empathy’ is named as an essential attribute of peace journalism in Galtung’s original PJ table (Galtung 1998), one that can be activated by ‘giving a voice to all parties’, in multi-perspectival construction, not merely the two counterposed protagonists – ‘goodie’ and ‘baddie’ – familiar from war journalism. But it is a human quality that is routinely downgraded, McGoldrick argues, in the assumptions shared by both scholarly endeavour and public policymaking, in fields including economics and social policy as well as international relations. Friendship, emotional responses and fellow-feeling are seen as relatively weak and ephemeral compared with ‘hard’ calculations of optimality, in accounting for – and attempting to regulate – the social behaviour of individuals, communities and nation states alike.

However, a swelling stream of research has taken up findings from neuroscience to argue that humans are ‘soft-wired for empathy’, and that emotional responses are far more influential on behaviours than is allowed for in such doctrines as neoclassical economics, or realism in international relations, or the characteristic policy sets built upon them. The dominant representations of war journalism, being ‘dehumanizing of “them”’, as Galtung puts it, abrogate and suppress a key part of our meaning-making and relational capacity, thus exerting influence towards competitive, hostile and ultimately violent relationships. Peace journalism supplies opportunities for readers and audiences to

activate their empathic capacities, and can therefore be seen as a form of representation that is preferable, because it appears more authentic to their needs and instincts.

Part II: Peace journalism in wartime and peacebuilding

The chapters in this section focus on media framing of, and attention to, conflict situations. Each author offers some assessment of media representations in relation to criteria of war and peace journalism, while also pointing to new areas of (usually comparative) research and/or to conceptual revisions of the PJ model.

Stuart Allan's chapter calls for peace photography rather than war photography, and advocates expanding PJ into the analysis of photojournalism (both as a practice and as visual texts). It reinforces arguments advanced by other authors in this book (Shaw, Mogeckwu & Hawkins) that PJ focuses too heavily on conflict at the manifest/visible level, and ignores peacebuilding processes or resolving conflict at the latent/invisible level. Allan argues that documenting the horrors of warfare is of vital importance, but so is the need to devise and offer visual representations of alternatives in the name of peace. In order to address the deficit identified in Susie Linfield's (2010) observation that 'seeing the images of war does not necessarily translate into believing, caring or acting', Allan proposes the need to 'reconsider anew photography's potential contribution to ongoing efforts to reinvigorate peace journalism'.

The chapter calls for the urgent need to document the lived realities of human suffering in all of their complexities while, at the same time, engendering opportunities to visualise alternatives. Peace photography constitutes more than anti-war photography, namely because disrupting the logics of familiar binaries ('good' and 'evil', 'victim' and 'oppressor', 'us' and 'them') is only the initial step. But, by way of expanding PJ and reinforcing the important human rights and peace nexus as discussed by other authors of this book, Allan proposes a second vital step in which peace photography calls for nothing less than a profound reimagining of photographic form, practice and epistemology in order to move beyond the imposition of binaries in the first place, and thereby contribute to

the re-articulation of visions of the world in the service of human rights and social justice.

Lioba Suchenwirth and Richard Lance Keeble offer a critical appraisal of the mediascape of a country, Guatemala, now in a phase routinely described as 'post-conflict' but still, as they explain, replete with conflict issues and abundant cultural and structural violence, bequeathed by a history of colonialism and civil war (the latter triggered by the installation and maintenance of a repressive US client regime). The political economy of the Guatemalan media places the lion's share of resources for symbolic production in the hands of a local oligarchy and branches of the state (though they are linked at multiple levels).

Opportunities for PJ are therefore to be found in independent or 'alternative' media sectors – rich in ideas, creativity and grassroots connections, if not in physical or political capital. Indigenous media were provided for by the country's 'post-conflict' Constitution, they observe, but with a twist: radio stations can only gain legal status if they have successfully competed in a franchise auction for the entitlement to broadcast on allotted frequencies, thus institutionalising a bias in favour of those wealthy enough to clear this hurdle.

The chapter by Sudeshna Roy and Susan Dente Ross critically analyses and compares the editorial commentary about the 2008 terror attacks in Mumbai, India, in leading newspapers of India and the US: the *Hindustan Times* (*HT*), the largest-circulation English-language newspaper in Mumbai, and *The New York Times* (*NYT*). The authors examine Indian and US media coverage of the terror event in Mumbai to explore distinctions in the embedded ideology of terrorism and the (mis)alignment of the two nations' media commentaries with the tenets of war or peace discourse.

They suggest that media in both India and the US perpetuate global ideological discourses around terror that reify social identities, promote nationalistic support for government actions, and call up religious and political divisions between India and Pakistan as a primary cause for the terror attacks. The analysis also indicates alignment of the above three characteristics with the propaganda and elite orientation of war journalism, and the 'giving peace a chance' category with the truth and

solution orientation of peace journalism (Lynch & McGoldrick 2005).

Still, the finding that a well-established newspaper like the *HT* can create space for at least some peace journalism, expanding and rendering, replete with contestation, the political context of the Mumbai terror attack, unlike the foreign *NYT*, suggests that peace journalism is 'doable', even in conditions of stress. This analysis can serve to answer criticisms that PJ is mere rhetoric. This chapter's major contribution to the expansion of PJ is not so much in theory as in the application of PJ as a critical method: it offers a useful contrast between a US and a major non-Western newspaper and their political context, and enables discussion of the local inflexion of globalising/US discourses on terrorism.

While recognising Galtung's PJ model as a useful tool or checklist both for journalists and peace researchers, Stig-Arne Nohrstedt and Rune Ottosen suggest conceptual limitations. They recommend extending the model in three ways: first, methodologically, to critical discourse analysis (CDA); second, in scope, to other stages of the conflict cycle (a theme in other chapters also); and third, conceptually, to Bourdieu's 'doxa' or blind spots in the news.

The CDA approach to media studies incorporates levels of meanings and the relations between different actors in the discourse analysis as part of the context. Public debates in society have influence on the intertextual meanings generated in response to media texts, as do a gamut of other discursive forms including, but not confined to, the speeches and writings of political and military leaders, rhetorical interventions by PR firms and spin-doctors, and popular conceptions of national and security identity. The authors draw on their empirical study of media silence around certain critical aspects of the plans for closer military cooperation between Finland, Norway and Sweden, and the hidden assumptions concerning the wider context of the US-led 'global war on terrorism', as some such important influences, the salience of which are in no way diminished by their remaining tacit in media texts.

By using CDA as a supplement, the authors suggest a more comprehensive analysis that reveals the systematic stifling of both ordinary people's voices, and certain crucial aspects of debate, with the objective of disclosing the complex discursive constructions and referential

structures that contribute to conflict escalations and wars. Nohrstedt and Ottosen make the argument that this silence (or doxa) about potential conflict-risks and possible involvement in future wars is not reflected in Galtung's model for war and peace journalism.

If Nohrstedt and Ottosen's observations mandate PJ's increased attention to strategic silences that may prevent timely discussion of trajectories ultimately leading to violence, then Matt Mogekwu's chapter picks up the theme by calling on peace journalists to intervene in that key phase of conflict where violence is 'latent', rather than waiting for it to become manifest. Drawing on an exploration of the coverage of the Niger-Delta crisis by the local Nigerian media, Mogweku calls on journalists to promote dialogue among the parties in conflict before things get out of hand.

Mogweku argues that, if local journalists in the Niger-Delta region had taken up the responsibility of 'managing' the crisis at the level where listening would have been a crucial factor in resolving the issues raised by the region's indigenes, the eventual violence might have been avoided.

Virgil Hawkins' chapter finds that, relative to the coverage of the violent phase of the conflict, the proportion of coverage of the peace process was considerably less for the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) than it was for Israel–Palestine, even when the death toll (threshold) was much higher in the former than the latter. He argues that the problem of war journalism is not only limited to the idea of 'stealth' conflicts but also 'stealth' peace processes.

The reasons for this marginalisation are complex, Hawkins notes, but they include the lack of involvement and interest of elite nations and persons; the perceived failure of a predominantly white and affluent audience to identify with the human stories within the intimidating statistics; the sheer complexity of the conflict; the fact that events in the DRC had been consistently marginalised in the past (continuity); commercial factors such as the lack of reporters permanently stationed in the vicinity; and the gravitational pull of powerful agenda-setters in the media. Hawkins calls for an expansion of the peace journalism movement to encourage 'improvements in the quantity, as well as quality, of journalism related to armed conflict and its resolution.'

Part III. Agencies and openings for change

The chapters in this section overlap conceptually with those in Part II, but they place more emphasis on opportunities and avenues for change, politically as well as academically, in the practice of journalism, of research, and of peacebuilding.

Jake Lynch considers the potential for PJ to serve as a rallying cry for social movement activism, seeking to exert influence in the form of extra-movement outcomes in the particular case of representations in Australian media of the Israel–Palestine conflict. Is there, he wonders, sufficient ‘commensurability’ between the distinctions in the PJ model and what social movement activists would consider as motivating goals in response to ‘hot poker’ issues, for coalitions of interest to form around demands for reforms to media practices and structures?

Lynch describes an experiment in which two focus groups of activists from Sydney’s Muslim community each saw a different version of a set of television news stories, including an episode of the Israel–Palestine conflict, in which Muslim people featured strongly as subjects (‘or objects, in the sense of having things done to them’). One version was framed as war journalism, the other as peace journalism. There was, Lynch recounts, an ‘incipient generation gap’ in the responses, with younger activists prepared to notice and appreciate the differences, while their older colleagues saw them essentially as variants of the same thing: ‘it’s not different enough for the community here’, one said; ‘you’d have to hit us in the face with a wet fish, I think’.

Elissa Tivona’s chapter builds on calls to expand PJ to incorporate coverage of largely invisible peacebuilding efforts such as those of social movements described in the chapters by Suchenwirth and Keeble, and by Lynch, by calling for similar attention to women’s roles in peacebuilding processes. Tivona’s point of departure is that intellectual elites, with the collusion of every form of recorded media from the beginning of history, have marginalised and obscured the identifiable agency of women and their particular capacity for compassion.

Drawing on the findings of her research based on the peace stories of nine women randomly selected from among the 1000 peacewomen collectively nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2005, Tivona

Expanding peace journalism

calls for a shift in the gendered assumptions of news discourse, from 'if it bleeds, it leads' to 'it heals if it reveals'. However, she warns that to achieve this requires a reformulation of the performances that are highlighted on a day-to-day basis – performances modelled by women activists across the globe. She calls for a move away from the narrow spectrum of rhetorical performance currently featured in headlines, which freezes human activity in images of intractable and often violent conflict, while creative and salient models for conflict mitigation and resolution, such as those by the nine peacewomen in her study, are systematically overlooked.

Rob McMahon and Peter Chow-White develop the notion of 'empathy' for all in conflict resolution and peace building by proposing the 'cold conflict' model that they say would help peace researchers investigate the more subtle discursive terrain of 'cold' conflicts, which other authors in this volume call 'latent/indirect/invisible' conflicts. They propose the concept of 'legacy' racism as an alternative to 'old' racism, to recognise the continuing impacts of past racist policies and practices on groups and individuals. They critically analyse a case study of news coverage about 'reconciliation' activities between First Nations and non-aboriginal communities in Canada. Their analytical model reveals the strains of 'legacy racism' and 'new racism' that exist alongside already existing examples of PJ in news coverage of Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

The McMahon and Chow-White model exposes nascent tendencies towards peace journalism, enabling them to highlight examples of discourses that challenge stereotypes, expose the structural effects of violence, demonstrate the fluid and contingent nature of group-based identities and offer appropriate contextual explanations. Their case study underscores questions asked by PJ researchers and their critics as to whether mediated approaches to peacebuilding are effective in securing material change and transforming conflict.

Future directions for peace journalism: research and strategy

Elissa Tivona builds up a qualitative document analysis through 'local focus dyads' – juxtaposing and contrasting the 'background [1000]

Peacewomen across the globe narrative ... with a foreground news story.’ The latter was taken from mainstream media, in acknowledgement of their power to foreground, through such effects – wellknown to media research – as agenda-setting and framing, which make salient particular aspects of the reality in which we are daily immersed. Some ‘knowns’ – things we know, as a human community – are systematically rendered ‘unknown’ by this power, Birgit Brock-Utne notes, adding a category to the (in)famous typology of intelligence material proposed by Donald Rumsfeld. The ‘unknown knowns’ – knowledges and understandings we need, to build peace – have to be disinterred from where hegemonic forces have buried them under mounds of euphemism and strategic silence.

It is by claiming a share of this power – to bring aspects of background into the foreground, Tivona suggests – that extra-movement outcomes might be brought within reach for movements committed to progressive social change: what she names as a ‘globalisation of compassion ... to move empathic sensitivity from a theoretical ideal to a practical reality’, by ‘regularly highlight[ing]’ the acts performed daily by ‘peacewomen’ across every continent, thus bridging Lederach’s interdependence gap.

Crucially, the binary of ‘foreground’ and ‘background’ (‘highlight’ and ‘shadow’) has to remain in place, at least to some extent, for this to work. The ‘trust bonus’ accorded to mainstream media is what enables them to do ideological work, in the Gramscian sense of camouflaging points of view as ‘common sense’, or appearing to place them in the realm of the ‘factual’. ‘The [journalistic] acceptance of representational conventions as facticity’, Gaye Tuchman noted in a landmark study of newsroom procedures, is what ‘leaves reality vulnerable to manipulation’ (Tuchman 1978, p109). Success in penetrating and transforming the category of mainstream news – its values, practices and definitions – to give peace more of a chance, by claiming part of its lasting ‘trust bonus’, still presents a glittering prize for PJ in non-research contexts and an attractive prospect for researchers to devise ways to investigate further.

In the upheavals of the Arab Spring, and other examples of extra-movement outcomes, this may entail looking both before and beyond

the 'new media moment' to disclose relations of cause and effect in longer perspective: how did the moment arrive, and what happened next? Egypt's Facebook phenomenon did not, by itself, bring about a revolution, any more than Wikileaks' crib to the real thoughts of the US Ambassador in Tunis 'caused' the fall of the Ben Ali regime. The 'risks to [its] long-term stability' were pinpointed, in his cable of 2009, as 'anger ... at Tunisia's high unemployment and regional inequities'. New media placed organisational and ideological resources in the hands of activists at what proved a crucial moment, thereby lowering a barrier to mobilisation in response to grievances long in the gestation.

It still leaves open the question of how this momentum came to exert such powerful political agency, and this is where alternative and conventional media may converge after all. The inchoate cry of tweets from Tahrir Square appeared to acquire political heft only when they attained 'crossover' into the mainstream, notably through coverage on Al Jazeera, and thence into the 'official public sphere'. An email circular from one of the best-known online activist groups, Avaaz.org, thus described the fruits of its actions in 'Syria, Yemen, Libya ... our support to activists has created global media cycles with footage and eyewitness accounts that our team helps to distribute to CNN, BBC, Al Jazeera and others'.

Wikileaks itself apparently made the calculation that, in order to attain due prominence and salience for the disclosures in its leaked diplomatic cables, formal arrangements with professional news organisations were required. The catalysing influence ascribed to them may be attributable, in part, to the phenomenology of their appearance, not on a campaigning website or in other 'alternative' media but in a context where traditional safeguards – trained observers, edited copy – had built up reputational resources to support them.

This pattern of 'crossover' from alternative to mainstream media, presaging extra-movement outcomes, is apparently being recapitulated in other, quite different mediascapes and political milieux at the same time. In a contemporaneous example, campaigners successfully halted the privatisation of forestry management by the UK's new Conservative-led Coalition government: an extension of neoliberal economic policy

identified by activists as a threat to cherished rights of access. Ministers were responding, Attorney General Dominic Grieve declared, to ‘a spontaneous combustion brought about by the internet [a half-million strong online petition organised via social media], which grew a momentum of its own. National newspapers jumped on the bandwagon once it started, but actually the bandwagon started without them.’

Matt Mogeckwu, in his contribution to this volume, argues that PJ must ‘free itself from the mainstream journalism strait-jacket’ if it is to fulfil its representational potential, but also that it must reach out across the divide between the parallel fields of alternative and mainstream media to ‘work hand-in-hand with existing journalism practice’. Robert A Hackett ends his chapter by making the case for ‘challenger paradigms’ to combine, in different permutations to suit different circumstances. Exponents of peace journalism, alternative media and communication rights could, he suggests, join forces, if their efforts are calibrated with due sensitivity to context.

It is possible, indeed, to extrapolate, from most if not all of the chapters in this volume, trajectories in which these approaches mesh to become greater than the sum of their parts. ‘Movements for media democratisation are pursuing communication rights that are formally recognised in national and international law’, Hackett observes; Jake Lynch, in his chapter, identifies the removal of bureaucratic filters to the ABC honouring its (notional) mandate to diversity; and Lioba Suchenwirth and Richard Lance Keeble point to reforms needed for indigenous Guatemalan media to fulfil their potential – these are all demands for structural changes whose focus is sharpened by the application of PJ analytical techniques.

There are roles for PJ research, then, in identifying, documenting and fostering the dynamics of ‘crossover’ between alternative and mainstream media, and thence into official public spheres, while those categories retain their applicability. PJ advocates must develop, between them, strategic approaches capable of motivating exponents in both fields – acknowledging that these will inevitably differ, and that they can draw strength from each other. ‘Giving serious *attention* to nonofficial sources is discouraged as unnewsworthy’, Shoemaker and Reese wrote

(Shoemaker & Reese 1996, p235), in journalism that thinks itself 'objective'; but this is a generalisation that dates from before the 'accentuation' of social movements' potential for political agency brought about by new media and its boost to multiple traditions of radical, openly committed journalistic practice.

In addition to the question of the potential for agency and change within the existing structures of media, future research could also explore the question that underlies the call by some of the authors in this volume for a more proactive role for PJ in preventing conflict escalation and violence. Could the practices of peace journalism, if embedded more widely in public communication processes and institutions, make a significant difference to conflict cycles? Could they change or break the hypothesised destructive 'feedback loop' noted above? Under what conditions could this occur? More empirical evidence on the potentially positive as well as negative impact of media practices and content would provide a stronger ethical case for a more consciously interventionist role for journalism in promoting and protecting peace and human rights.

Media, Schudson points out, 'are formally disconnected from other ruling agencies, in that they must attend as much to their own legitimation as to the legitimation of the capitalist system as a whole' (Schudson 1995, p270). They can ill afford, in other words, to appear less wellinformed or more credulous than their readers and audiences. Peace journalism, if it grows into a role connecting the alternative and mainstream media fields and speaks in ways intelligible to both, can come to be seen as offering means for journalists to 'wise up', for activists to bring their messages from background to foreground, and for democratisation agendas to acquire content to sharpen and promote their calls for structural reform.

References

Bennett, W Lance (1990). Towards a theory of press-state relations. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2): 103–25.

- Castells, Manuel (2007). Communication power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication*, 1: 238–66.
- Earl, Jennifer (2000). Methods, movements and outcomes. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, 22: 3–25.
- Earl, Jennifer, Katrina Kimport, Greg Prieto, Carly Rush & Kimberly Reynoso (2010). Changing the world one webpage at a time: conceptualizing and explaining internet activism. *Mobilization*, 15(4): 425–46.
- Freedman, Des (2009). ‘Smooth operator’? The propaganda model and moments of crisis. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, 6(2): 59–72.
- Galtung, Johan (2004). *Transcend and transform: an introduction to conflict work*. London: Pluto Press.
- Galtung, Johan (1998). High road, low road: charting the course for peace journalism, *Track Two*, (7): 4, Centre for Conflict Resolution, South Africa. [Online]. Available: ccrweb.ccr.uct.ac.za/archive/two/7_4/p07_highroad_lowroad.html [Accessed 23 July 2011].
- Gamson, William A (1975). *The strategy of social protest*. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas (2007). Situating peace journalism in journalism studies: a critical appraisal. *Conflict and Communication*, 6(2): 1–9. [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/hanitzsch.pdf [Accessed 23 January 2011].
- Keeble, Richard Lance (2010). Peace journalism as political practice: a new, radical look at the theory. In Richard Lance Keeble, John Tulloch & Florian Zollmann (Eds). *Peace journalism, war and conflict resolution* (pp49–68). London & New York: Peter Lang.
- Kempf, Wilhelm (2007). Peace journalism: a tightrope walk between advocacy journalism and constructive conflict coverage. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 6(2). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regener-online.de/2007_2/pdf/kempf.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2011].

Expanding peace journalism

Lederach, John Paul (1999). Justpeace: the challenge of the 21st century. In *People building peace: 35 inspiring stories from around the world* (pp27–36). Utrecht: European Centre for Conflict Prevention.

Linfield, Susie (2010). *The cruel radiance: photography and political violence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loyn, David (2007). Good journalism or peace journalism? *Conflict and Communication Online*, 6(2). [Online]. Available: www.cco.regeneronline.de/2007_2/pdf/loyn_reply.pdf [Accessed 20 July 2011].

Lynch, Jake (2008). *Debates in peace journalism*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Lynch, Jake & Johan Galtung (2010). *Reporting conflict: new directions in peace journalism*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Lynch, Jake & Annabel McGoldrick (2005). *Peace journalism*. Stroud: Hawthorn Press.

McKee, Alan (2005). *The public sphere: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Molotch, Harvey & Marilyn Lester (1997). News as purposive behaviour: on the strategic use of routine events, accidents and scandals. In Daniel Berkowitz (Ed.). *Social meanings of news: a text reader* (193–209). London: Sage.

Patindol, Jean Lee (2010). Building a peace journalists' network from the ground: the Philippine experience. In Richard Keeble, John Tulloch & Florian Zollmann (Eds). *Peace journalism, war and conflict resolution* (pp193–206). London & New York: Peter Lang.

Schirch, Lisa (2002). Human rights and peacebuilding: towards just peace. Paper presented to 43rd Annual International Studies Association Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, March 2002.

Schudson, Michael (1995). *The power of news*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shinar, Dov (2007). Peace journalism: the state of the art. In Dov Shinar & Wilhelm Kempf (Eds). *Peace journalism: the state of the art* (pp199–210). Berlin: Regener.

Shoemaker, Pamela J & Stephen D Reese (1996). *Mediating the message: theories of influences on mass media content*. 2nd edn. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Stephenson, Carolyn (1999). Peace studies, overview. In Lester Kurtz & Jennifer Turpin (Eds). *The encyclopaedia of violence, peace and conflict* (vol. 2) (pp809–20). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Tehrani, Majid (2002). Peace journalism: negotiating global media ethics. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 7(2): 58–83.

Tuchman, Gaye (1978): *Making news: a study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.

Williams, Louise & Roland Rich (Eds) (2000). *Losing control: freedom of the press in Asia*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press.